

# SEVEN DIMENSIONS OF CONSUMPTION

---



# SEVEN DIMENSIONS OF CONSUMPTION

---

ISAK BARBOPOULOS

Doctoral Dissertation in Psychology  
Department of Psychology  
University of Gothenburg  
2017

SEVEN DIMENSIONS OF CONSUMPTION

© Isak Barbopoulos

ISBN: 978-91-629-0183-7 (Print)

ISBN: 978-91-629-0184-4 (PDF)

ISSN: 1101-718X

ISRN: GU/PSYK/AVH-360-SE

Available online: [hdl.handle.net/2077/52156](http://hdl.handle.net/2077/52156)

Cover by Maurizio Marotta ([www.tatlin.net](http://www.tatlin.net))

Printed by Ineko AB, Gothenburg, Sweden, April 2017

For my daughter, Alma



# Preface

---

This thesis consists of a summary and the following three research articles:

- I. Barbopoulos, I., & Johansson, L.-O. (2016). A multi-dimensional approach to consumer motivation: Exploring economic, hedonic, and normative consumption goals. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 33(1), 75–84.
- II. Barbopoulos, I., & Johansson, L.-O. (2017). The Consumer Motivation Scale: Development of a multi-dimensional and context-sensitive measure of consumption goals. *Journal of Business Research*, 76, 118-126.
- III. Barbopoulos, I., & Johansson, L.-O. (2017). *The situational activation of consumption goals*. Manuscript submitted for publication.



# Abstract

---

Barbopoulos, I. (2017). *Seven dimensions of consumption*. Department of Psychology, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

This thesis presents the development of the integrative, context-sensitive, and multi-dimensional Consumer Motivation Scale (CMS). The CMS is based on the three higher-order master goals of goal-framing theory: the *gain goal* (“to guard or improve one’s resources”), the *hedonic goal* (“to feel better right now”), and the *normative goal* (“to act appropriately”). Across three articles, nine empirical studies, and various product categories and consumption contexts, the dimensionality and situational variability of the master goals are examined. The emergent goal structure—consisting of the three gain sub-goals *Value for Money*, *Quality*, and *Safety*, the two hedonic goals *Stimulation* and *Comfort*, and the two normative goals *Ethics* and *Social Acceptance*—is demonstrated to be linked to corresponding consumption behaviors and preferences. The resulting 34-item measure draws on a broad range of research, from economics and marketing to social and environmental psychology, and takes the cognitive, context-dependent, and multi-dimensional nature of motivation into account, providing consumer researchers and practitioners with a more nuanced and psychologically accurate measure of consumer motivation. It should prove useful in standard marketing research, as well as in the development of tailored marketing strategies and the segmentation of consumer groups, settings, brands, and products.

**Keywords:** Consumer Motivation Scale; consumption goals; multi-dimensionality; context-dependence; scale development

ISBN: 978-91-629-0183-7 (Print); ISBN: 978-91-629-0184-4 (PDF);

ISSN: 1101-718X; ISRN: GU/PSYK/AVH—360—SE;

Available online: <http://hdl.handle.net/2077/52156>

---

Isak Barbopoulos, Department of Psychology, University of Gothenburg, Box 500, SE 405 30, Gothenburg, Sweden. E-mail: [isak.barbopoulos@psy.gu.se](mailto:isak.barbopoulos@psy.gu.se)



## Swedish summary

---

Föreställ dig att du står i mataffären och precis ska bestämma vad du ska äta till middag ikväll. Enligt traditionell konsumentteori kommer beslutet främst bero på två faktorer: *begränsningar*, så som tillgänglighet, tid eller budget, och *preferenser*, som bygger på önskningar och begär. För att ett alternativ över huvud taget ska övervägas så krävs det för det första att det är rimligt enligt dina begränsningar. Det är till exempel troligt att du utesluter ett flertal alternativ som antingen är för dyra, krångliga, eller som av andra anledningar inte är skäligen. När du väl har identifierat ett antal rimliga alternativ så är det dina preferenser som avgör hur du rangordnar dem. Ordningen beror på hur du värderar den förväntade nyttan - baserat på till exempel näring, mättnad, kvalitet, och smak - kontra kostnader - baserat på till exempel pris, tid, och ansträngning. Således är det troligt att du kommer välja det alternativ som ger dig det mesta av de saker du värderar högst för den lägsta upplevda kostnaden.

Preferenser antas vara stabila över så väl tid som situation. Du kommer med andra ord inte plötsligt börja tycka om mat som du dagen innan avskydde. Förändringar i din rangordning av alternativ antas därför främst antingen bero på förändrade begränsningar, eller förändringar i själva produkten. Forskning har dock visat att konsumenters preferenser varierar som en funktion av både produkttyp och den kontext som produkten konsumeras i. Konsumenter har visat sig bry sig mer om priset när de handlar funktionella produkter (t.ex. rengöringsmedel) eller handlar dem till sig själva, än om de handlar hedonistiska produkter (t.ex. glass) eller handlar dem till sig och sina vänner, och de väljer ofta större variation av varor när deras val är synliga för andra snarare än dolda. Dessa fynd är svåra att förklara enligt den traditionella synen på konsumenters stabila preferenser.

Nya rön inom så väl motivations-, miljö- och kognitiv psykologi kan dock hjälpa oss förstå dessa fenomen. Enligt det kognitiva perspektivet på motivation utgör våra konsumtionsmål mentala representationer av våra önskade tillstånd. När ett mål blir aktivt uppstår en anspänning inom oss som varierar i styrka baserat på diskrepansen mellan det nuvarande tillståndet och det önskade tillståndet, och denna anspänning upphör först när målet antingen blivit tillfredsställt eller förkastats. Handlingar och objekt som kan tillfredsställa målet, och därmed minska anspänningen, ses i ett mer positivt ljus, medan det motsatta gäller för handlingar eller objekt som riskerar sakta ner vår framfart mot målet, eller ta oss längre från det. Mål kan i sin tur aktivera andra kognitiva processer, så som

uppmärksamhet, informationsbearbetning, och kunskaps-strukturer. Detta hjälper oss uppnå våra mål genom att betydelsefull information lättare blir uppmärksammasad och tillgänglig för oss.

Till skillnad från preferenser så varierar aktiveringen av mål både över tid och från situation till situation. Variationen är inte slumpmässig, utan vi tenderar sträva efter samma mål i situationer som liknar varandra, medan vi kan sträva efter helt andra mål i situationer som skiljer sig. Det är med andra ord ingenting konstigt i att vi har olika preferenser från ett tillfälle till ett annat. För att en forskare ska kunna förutse vad just du tänker äta till middag ikväll så räcker det alltså inte enbart med en förståelse för dina begränsningar och dina preferenser, utan även en förståelse för hur du upplever situationen du befinner dig i, och de mål som blir aktiva i den. Eftersom beteende är beroende individuella faktorer – så som värderingar och attityder – men även situationella – så som vem du konsumerar med och till vilket ändamål – så är det möjligt att utvinna mer information med hjälp av mätinstrument som bygger på det kognitiva synsättet på mål.

Mål antas vara organiserade i associativa nätverk, där överordnade abstrakta mål är kopplade till underliggande kunskapsstrukturer, delmål, samt preferenser. Tre särskilt inflytelserika mål har identifierats och beskrivits i detalj: *vinstmål* (“att bevaka eller förbättra sina resurser”), *hedonistiska mål* (“att må bättre just nu”), och *normativa mål* (“att agera på ett lämpligt sätt”). Vinstmål studeras vanligtvis inom teorier om ekonomiskt och rationellt beslutsfattande, hedonistiska mål inom teorier om affekt och emotioner, och normativa mål inom teorier om socialt och moraliskt beteende. Trots att målen är väletablerade inom sina respektive fält så har få försök gjorts för att integrera dem i en och samma modell, och de mäts sällan med ett och samma mätinstrument.

Denna doktorsavhandling bygger på två grundläggande antaganden. För det första så antas konsumenter inte bara sträva efter ekonomisk nytta, utan de antas även sträva efter emotionella så väl som sociala och moraliska mål. För det andra, konsumenters val och preferenser varierar inte bara mellan individer, utan också inom individer. Med andra ord så kan en och samma person föredra och välja olika alternativ beroende på vilken typ av produkt de överväger att köpa, med vem de köper den, och i vilken typ av situation de avser konsumera den i. Det primära syftet med avhandlingen är att utforska strukturen hos de tre överordnade målen, samt baserat på denna struktur utveckla ett mätinstrument som är integrativt, tar så väl individuell och situationsberoende varians i hänsyn, samt går att applicera på en mängd olika produkter och situationer.

Avhandlingen består av tre forskningsartiklar, med tre empiriska studier i vardera. I den första och andra artikeln etableras och valideras en motivstruktur baserat på de tre överordnade målen. Resultatet är en struktur med sju distinkta delmål, som trots att de är länkade till de tre överordnade målen var och en har en unik koppling till konsumentbeteenden. Av de sju delmålen faller tre under det överordnade vinstmålet: *Värde för pengarna*, *Kvalitet*, och *Säkerhet*; två faller under det hedonistiska målet: *Stimulation* och *Bekvämlighet*, och två faller under det normativa målet: *Etik* och *Social acceptans*.

Ett viktigt fynd är att delmål som är kopplade till samma överordnade mål kan leda till markant olika val; *Stimulation* och *Bekvämlighet* är till exempel båda kopplade till det överordnade hedonistiska målet, men de uppfyller det på olika vis. En person som strävar efter att må bättre just nu genom avslappning och bekvämlighet, kommer således inte uppskatta en festlig middag, trots att festliga middagar kan få en att må bra genom uppfyllelse av stimulationsmålet. På liknande sätt skiljer sig även de andra delmålen från varandra, till exempel *Kvalitet* kontra *Värde för pengarna*, samt *Etik* kontra *Social Acceptans*.

I den tredje artikeln testas antagandet att konsumenters mål varierar som en funktion av produkttyp och situation, och vi tittar även närmare på i vilken utsträckning dessa effekter påverkar konsumenters beteenden, till exempel deras villighet att betala, priskänslighet, och variationssökande. Resultaten visar att målen varierar beroende på både produkttyp - till exempel så tycker vi priset spelar större roll för mat än för underhållning, och vi bryr oss i allmänhet mer om vad våra vänner anser om de kläder vi köper än den mat vi köper – och tillfälle – vi är nämligen redo att betala betydligt mer när vi avser konsumera produkten ihop med vänner än om vi bara ska vara själva; ett faktum som tycks gälla även när vår budget är begränsad.

Denna doktorsavhandling beskriver utvecklingen av mätinstrumentet 'the Consumer Motivation Scale' (CMS), vilken täcker ett brett spektrum av motivationsfaktorer, från ekonomiska till hedonistiska, moraliska, och sociala; tillämpbara i en mängd olika konsumtionssammanhang och för olika produkttyper. CMS borde därmed vara ett användbart verktyg vid såväl traditionell marknadsföring som vid utvecklandet av skräddarsydda marknadsföringsstrategier och beteendeförändringskampanjer, och kan användas till att kartlägga inte bara individer och målgrupper, utan även situationer och produkter.



## Acknowledgements

---

I would first like to thank my mother Kristina and my daughter Alma. I would also like to thank the rest of my family and all my friends outside the department.

Within the department, I would like to thank my supervisor and co-author, Lars-Olof Johansson, for all his support and feedback over the last few years. I also wish to thank Leif Denti, André Hansla, Gró Einarsdóttir, Anders Carlander, and the rest of my friends, colleagues, and fellow doctoral students, for all the interesting and enjoyable discussions over the years. And finally, I want to thank the administrative staff at the department, to name but a few: Ann Backlund, Petra Löfgren, Marie-Louise Rydberg ...

Isak Barbopoulos,  
Gothenburg, 18th April 2017

### **Funding**

This research was funded by VINNOVA (grant number 2008-03195), and the Swedish Research Council (grant number 2007-2227).



# Contents

---

SEVEN DIMENSIONS OF CONSUMPTION .....	1
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND .....	5
CONSUMER MOTIVATION.....	5
Motivation as cognition .....	6
Structural properties of goals .....	7
Interconnectedness.....	7
Transfer of properties within a goal system.....	7
Subconscious impact.....	8
Contextual dependence. ....	8
Functional properties of goals.....	8
Limited cognitive resources.....	8
Goal priority .....	9
Motivational properties of goals .....	9
Goal-commitment .....	9
Persistence-until.....	9
Docility .....	9
Affect.....	10
Effort.....	10
Promotion vs. Prevention goals .....	10
THREE MASTER GOALS: THREE LINES OF RESEARCH.....	11
The gain goal .....	11
The hedonic goal .....	12
The normative goal.....	13
DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONSUMER MOTIVATION SCALE ..	15
OVERVIEW.....	15
SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL STUDIES.....	16
Article I.....	16
Study 1A .....	16
Study 1B .....	17
Study 1C.....	18

Article II.....	19
Study 2A .....	20
Study 2B .....	21
Study 2C.....	22
Article III .....	22
Study 3A .....	23
Study 3B .....	24
Study 3C.....	25
DISCUSSION .....	27
THE SEVEN DIMENSIONS OF THE CMS.....	28
The gain goal .....	28
Value for Money and Quality. ....	28
Safety.....	28
The hedonic goal .....	29
Stimulation and Comfort. ....	29
The normative goal.....	30
Ethics and Social Acceptance.....	30
CONTRIBUTIONS .....	30
IMPLICATIONS.....	31
LIMITATIONS .....	32
FUTURE RESEARCH.....	33
REFERENCES .....	34
APPENDIX A.....	43
APPENDIX B.....	45

# Seven dimensions of consumption

---

Imagine that you are walking along an aisle in a grocery store, about to decide what to eat for dinner this evening. According to standard consumer theory, your decision will depend mainly on two factors: *constraints*, such as time and budget, and *preferences*, based on wants and desires (Lindenberg & Frey, 1993). The constraints determine what options you are likely to include or exclude from consideration, and once you have a number of options under consideration, your preferences will determine their rank order, based on evaluation of the gains, such as nutrition, quality, or taste, versus the costs, in terms of, for instance, money, time, and effort (Zeithaml, 1998). You are likely to prefer the option that gives you most of the things you value at the lowest perceived cost.

Whereas constraints may vary from one occasion to another, preferences are often assumed to remain stable over time as well as across situations (Andersen, Harrison, Lau, & Rutström, 2008). If your choices this evening differ from your usual preferences for products, brands, or stores, then this change in behavior should be attributed to a change in either your constraints or in the attributes of the alternatives, rather than a change in your preferences (Lindenberg & Frey, 1993).

However, research has found that individual preferences are not as stable as is often assumed, as preferences for product attributes, brands, and stores often fluctuate as a function of the situation (Bearden & Woodside, 1978; Mattson, 1982). These fluctuations are not merely random noise, as consumers seem to prefer cheaper alternatives when the product is utilitarian in nature (e.g., detergent) or when it is to be consumed by oneself, rather than hedonic (e.g., ice cream) or when consumed with others (Wakefield & Inman, 2003). Furthermore, consumers tend to incorporate more variety when their choices are public rather than private

(Ratner & Kahn, 2002) and are more likely to choose environmentally friendly products when environmental values are made salient (Verplanken & Holland, 2002).

Recent developments in the study of motivation may provide some insight into the situational variation of preferences. According to the cognitive perspective on motivation, goals are mental representations of desired end-states (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 1999) that guide our thoughts and actions (Moskowitz & Grant, 2009). When a goal becomes active, associated motives and knowledge structures become active as well (Gollwitzer & Bargh, 1996), helping us pursue our target by making relevant information salient (Janiszewski, 2008) and selectively infusing the alternatives with positive or negative valence, depending on whether they are conducive or detrimental to our active goals (Förster, Liberman, & Friedman, 2007).

By influencing attention and information processing, goals determine how we perceive, evaluate, and choose among the alternatives under consideration (Lindenberg & Frey, 1993). Consequently, when the active goals change, the alternatives under consideration will be perceived differently, leading to different preferences and choices.

Unlike preferences, goals are influenced by environmental cues (Bargh & Barndollar, 1996), as they become activated or deactivated depending on how we perceive the situation (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). Knowing which goals are active in a situation, and how activation varies across situations, provides valuable knowledge about what consumers attend to, the product attributes they prefer, and the pricing strategies that may be most effective. To date, the situational variability of goals has been overlooked in models of consumer behavior, as scales generally consist of situation-independent constructs, such as consumer values (Kahle, Beatty, & Homer, 1986) or personality traits (Aluja, Kuhlman, & Zuckerman, 2010), or are designed for specific settings or products, such as sports, tobacco (Sheth, Newman, & Gross, 1991), or travel (Bello & Etzel, 1985), making it hard to assess changes across situations.

Goals are assumed to be organized in associative networks in which higher-order goals can be linked to whole areas of knowledge structures, sub-goals, and means (Kruglanski et al., 2002; Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). Three such higher-order “master goals” have been identified and described in detail (Lindenberg, 2001a). These are the *gain goal* (“to guard or improve one’s resources”), the *hedonic goal* (“to feel better right now”), and the *normative goal* (“to act appropriately”). Despite the well-established influence of these three key goals, few attempts have been made to

integrate them into a single coherent model or scale (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007), as consumer scales often focus on specific determinants (e.g., Batra, Homer, & Kahle, 2001), while certain goals, such as normative and moral goals, are commonly ignored altogether (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007).

In this doctoral dissertation, the primary aim is the development of a method of measuring consumption goals that takes the cognitive, situation-dependent, and multi-dimensional nature of motivation into account. In nine empirical studies, presented in three research articles, the dimensionality, reliability, validity, and situational variability of the three influential master goals are examined across a variety of product categories, including the consumption of food, clothes, entertainment, banking and investments, travel, and accommodations. The result is the seven-dimensional Consumer Motivation Scale (CMS).

The remainder of this summary is organized as follows. First, the cognitive and motivational properties of goals are reviewed. Second, the three master goals, which constitute the foundation of the present scale, are described in detail. Third, the scale development procedure is described along with a summary of the empirical studies. Finally, findings, conclusions, and future research directions are discussed. The final version of the CMS is included in Appendix A, and a template for how it might be implemented in a questionnaire is included in Appendix B.



# Theoretical background

---

## Consumer motivation

*A strongly accented goal so transforms the situation that practically all objects acquire a reference to this goal. (Lewin, 1935, p. 102)*

Motivation is what initiates, sustains, and regulates conscious and intentional actions: it is what drives thinking and doing, giving us a sense of purpose and of directed movement (Moskowitz & Grant, 2009).

Most human behavior is goal driven, performed as a means toward some end, and consumer behavior is no exception (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 1999). In the context of consumption, motivation comprises the needs and wants of the consumer and constitutes the basis of consumer values (Vinson, Scott, & Lamont, 1977), influencing how we perceive, categorize, and choose among products (Gutman, 1982).

Once a goal has been activated, tension arises based on the discrepancy between the current and desired states, a tension which is not relieved until the goal has been reached or discarded (Carver & Scheier, 1981). Actions and objects that may fulfill our goals are infused with positive valence (Förster et al., 2007) in a process that constructs and reconstructs the perceived value of alternatives independent of pre-existing preferences (Custers & Aarts, 2005). Goals thereby function as reference points and guides, helping us identify relevant information, evaluate the available means, and initiate appropriate action (Moskowitz & Grant, 2009).

When our active goals are achieved, the association between the means and the given situation which they were consumed in becomes stronger.

Consumers thereby learn to associate specific products with their consequences in given situations (Gutman, 1982).

**Motivation as cognition.** Motivation has traditionally been seen as static, in that individuals either have a high or low degree of a certain motivation, for example, a need for closure (Kruglanski & Webster, 1996) or for cognition (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982). As with preferences, a change in motivated behavior has therefore typically been attributed to changes in constraints or incentives, rather than by a change in goal activation (Kruglanski et al., 2002). Furthermore, motivation has been seen a separate construct from cognition, in that the two are assumed to have different properties and be related to different mental functions. In dual-process theories of persuasion, for instance, motivation is thought to determine the degree of cognitive processing used for a task, with high motivation leading to elaborate processing of information, and low motivation leading to shallow processing and the use of potentially misleading heuristic cues (Chen & Chaiken, 1999; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).

However, research has found that motivation is in fact not static and not necessarily separate from other cognitive processes (Kruglanski et al., 2002). Although an individual's motivation may indeed seem stable and static when their behavior is aggregated across many situations, research suggests that this approach neglects situational variance. The variance between situations, often treated as "error," may in fact convey important information about the interaction between personality and the situation (Mischel & Shoda, 1995). Goals pursued over a long period in many different situations give insight into the stable values and traits of the individual, whereas goals pursued only in certain situations or under certain circumstances can be used to gain knowledge of differences within the individual, for example, over time or across situations (Moskowitz & Grant, 2009). To better understand these situational fluctuations, it is necessary to abandon the view of motivation as an isolated and static construct, and instead adopt a cognitive approach.

According to the "new look on motivation" (Kruglanski et al., 2002), motivational constructs share certain structural as well as functional properties with other cognitive constructs. The structural properties entail cognitive interconnectedness and the organization of goals, sub-goals, and means into hierarchical goal systems, whereas the functional properties entail limited cognitive resources and the need for activation.

## Structural properties of goals

**Interconnectedness.** In cognitive systems, units spread activation to other units to which they are connected (Srull, 1981). Likewise, goals spread activation to associated goals, sub-goals, motives, and means (Kruglanski et al., 2002). These connections can be represented hierarchically, with higher-order goals at the top, sub-goals at the intermediate level, and means at the bottom. Links between units in the goal system can be vertical, spreading from a higher-order goal to a sub-goal, to a means, or lateral, spreading between two goals or two means. Furthermore, links can be either excitatory (positive) or inhibitory (negative), depending on the compatibility between the units. Following the activation of a goal, units connected by excitatory links are therefore more likely to become active as well, while units with inhibitory links are less likely to become active. The higher-order goal to “feel better right now” may, for example, activate two sub-goals, “to feel stimulated” and “to feel comfortable,” which in turn may spread activation to corresponding means, such as “socialize with friends” and “stay at home.” These means may then spread activation laterally to facilitating means, for example, “go to a pub” or “read a book.” Following the activation of the goal to “feel better right now,” the consumer may thus plan either to go to a pub with his friends or to stay at home and read a book. Meanwhile, the higher-order goal “to feel better right now,” along with the sub-goal to “to feel stimulated,” may inhibit other conflicting goals, such as “to guard or improve one’s resources,” thereby making the consumer less sensitive to prices than he or she usually would be, allowing the consumer to purchase drinks in the bar with little concern about the cost.

**Transfer of properties within a goal system.** Excitatory links may spread not only activation but other properties as well (Kruglanski et al., 2002). For example, if a given means is connected to a goal with high valence, then that means should also attain high valence. In other words, the stronger the goal “to feel better right now,” the higher the valence to be assigned to the related sub-goals and to the means for attaining this goal. It should be noted that this positive emotional value is not necessarily tied to the means itself, but rather to the goal that it promises to fulfill. If the goal is satisfied or discarded, the means may lose its valence and thereby become less attractive. Attitudes toward products therefore depend on the goals actively being pursued at a given time.

**Subconscious impact.** Though ongoing cognitive processes do not always enter consciousness, they may still influence evaluations and actions (Draine & Greenwald, 1998). Although consciously pursued goals are assumed to have a stronger effect on decisions, background goals may still influence choice through excitatory and inhibitory links, thereby increasing or decreasing the strength of the focal goal (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). For example, when deciding who to invite for dinner, the subconscious goal to “improve one’s self-image” may strengthen the focal goal “to feel better right now,” leading to the invitation of friends who are likely to make one feel better about oneself.

**Contextual dependence.** Behavior can be understood as resulting not only from an individual’s personal characteristics and values but also from their perception of the environment surrounding them (Lewin, 1935; Mischel & Shoda, 1995). This also holds true for goals, as goals have been demonstrated to be influenced by environmental cues (Bargh & Barndollar, 1996). Goals, and all other units in the goal system, may be facilitated or inhibited given the perception of the situation, leading to different patterns of activation in different situations (Kruglanski et al., 2002). That is, the associative links of the units in the goal system, as it is cognitively represented, may vary from situation to situation, leading to different links between goals and means. For instance, the goal “to feel better right now” may lead to significantly different choices depending on whether the consumer is alone or with friends, or whether the day is in the middle of the week or on the weekend.

### **Functional properties of goals**

**Limited cognitive resources.** Most individuals have multiple active goals at any given time. A consumer may, for example, strive to choose a dinner alternative that promises tasty, healthy, environmentally friendly food for a bargain price, in an environment that is exciting, relaxing, and social. However, cognitive resources, like all other resources, are limited (Kruglanski et al., 2002). Therefore, a goal that demands considerable cognitive resources will effectively pull resources away from other cognitive processes, including alternative goals and even attention to, or perception of, alternative means (Gollwitzer, 1996). Salient goals may therefore prevent the activation of competing goals, leading to a narrower perception of the situation and the available means.

**Goal priority.** When resources are poorly focused, for example, when too many goals are active, progress toward any one goal may be hampered. In these situations, prioritizing among goals may be necessary, as it is better to achieve one of many goals than none at all. Managing when and to what goals resources are allocated is an important mental activity that most people deal with daily (Gollwitzer, Heckhausen, & Steller, 1990). When resources are scarce, or the desired ends are incompatible, goals are normally prioritized according to their desirability and feasibility (Moskowitz & Grant, 2009). Goals that are desirable but unfeasible may therefore be set aside in favor of less desirable but more feasible goals. When goals are discarded, the goal-related effects soon wear off, freeing resources for other goals and changing how we perceive and evaluate the alternatives under consideration (Lindenberg & Frey, 1993).

### **Motivational properties of goals**

**Goal-commitment.** Once a goal has been activated, people are generally committed to reaching it. The level of commitment depends on the value assigned to the goal and the likelihood of attaining it. Consumers are unlikely to be committed to goals that are either undesirable or unattainable, though there are exceptions. In some cases, and for some individuals, commitment to a goal may be stronger if the attainment is hard, for example, when trying to obtain something rare; in other cases, commitment may be stronger if attainment is easy, for example, when the satisfaction of goal attainment is valued in itself (Kruglanski et al., 2002).

**Persistence-until.** The effects of an activated goal usually persist until the goal has either been attained or discarded (Martin & Tesser, 2009). Consequently, if a product has been infused with positive valence due to the activation of a goal, this valence may expire when the goal is no longer active. Due to limited cognitive resources, attention to certain information, knowledge held in the working memory, and other goal-related cognitive functions will also expire once a goal has been deactivated, freeing resources for other goals.

**Docility.** Behaviors and means are often evaluated in terms of goal progress. Behaviors that do not lead to goal progress are generally seen as meaningless, and are less likely to be repeated, whereas behaviors seen as productive are facilitated. In this way, relevant behaviors are selected based on their potential for progress toward the active goals (Martin & Tesser,

2009). Goal progress will therefore increase the likelihood of repeat behaviors. Seen from another perspective, goals help sort out the ineffective behaviors that do not lead to desired consequences, helping us select only those that advance our goal fulfilment. Eventually, behaviors that frequently lead to goal progress may become habits.

**Affect.** Goal progress is usually evaluated relative to a reference point. Research has shown that as one moves closer to a reference point, or moves toward it at a faster pace, positive affect is experienced (Martin & Tesser, 2009). Conversely, if one moves away from it, or moves at a slower pace, negative affect is experienced. For instance, price-conscious consumers may feel satisfied if they find a deal that is better than usual. They may feel dissatisfied, however, if the next time they buy the same product, the deal is not as good. In other words, their satisfaction with the product is dependent on their distance from the reference point, which in turn is determined by their goal to save money. If there were no goal to strive for, then there would be no distance or sense of movement relative to a reference point, and the price difference between the two occasions would not influence satisfaction with the purchase.

**Effort.** How much effort is expended to reach a goal depends on the value and probability of goal attainment (Martin & Tesser, 2009). The goal-gradient hypothesis states that as progress is made toward a goal, motivation and effort increase. Early psychological research by Hull (1931) found evidence for this in experiments with rats. As the rats in a maze approached the food box, they ran faster than they did at the beginning of the maze. More recently, these findings have been replicated with human consumers. Participants in one study were found to purchase coffee more frequently the closer they got to earning a free coffee on a stamp card. In fact, even the illusion of goal progress had this effect, as participants with a 12-stamp coffee card with two preexisting “bonus” stamps would complete 10 purchases needed for the reward faster than participants who got a 10-stamp coffee card with no preexisting bonus stamps (Kivetz, Urminsky, & Zheng, 2006).

**Promotion vs. prevention goals.** A distinction can be made between *promotion* goals, which are what people strive to obtain, and *prevention* goals, which are what people strive to avoid. Attainment of a promotion goal typically leads to feelings of happiness and pride, whereas failure leads to disappointment. Attainment of a prevention goal, on the other hand,

typically leads to feelings of calm and relaxation, whereas failure leads to tension and agitation (Higgins, 1997).

## Three master goals: three lines of research

Different motivational factors have traditionally been studied within different frameworks and applied to different aspects of consumption. Although proven effective in their respective areas, few attempts have been made to bring these different but important perspectives together into the same model or measurement scale (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007; Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007). One of the basic assumptions in the present research is that consumers may be motivated by multiple goals simultaneously, and that some overarching goals include whole areas of knowledge structures and motives (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). Three such “master” goals are identified and described in goal-framing theory (Lindenberg, 2001a). These are the *gain goal* (“to guard or improve one’s resources”), the *hedonic goal* (“to feel better right now”), and the *normative goal* (“to act appropriately”). The gain goal is commonly studied in research with an economic or utilitarian perspective on consumption, for example, in theories of rational choice (e.g., expected utility theory; Schoemaker, 1982) and in the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), whereas the hedonic goal is usually studied in theories of affect and emotions (e.g., the experiential perspective on consumption; Babin, Darden, & Griffin, 1994; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982) and the normative goal in theories of normative and moral behavior (e.g., norm activation model, Schwartz, 1977; value-belief-norm theory, Stern, 2000; and the focus theory of normative conduct, Kallgren, Reno, & Cialdini, 2000).

### **The gain goal**

Consumers motivated by the gain goal are sensitive to changes in personal resources (Lindenberg and Steg, 2007). When the gain goal is active, consumers pay more attention to variations in costs and perceived value, while emotional, social, or ethical considerations are of lesser importance. According to rational choice theories, consumers are well-informed and self-interested; they seek to guard or improve their resources, carefully managing their spending by weighing costs and benefits in order to maximize the value or utility of their choices (Schoemaker, 1982) and

evaluating and ranking alternatives according to their perceived value, based on what is given and received (Zeithaml, 1988). Perceived value has traditionally been treated as a unidimensional construct (simply ranging from low to high). However, recent research suggests that this approach is far too simplistic and that a multi-dimensional approach is needed (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007). In goal-framing theory, the gain goal is thought to be associated with sub-goals dealing with frugality, value, and financial security (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007).

The gain goal has been found to increase in strength as the potential for monetary gains increases (Bazerman, Lowenstein, & White, 1992; Johansson & Svedsäter, 2009; Loewenstein, Bazerman, & Thompson, 1989). This suggests that a focus on monetary matters may strengthen the gain goal. Indeed, strong economic motivations have been demonstrated to displace or weaken other motivations, such as personal responsibility or moral obligations, a phenomenon referred to as “motivation crowding out” (Frey & Jegen, 2001). Economic incentives may therefore be counterproductive in situations in which the gain goal is not the preferred goal, since they may lead to decreased rather than increased motivation to act in line with the implemented policy.

### **The hedonic goal**

The hedonic goal is emotional rather than rational in nature, concentrating on attaining pleasure and excitement while avoiding effort and negative feelings (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). Hedonically motivated consumers will generally be more sensitive to information and effects related to satisfaction, mood, and effort, emphasizing immediate and short-term satisfaction, and may be more influenced by seemingly peripheral factors, such as mood and energy levels. As this is not only a short-sighted but also relatively unstable goal, strategies and incentives based on it are generally not that effective in the long term, and the activation of this goal may in fact reduce the effectiveness of strategies tied to the other goals, such as pricing strategies, economic incentives, and information campaigns. Like perceived value, hedonism is often treated as a uni-dimensional construct, ranging, for example, from pleasant to unpleasant (Batra & Ahtola, 1991). However, as shown by Bello and Etzel (1985), the motivation to choose an exciting or stimulating alternative differs from that of selecting a relaxing or comfortable alternative, despite the fact that both excitement and relaxation are related to well-being (Ormel, Lindenberg, Steverink, & Verbrugge, 1999). The hedonic goal is assumed to be associated with sub-

goals that deal with pleasure-seeking, excitement, and avoiding effort (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007).

Emotions and affect have been shown to be an important aspect of consumption in many consumer contexts (Babin et al., 1994; Childers, Carr, Peck, & Carson, 2001; Dhar & Wertenbroch, 2000; Pohjanheimo, Paasovaara, Loumala, & Sandell, 2010), including in highly functional consumer decisions, such as the choice between public transport and the car (Steg, 2003, 2005). The hedonic goal has been found to be activated by, among other things, the products under consideration. For example, consumers are generally less price sensitive for products that are hedonic rather than functional in nature (Wakefield & Inman, 2003).

### **The normative goal**

Consumption has been linked to several environmental issues facing modern society (IPCC, 2013). Though recent decades have seen growing interest in ethical consumption on the part of consumers and researchers (e.g., Chatzidakis, Hibbert, & Smith, 2007; Fairtrade International, 2013; Organic Trade Association, 2012), consumer models and measures often lack normative dimensions (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007). The normative goal is related to acting appropriately or ethically correctly, rather than to attaining personal gains or satisfaction. The motivating forces of this goal include obligations or a sense of duty to others or to the environment (Dawes & Messick, 2000; Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). The activation of a normative goal is assumed to activate processes and knowledge structures related to “oughts,” norms, and the opinions of others. The normative goal has been found to be related to pro-social and pro-environmental behaviors, although it should be noted that this is not a necessary relationship, as the content of a norm largely depends on one’s ideals or the ideals of the social group of which one considers oneself a member. An important distinction should be made between norms conceptualized as either internal, like moral norms, or external, like social norms (Cialdini, Reno, & Kallgren, 1990). According to Lindenberg and Steg (2007), the normative goal may be associated with sub-goals that concern behaving the right way, contributing to a clean environment, and displaying exemplary behavior.

Although the normative goal is assumed to be more stable than, for example, the hedonic goal, it is still easily displaced by the other goals. For instance, costs, in terms of money or effort, may reduce the influence of the normative goal, a phenomenon referred to as the “low-cost

hypothesis” (Diekmann & Preisendörfer, 2003). Whereas economic and hedonic goal attainment is relatively straightforward, as the consequences are easy to perceive and evaluate, the outcomes of normative actions are more abstract. Therefore, compared with the other goals, the normative goal is more reliant on social proof, such as information about what others are doing (Cialdini et al., 1990). Even if people are motivated by their own moral standards, they may still fail to act morally if they perceive others as not approving or following suit. The fact that others do not approve may implant doubt in their minds as to the effectiveness or moral righteousness of the action. Ambiguous or uncertain information may also lead to unconscious self-serving processes, often weakening the normative goal in favor of gain or hedonic goals (Johansson & Svedsäter, 2009; Lee & Holden, 1999; Opatow & Weiss, 2000; Schwartz & Howard, 1981). A number of psychological mechanisms contribute to this effect. In the case of pro-environmental behavior, consumers may, for example, deny the seriousness of environmental problems, based on selective attention to scientific findings (Opatow & Weiss, 2000), reject their own liability by transferring responsibility to higher authorities (Pieters, Bijmolt, van Raaij, & De Kruijk, 1998), disbelieve their own ability to make a difference (Harland, Staats, & Wilke, 1999), or refrain from action due to doubts regarding the effectiveness of pro-environmental action (Lee & Holden, 1999; Lubell, 2002).

# Development of the Consumer Motivation Scale

---

Knowing which goals are active in a situation, and how activation varies across situations, provides valuable knowledge of what information consumers may attend to, what product attributes they may prefer, and what pricing strategies may be most effective. To date, the situational variability of motivation is often overlooked in models of consumer behavior, as measures generally consist of situation-independent constructs, such as consumer values (Kahle et al., 1986) or personality traits (Aluja et al., 2010). Furthermore, few attempts have been made to integrate multiple higher-order goals into a single coherent model or scale (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007), as consumer scales often address specific determinants (e.g., Batra et al., 2001), while certain goals, such as normative and moral goals, are often ignored altogether (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007).

Based on these insights, the aim of this thesis was to develop a method of measuring consumption goals that is:

1. *Integrative*—encompassing utilitarian, hedonic, and normative goals;
2. *Multi-dimensional*—taking multiple sub-goals into account;
3. *Context-sensitive*—measuring individual and situational variance; and
4. *General*—applicable to a wide variety of products and settings.

## Overview

The development of the Consumer Motivation Scale (CMS) followed a top-down approach in which the higher-order master goals of goal-framing theory were intentionally chosen as a point of departure. Based on

the gain, hedonic, and normative goals, a structure of sub-goals was explored, confirmed, and then validated. The scale development is described in articles I and II and follows Churchill's (1979) paradigm for developing better marketing constructs. First, the domain of the construct, i.e., the three master goals and their potential sub-goals, was specified and described. Second, a pool of items was generated based on theories and scales related to the preliminary sub-goals. Third, data were collected; the dimensions were explored and refined, and then confirmed. Fourth, additional data were collected for the purpose of thoroughly testing the scale's convergent, discriminant, and construct validities, as well as its criterion-related validity.

Finally, in Article III, the situational variability of consumption goals was demonstrated across different product categories and consumption contexts. Together, these three articles demonstrate the multi-dimensional and context-dependent nature of consumption goals, and furthermore show that the resulting measure can be a useful tool in explaining various consumption behaviors in several different product categories, settings, and contexts.

## Summary of empirical studies

### Article I

In the first article, the aim was to establish an integrative structure of consumption goals, consisting not only of utilitarian, but also hedonic and normative goals. To this end, the dimensionality of the master goals was explored, confirmed, and validated across three empirical studies.

**Study 1A.** In Study 1A, 207 participants were recruited from a pool of voluntary research participants at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The participants completed a questionnaire about their consumption in one of three consumption contexts: food consumption, leisure time consumption, and savings and investments. The pool of items was generated based on the definitions of the three goals (Lindenberg, 2001a, 2001b, Lindenberg & Steg, 2007; Steg & Vlek, 2009) as well as similar concepts in the literature (e.g., Ajzen, 1991; Babin et al., 1994; Schwartz, 1977). Additionally, items were formulated based on each combination of the three master goals (i.e., gain-hedonic, gain-norm, and hedonic-norm) for the purpose of adding nuance to the pool of items and allowing for the emergence of additional dimensions. A total of 36 items were generated in

**Table I.**

Overview of the three empirical studies presented in Article I.

<b>Study</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>Aim/Type</b>	<b>No. of dim.</b>	<b>Result</b>
1A	207	Exploration	6	Six preliminary dimensions were formulated, from which five distinct dimensions emerged
1B	255	Confirmation	5	The five dimensions were confirmed
1C	269	Validation	5	The five dimensions were validated

No. of dim. = Number of dimensions

this way, six for each master goal and six for each combination of two master goals. The list of items was presented in the questionnaire with the following question: “When you decided how you would use your money, how important was it for you to ... ?” followed by the 36 items that completed the question (e.g., “Maintain or improve your economy”). The perceived importance of the items was rated on a five-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all important) to 4 (very important).

Principal component analysis (PCA)<sup>1</sup> was performed, and a solution with five factors emerged as the solution with the highest explained variance without signs of over-extraction (i.e., no factors mainly comprising weak or cross-loaded items): *Thrift*, a dimension dealing with frugality and resource efficiency; *Safety*, items dealing with securing one’s future well-being and feeling safe; *Instant gratification*, dealing with short-term needs and comfort; *Moral norms*, dealing with moral and ideological obligations; and finally, *Social norms*, dealing with fitting in and gaining approval from one’s peers.

**Study 1B.** In the second study presented in Article I, the emergent five-factor structure was confirmed on an independent sample of 255 participants recruited from a pool of voluntary research participants at Karlstad University, Sweden. Confirmatory factor analysis was performed to test the consistency of the emergent five-factor structure across the new sample. Multiple models were defined with increasing separation between

---

<sup>1</sup> While there are differences between PCA and factor analysis, the results presented in articles I and II are essentially identical to that of exploratory factor analysis (e.g., using maximum likelihood for extraction method); the same structure with very similar factor loadings emerge regardless of extraction method.

**Table II**

The five emergent dimensions presented in Article I.

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Sub-goal</b>	<b>Underlying motive</b>	<b>CA</b>
Gain	Thrift	<i>To be economical and cost-effective, consume in moderation</i>	.82
	Safety	<i>To secure one's future well-being, feeling calm, and safe</i>	.86
Hedonic	Instant gratification	<i>To gain immediate short-term satisfaction and comfort</i>	.77
Norm.	Moral norms	<i>To take a stand for one's ideals, being considerate, and morally righteous</i>	.78
	Social norms*	<i>To feel good and accepted in the eyes of others, gain approval and prestige</i>	.76

CA = Cronbach's alpha; Norm. = Normative

\* Although conceptually most closely related to the normative goal, Social norms was also statistically related to the gain goal

the dimensions, ranging from a one-factor model to the emergent five-factor model. Each model was a significant improvement on the previous one, indicating that the five-factor model, in which items were loaded according to the PCA, better represented the data than did either the one-factor model (i.e., one general factor) or the three-factor model (representing the gain, hedonic, and normative master goals). In conclusion, the assumption that the master goals are distinct from each other, and furthermore, that the master goals may themselves be multi-dimensional and best represented by multiple distinct sub-goals, gained support.

**Study 1C.** The purpose of Study 1C was to fully test the construct validity of the five emergent dimensions. A total of 269 participants were recruited from a pool of voluntary research participants at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The participants were asked where they would like to travel and what they would like to do at the destination, as if they were planning a vacation at that time. For each of the five emergent consumption goals, one type of information and one hypothetical travel package was formulated for each of the five emergent dimensions:

1. Thrift—*information on rebates and deals*;
2. Safety—*insurance, safety and unrest*;
3. Instant gratification—*recreation and excursions*;
4. Moral norms—*environmental standards and emissions*; and
5. Social norms—*opinions and recommendations of one's friends*.

1. Thrift—*preference for a 10 percent rebate*;
2. Safety—*upgraded travel insurance*;
3. Instant gratification—*“deluxe” package*;
4. Moral norms—*environmentally friendly transportation and hotel*; and
5. Social norms—*trendy and popular destination and hotel*.

The results indicate that all five emergent dimensions have sufficient construct validity, as they correlate positively and significantly with their respective information type and preference.

Furthermore, three one-item measures were included, representing each of the three master goals: “Guard or improve your resources” (representing the gain goal), “Feel better right now” (hedonic), and “Act appropriately” (normative). Thrift and Safety were demonstrated to be significantly related to the gain goal ( $\beta = .46, p < .001$  and  $\beta = .56, p < .001$ , respectively), Instant gratification to the hedonic goal ( $\beta = .48, p < .001$ ), and Moral norms to the normative goal ( $\beta = .58, p < .001$ ). As expected, the Social norms dimension was related to the normative goal ( $\beta = .34, p < .001$ ), but it was also significantly related to the gain goal ( $\beta = .40, p < .001$ ), demonstrating that sub-goals can be related to multiple higher-order goals. It has previously been shown that people often comply with norms to gain rewards or avoid punishment (Burnkrant & Cousineau, 1975), which may explain this finding.

## Article II

A sixth dimension was close to emerging in Study 1A, dealing with excitement (as opposed to satisfaction and comfort). This indicated that the hedonic goal might perhaps also be better represented by at least two sub-goals. This, and the fact that the gain and normative goals emerged as two distinct dimensions in Study 1, justified further investigation of the dimensionality of the master goals. In the second article, the goal structure found in Article I was expanded upon, based on established constructs and scales related to the master goals and their potential sub-goals. Following

**Table III.**

Overview of the three empirical studies presented in Article II.

<b>Study</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>Aim/Type</b>	<b>No. of dim.</b>	<b>Result</b>
2A	987	Exploration & confirmation	9	Nine preliminary dimensions were formulated based on the previous studies, from which seven distinct dimensions emerged
2B	255	Validation	7	Construct and discriminant validities were tested with satisfactory results
2C	261	Validation	7	Criterion-related validity was tested with satisfactory results

No. of dim. = Number of dimensions

an in-depth literature review on theories and scales related to the master goals, including research in economics, marketing, as well as social and environmental psychology, nine preliminary dimensions were formulated, each representing one aspect of the three master goals: The gain goal was represented by the dimensions *Value for Money*, *Quality*, *Function*, and *Safety*, the hedonic goal by *Stimulation*, *Comfort*, and *Pleasure*, and the normative goal by *Social Acceptance* and *Ethics*. This proposed structure represents a broad and nuanced range of consumption goals, taking into account some of the central findings of each line of research, such as the distinction between value and quality in the marketing literature (e.g., Sweeney & Soutar, 2001), valance and arousal in the literature on emotions and mood (e.g., Russel, 1983), and external and internal sources of norms (Cialdini et al., 1990).

**Study 2A.** In Study 2A, 987 participants were recruited from a general population research panel at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The participants were randomly and unknowingly divided into five contexts: food, clothes, entertainment, travel, and accommodations. The sample was then split into two halves ( $n_1 = 496$ ;  $n_2 = 491$ ), with exploratory analysis performed on the former and confirmatory analysis on the latter. Using PCA on the first sample, seven distinct and reliable factors emerged, consisting of 45 items and explaining 65.72% of the variance. Of these nine preliminary dimensions, only the *Function* dimension of the gain goal and the *Pleasure* dimension of the hedonic goal did not emerge. In the second half of the sample, a null model was compared with four specified models,

**Table IV**

The seven emergent dimensions presented in Article II.

<b>Goal</b>	<b>Sub-goal</b>	<b>Underlying motive</b>	<b>CA</b>
Gain	Value for Money	<i>To get a lot for one's money, pay a reasonable price, avoid wasting money</i>	.89
	Quality	<i>To get something of superior quality and reliability, meeting one's highest expectations, avoid unreliability</i>	.82
	Safety	<i>To feel secure, calm, and prepared for the unforeseen, avoid uncertainty</i>	.86
Hedonic	Stimulation	<i>To get something exciting, stimulating, or unique, avoid dullness</i>	.89
	Comfort	<i>To get something pleasant and enjoyable, avoid hassle and discomfort</i>	.81
Norm.	Ethics	<i>To act per one's ideals, moral principles, and obligations, avoid guilt</i>	.88
	Social Acceptance	<i>To make a good impression, identify with peers, conform to expectations, avoid faux pas</i>	.92

CA = Cronbach's alpha; Norm. = Normative

with increasing levels of separation between the dimensions. The results supported the assumption of multi-dimensionality, as each model was a significant improvement in model fit over the previous model.

**Study 2B.** Construct validity of the seven emergent dimensions of Study 2A was tested. A total of 255 participants were recruited from a pool of voluntary research participants at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. One information type and one hypothetical travel package upgrade was formulated for each of the seven dimensions:

1. Value for Money—*information on rebates and deals;*
2. Quality—*hotel classifications and quality standards;*
3. Safety—*insurance, safety, and unrest;*
4. Stimulation—*activities, sights, and experiences;*
5. Comfort—*availability of sights/facilities at or near the hotel;*
6. Ethics—*environmental standards, impact, and carbon emissions; and*
7. Social Acceptance—*opinions and recommendations of peers.*

1. Value for Money—SEK 600 (approx. EUR 60) discount per person;
2. Quality—upgrade to a four-star hotel;
3. Safety—extra travel insurance with health care and cancellation protection;
4. Stimulation—“adventure hotel,” with bungee jumping, rafting, kite surfing;
5. Comfort—first-class tickets, an extra-comfortable room, and access to a spa;
6. Ethics—environmentally certified flight and hotel; and
7. Social Acceptance—Trendy destination, as per fashion and travel magazines.

A series of regression analyses were performed using the dimensions of the CMS as independent variables, and each of the information-search behaviors and preferences as dependent variables. As can be seen in Table V, all dimensions of the CMS were significantly related to their target constructs. The CMS generally performed better and more consistently than did the bundle of reference scales, as the relationships between the reference scales and the target information-search behaviors and preferences were non-significant in five of 14 cases.

**Study 2C.** In the third study presented in Article II, 261 participants were recruited in a classroom environment at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. The participants were asked which of two chocolate bars they would choose: one regular chocolate bar costing SEK 20 (approximately EUR 2) and a “green” carbon-compensated chocolate bar costing SEK 50 (approximately EUR 5). They were then asked to rate the importance of the items in the CMS. Binary logistic regression was performed with purchase choice (i.e., regular vs. green chocolate) as the dependent variable and the seven dimensions of CMS as independent variables. The model correctly explained 86.8% of the choices, and the Cox and Snell  $R^2$  as well as the Nagelkerke  $R^2$  were high (.51 and .69, respectively), suggesting that the dimensions explain choice well. Four of the dimensions were significantly related to the choice of green chocolate. Ethics and Stimulation increased the likelihood of choosing green over regular chocolate, i.e.,  $B_{Ethics} = 2.80, p < .001$ ;  $B_{Stimulation} = 1.48, p < .001$ , whereas Value for Money and Safety decreased the likelihood, i.e.,  $B_{VJM} = -2.35, p < .001$ ;  $B_{Safety} = -0.76, p = .046$ .

### Article III

While articles I and II focused on the integrative and multi-dimensional nature of consumption goals, Article III aimed to demonstrate the context-dependent nature of the seven emergent consumption goals. This was

**Table V**

Standardized regression coefficients for the dimensions of the CMS and the reference scales for information-search behaviors (I.) and upgrade preferences (P.). The hypothesized relationships are identified in the bolded diagonal (CMS) and in the bolded column (reference scales).

		VfM	Qua.	Saf.	Sti.	Com.	Eth.	Soc.	Ref.
		$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$	$\beta$
VfM	I. Deals	<b>.24***</b>	.01	.33***	-.01	.00	-.01	.03	<b>.17***</b>
	P. Rebates	<b>.15*</b>	-.11	.23*	-.03	-.04	-.06	.01	.12
Qua.	I. Standard	-.04	<b>.41***</b>	.06	.04	.19*	-.09	.06	<b>.62***</b>
	P. Four-star	-.12	<b>.34***</b>	.06	-.01	.23*	-.15*	-.01	<b>.31***</b>
Saf.	I. Security	-.12	.09	<b>.43***</b>	.14*	-.12	.06	.11	-.01
	P. Travel insur.	.01	.07	<b>.30***</b>	.05	-.11	.04	.04	.04
Sti.	I. Activities	-.01	-.06	.22*	<b>.30***</b>	-.09	.13*	-.01	.10
	P. Adventure	.10	.15	-.09	<b>.28***</b>	-.28**	-.10	.07	<b>.51***</b>
Com.	I. Availability	-.06	.16	.20*	.08	<b>.25**</b>	-.09	.00	-.03
	P. Comfortable	.03	.21*	.04	-.02	<b>.19*</b>	-.20**	.02	<b>.13*</b>
Eth.	I. Env. standard	-.09	-.07	-.01	.08	-.08	<b>.54***</b>	-.02	<b>.41***</b>
	P. Env. certified	-.07	-.23*	.10	.01	-.11	<b>.58***</b>	-.13*	<b>.54***</b>
Soc.	I. Friends	.06	.18	.01	.14*	.02	-.07	<b>.22***</b>	<b>.14*</b>
	P. Trendy	-.07	.22*	-.03	.08	.08	-.18**	<b>.25***</b>	<b>.36***</b>

For better readability, hypothesized relationships are bolded while non-significant relationships are colored gray

VfM = Value for Money; Qua. = Quality; Saf. = Safety; Sti. = Stimulation; Con. = Convenience; Eth. = Ethics; Soc. = Social Acceptance; Ref. = Corresponding reference scale; insur. = insurance; Env. = Environmental  
 \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$  (hypothesized  $p$ -values are one-tailed; the rest are two-tailed)

examined in three experimental studies.

**Study 3A.** In the first study presented in Article III, the aim was to investigate how different product categories influence the activation and deactivation of consumption goals. Three categories were compared: grocery shopping (usually regarded as a relatively functional category in which money-saving motives should be salient; Wakefield & Inman, 2003), entertainment (a hedonic category, in which stimulation and pleasure-seeking motives should be active; Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982), and clothes (a relatively conspicuous category, in which motives related to

**Table VI**

Overview of the three empirical studies in Article III.

<b>Study</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>Aim/type</b>	<b>No. of dim.</b>	<b>Result</b>
3A	613*	Experimental	7	The goals were shown to fluctuate across product categories
3B	487	Experimental	7	The goals were shown to fluctuate across consumption occasions
3C	111	Experimental	7	The relationship between situations, goals, and behaviors was demonstrated

No. of dim. = Number of dimensions

\* Study 3A uses a subset of the data from Study 2A; Total N for the eight independent samples of this thesis (not counting study 3A) = 2832

fitting in and gaining the approval of one's peers should be active; Bearden & Etzel, 1982). A total of 613 participants were recruited from a general population research panel at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden (note that the data in this study are a subset of the sample used in Study 2A: I, food [ $n = 220$ ]; II, clothes [ $n = 200$ ]; and III, amusement and entertainment [ $n = 193$ ]). In line with the hypotheses, Stimulation was most important for entertainment, Social Acceptance for clothes, and Value for Money was more important for groceries than entertainment, but not for clothes.

**Study 3B.** In the second study presented in Article III, in addition to product type, the influence of the consumption occasion (ordinary vs. festive) was also examined, in order to test how product and occasion interact in the activation of goals. More specifically, it was hypothesized that while groceries are generally regarded as more functional than clothes, festive groceries should be seen as a hedonic product category whereas ordinary clothes should be seen as a functional product category. In this study, 487 participants were divided into four groups, following a  $2 \times 2$  factorial design: product (food vs. clothes)  $\times$  occasion (ordinary vs. festive). A MANOVA was performed with product type and occasion as independent variables, and the seven dimensions of the CMS as dependent variables. In line with the hypotheses, Stimulation and Social Acceptance were more important in the festive contexts than in the ordinary contexts, while Value for Money was less important in the festive contexts than the ordinary. Furthermore, there was a significant interaction between product

and occasion: Social Acceptance was the most important for festive groceries, and least important for ordinary groceries. Similarly, Stimulation was the most important for festive groceries, and about equal in the remaining three contexts.

**Study 3C.** When goals are activated or deactivated, corresponding changes in behavior should be expected. If the changes in consumption goals are not mirrored by changes in behavior, then goals might not explain the observed influence of situations on consumption behaviors. So far, it has been shown that goals are indeed related to consumption behaviors, and furthermore, that goals, unlike, for example, values, do indeed vary as a function of product type as well as consumption occasion. In Study 3C ( $n = 111$ ), three measures were used to assess changes in behavior, namely: the estimated per portion cost of a hypothetical dinner, a price sensitivity measure, and a variety-seeking measure. Additionally, because a link between the social product category (clothes) and a decrease in activation of the Value for Money goal could not be established in studies 1A and 1B, a distinction was made between social and hedonic contexts. To this end, three situations were formulated, one defined as an ordinary day when the participants would be eating dinner by themselves (functional), another defined as an ordinary day when the participants would be eating dinner with a friend (social), and finally, a festive occasion, defined as a dinner party or a feast. Note that the design was not fully factorial, as a dinner party where one is eating alone was deemed rather unusual.

In this study, the influence of the situation on Stimulation and Value for Money seen in Study 3B was not observed, possibly because the sample consisted mainly of students, who generally have more constrained budgets than do members of the general population. However, both the social and festive situations significantly influenced the Social Acceptance goal, and in line with expectations, participants in those situations indicated that they would seek more variety, and estimated that they would pay significantly more, than did participants in the functional situation. In line with the find that clothes did not lead to a decrease in the Value for Money goal, the effect on estimated price seemed to take place despite a null effect on price sensitivity. Participants may therefore spend more in social than non-social situations, even when they do not want to or when their budgets do not allow for it, due to social demand. It was concluded that that consumers in lower income groups may find it hard to regulate their spending in social situations, and some might perhaps choose to not participate in these situations, risking social isolation instead. Indeed, recent longitudinal research on the social effects of poverty has

**Table VII**

The rated importance of the seven sub-goals, ranging from 0 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important), as well as the estimated difference *per portion* of an ordinary dinner and the evening's dinner in the given context, and price sensitivity (ranging from 0 to 5) and variety-seeking (ranging from 0 to 5) in the ordinary, social, and festive contexts.

	Ordinary (O)		Social (S)		Festive (F)		<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Value for Money	3.50	0.86	3.45	0.86	3.30	1.22	.665
Quality	3.50	0.91	3.42	0.86	3.62	0.92	.646
Safety	2.82	0.99	2.84	1.00	2.83	0.99	.995
Stimulation	2.09	1.07	2.11	1.05	2.26	1.19	.786
Comfort*	2.89	1.19	2.96	1.15	2.84	1.03	.701
Ethics	3.32	1.50	3.85	1.15	3.63	1.20	.205
Social Acceptance	1.42 <sup>B</sup>	1.28	2.44 <sup>A</sup>	1.00	2.53 <sup>A</sup>	1.30	.000
ΔPrice	5.97 <sup>B</sup>	26.41	22.68 <sup>A</sup>	23.93	29.58 <sup>A</sup>	26.14	.000
Price-sensitivity	2.84	1.19	2.44	1.35	2.90	1.30	.270
Variety-seeking	2.44 <sup>B</sup>	1.34	2.84 <sup>AB</sup>	1.20	3.30 <sup>A</sup>	1.12	.013

Note: <sup>A</sup> is rated significantly higher than <sup>B</sup> (at  $p < .05$ )

\* One item was removed to improve Cronbach's alpha

demonstrated a link between poverty and a less active social life (Mood & Jonsson, 2015).

# Discussion

---

At the start of this thesis, two basic assumptions were stated: first, people strive to obtain not only necessities, but also satisfaction and moral congruency; second, consumer preferences and choices are not only influenced by individual factors and traits, but also by product categories and consumption contexts. With this in mind, a cognitive approach to consumer motivation was adopted, in which goals are assumed to be multi-dimensional and context-dependent. Goal-framing theory—consisting of the three overarching gain, hedonic, and normative goals—was then chosen as the foundation and the starting point of the scale.

The dimensionality and situational variability of the three master goals was explored, confirmed, and validated across three research articles, eight independent samples with a combined sample size of 2832, and various product categories and consumption contexts, ranging from food, clothes, and entertainment, to investments, accommodations, and vacation travel. The result is the Consumer Motivation Scale (CMS), consisting of the seven consumption goals Value for Money, Quality, Safety, Stimulation, Comfort, Ethics, and Social Acceptance. The CMS has been shown to be an integrative, multi-dimensional, and context-sensitive measure of consumption goals, applicable to various consumption settings and product categories.

# The seven dimensions of the CMS

## The gain goal

**Value for Money and Quality.** Consumers motivated by the gain goal seek to improve or guard their resources, a goal which can be achieved by carefully weighing the costs and benefits of purchases. In marketing and economics, value is commonly defined as “the quality obtained for the price paid” (Zeithaml, 1988). To attain the highest value, a consumer therefore needs to obtain high quality for a low price. However, different consumers may weigh the quality and price components of value differently, some emphasizing obtaining quality and others a low price (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). In the CMS, these two value-based motives are represented by the two dimensions Value for Money and Quality. The former entails price sensitivity, in which value is improved by reducing the price paid, while the latter entails a concern with reliability, standards, and performance, in which value is improved by obtaining a better product.

In Study 2B, a thorough validation was performed in which the relationship between the dimensions of the CMS and other similar constructs were examined. In this study, Value for Money was demonstrated to be related to the price construct in the Consumer Perceived Value (PERVAL) scale (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001), to a search for rebates and deals, and to a preference for discounts, while Quality was demonstrated to be related to the quality dimension of PERVAL (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001), to a search for information about quality standards, and to preferences for luxury hotels. Furthermore, in Article III, it was demonstrated that Value for Money is significantly influenced by both the product type and the consumption context, as consumers regard the goal as less important for entertainment and festivities than for groceries and ordinary occasions.

**Safety.** The Safety dimension, with its emphasis on feeling calm, secure, and well-prepared, is assumed to be related to the financial security aspect of the gain goal. Indeed, like Value for Money, Safety was positively related to searching for information on deals and preference for rebates in Study 2B, and for choosing the least expensive product in Study 2C.

Furthermore, concerns about safety are thought to be related to seeking harmony and stability (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003), to being conventional, realizing life’s limitations, and being private (Chulef, Read, & Walsh, 2001), as well as to avoidance of dangers and risks (Richins, 2005). Management

of fear and uncertainty has been shown to be important in many consumer settings (Becker, 1973; Rindfleisch & Burroughs, 2004). Consumers motivated by Safety are therefore expected to attend to information about their and their loved ones' safety, and are also expected to avoid risks and take precautions. In a consumption setting, this may entail paying attention to information about health issues, the side-effects of consumption, potential risks, warranties, and insurance, and may also entail preferences for products that have been well-tested and that meets safety standards.

In Study 2B, Safety was shown to be related to family security (Schwartz, 1992), information search regarding insurance, safety, and unrest, as well as a preference for extra travel insurance with broader coverage.

### **The hedonic goal**

**Stimulation and Comfort.** Consumers motivated by the hedonic goal focus more on the pleasure and excitement of consumption than on the utilitarian properties of products, and avoid unnecessary effort and negative feelings rather than striving to save money (Lindenberg & Steg, 2007). Just as the gain goal can be achieved either by attaining high value or by decreasing value in relation to costs, the hedonic goal can be achieved in at least two ways, i.e., by increasing stimulation, or by decreasing effort and hassle. In the CMS, these two paths are represented by the two dimensions Stimulation and Comfort. Consumers motivated by the former seek to increase their well-being by means of excitement and exclusivity, whereas consumers motivated by the latter seek to increase their well-being by means of convenience and avoidance of effort.

In Study 2B, the Stimulation dimension was shown to be related to sensation seeking (Aluja et al., 2010), search for information about activities, sights, and experiences, as well as a preference for adventures, such as bungee jumping, kite surfing, diving, rafting, and mountain climbing. Furthermore, in Article III, it was shown that Stimulation is more important for entertainment and festivities than groceries and ordinary occasions. On the other hand, Comfort was shown to be related to a restful travel experience (Bello & Etzel, 1985), searching for information on availability, accessibility, and vicinity, as well as a preference for an upgrade package that included extra-comfortable rooms, first-class tickets, and access to spa and relaxation facilities at the hotel.

## The normative goal

**Ethics and Social Acceptance.** Consumers motivated by the normative goal should primarily strive to act appropriately according to some standard. An important distinction can be made between sources of norms that are internal, such as moral obligations, and external, such as social norms. The different sources may entail different rules to be followed, and they may also lead to different consequences for the individual upon success or failure. Upholding one's moral obligations may, for example, result in pride, whereas failing to do so may lead to guilt (Schwartz, 1977). Upholding social norms, on the other hand, may lead to improved standing within a social group, whereas failing to do so may lead to social sanctions (Cialdini et al., 1990). In the CMS, these two sources of norms are represented by the Social Acceptance and Ethics dimensions. The former entails making a good impression, fitting in, and conforming to expectations, whereas the latter entails a focus on moral principles and avoiding immoral actions. In Study 2B, Social Acceptance was shown to be related to consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influences (Bearden, Netemeyer, & Teel, 1989), asking friends for recommendations, and choosing a popular travel destination, and in Article III, Social Acceptance was shown to be more important in social and festive situations. The Ethics dimension, on the other hand, was related to the universalism value type (Schwartz, 1992) as well as to search for information about environmental impacts and pro-environmental travel alternatives.

## Contributions

The main theoretical contribution of this thesis lie in its demonstration of the multi-dimensional and context-dependent nature of consumption goals. This challenges the common practice of measuring consumer motivation with uni- or bi-dimensional measures, or with constructs that are invariant across situations (e.g., values and traits). According to the cognitive-affective model of personality (Mischel & Shoda, 1995), individuals display relatively stable *patterns of activation* across situations. That is, a given group of consumers may strive for Quality in some situations and Value for Money in others, doing so consistently whenever they find themselves in these types of situations. However, this information is lost if consumption goals are measured using only situation-invariant constructs, or if situations are simply aggregated, as the situational

variability will then be treated as mere measurement error. A context-dependent approach to consumer motivation thereby offers a richer account of the drivers of consumption: chronically activated goals are indicators of the stable traits and values of consumers, which can be used to study between-group variance, while the individual activation and deactivation of goals is an indicator of situational effects, which can be used to study within-group variance (Moskowitz & Grant, 2009).

Likewise, information is lost if two sub-goals, with potentially conflicting links to behavior, are combined into one higher-order goal. For instance, a consumer may be motivated to feel better right now (the hedonic goal) by means of attaining relaxation (the Comfort sub-goal). For this consumer, attending a festive dinner party may not be the best course of action, despite a positive link between festivities and the higher-order hedonic goal (via the Stimulation sub-goal).

The CMS is a significant contribution to the measurement of consumption goals, as it integrates a wide range of established scales and theoretical constructs from economics, marketing, social and environmental psychology, and sociology, doing so in a way that is easily applicable to, and comparable across, various consumption contexts. The fact that the CMS is based on a variety of established constructs and scales means that there is already a wealth of knowledge associated with each of the seven dimensions. The CMS should therefore prove useful in standard marketing research and in the mapping and segmentation of consumer groups, settings, and even products.

## Implications

Knowing what goals consumers strive for tells us what information and knowledge they are likely to attend to, what incentives they may respond to, what attributes they may prefer, and what price they may be willing to pay—information beneficial to practitioners, behavior change agents, and researchers alike. Regardless of whether the aim is to increase consumption (to promote profit) or decrease consumption (to promote sustainability), the key to consumer behavior lies in the goals that consumers are striving to achieve. A behavior is unlikely to be repeated if it did not lead to goal satisfaction in the past, and likewise, a behavior is unlikely to stop until the goal that drives it has been either attained in another way, or discarded and replaced with another goal.

It is important to consider the pattern of goal activation to better understand a given group of consumers. For instance, consumers motivated by Value for Money and Ethics, but not Social Acceptance, may avoid buying expensive pro-environmental products in favor of relatively “cheap” pro-environmental behaviors, such as buying second hand, reusing/recycling, and simply reducing consumption. Conversely, consumers motivated by Ethics and Social Acceptance, but not Value for Money, may instead prefer pro-environmental behaviors that are noticeable, while paying less attention to their costs. In this way, the pattern of goal activation provides important knowledge attainable only by a multi-dimensional measure.

Furthermore, since the CMS applies to various levels of abstraction—from higher-order consumption settings and contexts, through product categories, down to specific products—it could be used not only to segment groups of consumers, but also to categorize consumption contexts, stores, store departments, product categories, brands, and even specific products. This categorization would not be based on the simple utilitarian–hedonic dichotomy commonly applied (e.g., Wakefield & Inman, 2003), but on a much wider range of goals, each connected to distinct preferences and behaviors. The unique profile of a context, product category, or specific product could then be used in developing tailored marketing strategies or interventions specifically targeting those contexts or products.

## Limitations

The three goals described by Lindenberg and Steg (2007) were intentionally chosen as a point of departure, as they cover a broad range of research that has proven effective in explaining consumer choices in many different settings. However, limiting our study to these three master goals may have left potentially influential goals and motives unexplored. One such goal may be the search for long-term subjective well-being (Ormel et al., 1999). Although the CMS dimensions Stimulation and Comfort deal with well-being, both are primarily concerned with short-term, day-to-day well-being. The Safety dimension, on the other hand, deals with the long-term perspective, but is not as focused on well-being specifically. A dimension with a longer-term perspective on well-being would likely be a useful supplement to the scale.

Several additional intermediate-level goals could be considered, such as goals related to self-esteem and self-concept (Grubb & Grathwohl, 1967), expression of identity (Belk, 1988), self-control (Baumeister, Sparks, Stillman, & Vohs, 2008), group membership (Pechmann & Slater, 2005), and uniqueness (Kaiser & Ketchum, 2005). Although additional goals and motives could certainly be added, it should be noted that the aim of the present research was not to provide an exhaustive list of consumer motives. Such an endeavor might in any case be futile, as the total number of human goals is likely in the hundreds (Chulef et al., 2001). Rather, the aim was to focus on a few general and influential consumption goals, which could be expected to be relevant across many different consumption contexts and product types. For instance, a dimension representing taste was not included, as it would only be applicable to contexts involving food or beverages. Any additions to the CMS should be evaluated with this in mind.

Furthermore, although the dimensions were based on already established constructs and scales, only Swedish samples were used in the present research. While we expect the structure to be stable across most cultures and languages, especially those that are similar to Swedish, the stability and validity of the dimensions should be examined across diverse cultures and languages.

## Future research

At this point, many interesting paths lie open for future research. For example, one could further develop the scale by identifying and incorporating additional dimensions, or perhaps more closely examining the hierarchy, as well as lateral links, of goals, sub-goals, and means. It is also important to further investigate how the dimensions vary across other types of consumption contexts, product categories, brands, products, and product attributes, as well as the relationships between the dimensions and values/personality traits and demographics (e.g., age, gender, and socioeconomic status), and how these factors interact to influence preferences and behaviors. Last, the connection between specific sub-goals and motives, on one hand, and methods of behavior change and marketing strategies, on the other, could be investigated. In this regard, it is important to develop and test methods of goal-activation and deactivation to find out how to effectively influence the strength of the goals in question.

## References

---

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179–211.
- Aluja, A., Kuhlman, M., & Zuckerman, M. (2010). Development of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Aluja Personality Questionnaire (ZKA-PQ): A factor/facet version of the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (ZKPQ). *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 92, 416–431.
- Andersen, S., Harrison, G. W., Lau, M. I., & Rutström, E. E. (2008). Lost in state space: Are preferences stable? *International Economic Review*, 49(3), 1091–1112.
- Babin, B. J., Darden, W. R., & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 644–656.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Dholakia, U. (1999). Goal setting and goal striving in consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(Special Issue), 19–32.
- Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1207–1220.
- Bargh, J. A., & Barndollar, K. (1996). Automaticity in action: The unconscious as repository of chronic goals and motives. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Batra, R., & Ahtola, O. T. (1991). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian sources of consumer attitudes. *Marketing letters*, 2, 159-170.
- Batra, R., Homer, P. M., & Kahle, L. R. (2001). Values, susceptibility to normative influence, and attribute importance weights: A nomological analysis. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 11, 115–128.
- Baumeister, R. F., Sparks, E. A., Stillman, T. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2008). Free will in consumer behavior: Self-control, ego depletion, and choice. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 18, 4–13.
- Bazerman, M. H., Loewenstein, G., & White, S. B. (1992). Reversals of preference in allocation decisions: Judging an alternative versus choosing among alternatives. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 37, 220–240.

- Bearden, W. O., & Etzel, M. J. (1982). Reference group influence on product and brand purchase decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 183–194.
- Bearden, W. O., Netemeyer, R. G., & Teel, J. E. (1989). Measurement of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 473–481.
- Bearden, W. O., & Woodside, A. G. (1978). Consumption occasion influence on consumer brand choice. *Decision Sciences*, 9(2), 273–284.
- Becker, E. (1973). *The denial of death*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Belk, R. W. (1988). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 139–168.
- Bello, D. C., & Etzel, M. J. (1985). The role of novelty in the pleasure travel experience. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24(1), 20–26.
- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 116–132.
- Burnkrant, R. E., & Cousineau, A. (1975). Informational and normative social influence in buyer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2, 206–215.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control theory approach to human behavior*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Chatzidakis, A., Hibbert, S., & Smith, A. P. (2007). Why people don't take their concerns about fair trade to the supermarket: The role of neutralization. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74, 89–100.
- Chen, S., & Chaiken, S. (1999). The heuristic–systematic model in its broader context. In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Childers, T. L., Carr, C. L., Peck, J., & Carson, S. (2001). Hedonic and utilitarian motivations for online retail shopping. *Journal of Retailing*, 77, 511–535.
- Chulef, A. S., Read, S. J., & Walsh, D. A. (2001). A hierarchical taxonomy of human goals. *Motivation and Emotion*, 25, 191–232.
- Churchill, G.A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 64–73.

- Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 1015–1026.
- Custers, R., & Aarts, H. (2005). Positive affect as implicit motivator: On the nonconscious operation of behavioral goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 129–142.
- Dawes, R. M., & Messick, D. M. (2000). Social dilemmas. *International Journal of Psychology*, *35*, 111–116.
- Dhar, R., & Wertenbroch, K. (2000). Consumer choice between hedonic and utilitarian goods. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *37*, 60–71.
- Diekmann, A., & Preisendörfer, P. (2003). Green and greenback: The behavioral effects of environmental attitudes in low-cost and high-cost situations. *Rationality and Society*, *15*, 441–472.
- Draine, S. C., & Greenwald, A. G. (1998). Replicable unconscious semantic priming. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *127*, 286–303.
- Fairtrade International (2013). *Annual report 2012–2013*. Accessed at: [www.fairtrade.net/about-fairtrade/annual-reports.html](http://www.fairtrade.net/about-fairtrade/annual-reports.html)
- Frey, B. S., & Jegen, R. (2001). Motivation crowding theory. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *15*, 589–611.
- Förster, J., Liberman, N., & Friedman R. S. (2007). Seven principles of goal activation: A systematic approach to distinguishing goal priming from priming of non-goal constructs. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*, 211–233.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1996). The volitional benefits of planning. In P. M. Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gollwitzer, P. M., & Bargh, J. A. (Eds.) (1996). *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gollwitzer, P. M., Heckhausen, H., & Steller, B. (1990). Deliberative and implemental mind-sets: Cognitive tuning toward congruous thoughts and information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 1119–1127.
- Grubb, E. L., & Grathwohl, H. L. (1967). Consumer self-concept, symbolism and market behaviour: a theoretical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, *31*(4), 22–7.

- Gutman, J. (1982). A means–end chain model based on consumer categorization processes. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(1), 60–72.
- Harland, P., Staats, H., & Wilke, H. A. (1999). Explaining proenvironmental intention and behavior by personal norms and the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(12), 2505–2528.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280–1300.
- Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: Emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(3), 92–101.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 132–140.
- Hull, C. L. (1931). Goal attraction and directing ideas conceived as habit phenomena. *Psychological Review*, 38, 487–506.
- IPCC (2013). Summary for policymakers. In T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, et al. (Eds.), *Climate change 2013: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, UK and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Janiszewski, C. (2008). Goal-directed perception. In C. P. Haugtvedt, P. M. Herr, & F. R. Kardes (Eds.), *Handbook of consumer psychology*. London, UK and New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Johansson, L.-O., & Svedsäter, H. (2009). Piece of cake? Allocating rewards to third parties when fairness is costly. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109, 107–119.
- Kahle, L. R., Beatty, S., & Homer, P. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values: The List of Values (LOV) and Values and Life Style (VALS). *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13, 405–409.
- Kaiser, S. B., & Ketchum, K. (2005). Consuming fashion as flexibility: Metaphor, cultural mood, and materiality. In S. Ratneshwar & D. G. Mick (Eds.), *Inside consumption: Consumer motives, goals, and desires*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Kallgren, C. A., Reno, R. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2000). A focus theory of normative conduct: When norms do and do not affect behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 1002–1012.
- Kivetz, R., Urminsky, O., & Zheng, Y. (2006). The goal-gradient hypothesis resurrected: Purchase acceleration, illusionary goal progress, and customer retention. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*, 39–58.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Shah, J. Y., Fishbach, A., Friedman, R., Chun, W. Y., & Sleeth-Keppler, D. (2002). A theory of goal systems. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *34*, 331–378.
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Webster, D. M. (1996). Motivated closing of the mind: “Seizing” and “freezing.” *Psychological Review*, *103*, 263–283.
- Lee, J. A., & Holden, S. (1999). Understanding the determinants of environmentally conscious behavior. *Psychology and Marketing*, *16*, 373–392.
- Lewin, K. (1935). *A dynamic theory of personality*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Lindenberg, S. (2001a). Social rationality versus rational egoism. In J. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Lindenberg, S. (2001b). Intrinsic motivation in a new light. *Kyklos*, *54*, 317–342.
- Lindenberg, S., & Frey, B. S. (1993). Alternatives, frames, and relative prices: A broader view of rational choice theory. *Acta Sociologica*, *36*, 191–205.
- Lindenberg, S., & Steg, L. (2007). Normative, gain and hedonic goal frames guiding environmental behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, *63*, 117–137.
- Loewenstein, G. F., Bazerman, M. H., & Thompson, L. (1989). Social utility and decision making in interpersonal contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 426–441.
- Lubell, M. (2002). Environmental activism as collective action. *Environment and Behavior*, *34*, 431–454.
- Martin, L. L., & Tesser, A. (2009). Five markers of motivated behavior. In G. B. Moskowitz & H. Grant (Eds.), *The psychology of goals*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Mattson, B. E. (1982). Situational influences on store choice. *Journal of Retailing*, 58, 46–58.
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive–affective system theory of personality: Reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, 102, 246–268.
- Mood, C., & Jonsson, J. O. (2015). The social consequences of poverty: An empirical test on longitudinal data. *Social Indicators Research*, 127, 633–652.
- Moskowitz, G. B., & Grant, H. (2009). Four themes in the study of goals. In G. B. Moskowitz & H. Grant (Eds.), *The psychology of goals*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Opotow, S., & Weiss, L. (2000). Denial and the process of moral exclusion in environmental conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 475–490.
- Organic Trade Association (2012). *2012 Organic Industry Survey*. Accessed at: [www.ota.com/resources/organic-industry-survey](http://www.ota.com/resources/organic-industry-survey)
- Ormel, J., Lindenberg, S., Steverink, N., & Verbrugge, L. M. (1999). Subjective well-being and social production functions. *Social Indicators Research*, 46, 61–90.
- Pechmann, C., & Slater, M. D. (2005). Social marketing messages that may motivate irresponsible consumption behavior. In S. Ratneshwar & D. G. Mick (Eds.), *Inside consumption: Consumer motives, goals, and desires*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19, 123–205.
- Pieters, R., Bijmolt, T., van Raaij, F., & de Kruijk, M. (1998). Consumers' attributions of proenvironmental behavior, motivation, and ability to self and others. *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, 17, 215–225.
- Pohjanheimo, T., Paasovaara, R., Loumala, H., & Sandell, M. (2010). Food choice motives and bread liking of consumers embracing hedonistic and traditional values. *Appetite*, 54, 170–180.
- Ratner, R. K., & Kahn, B. E. (2002). The impact of private versus public consumption on variety-seeking behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 246–257.

- Richins, M. L. (2005). What consumers desire: Goals and motives in the consumption environment. In S. Ratneshwar & D. G. Mick (Eds.), *Inside consumption: Consumer motives, goals, and desires*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rindfleisch, A., & Burroughs, J. E. (2004). Terrifying thoughts, terrible materialism? Contemplations on a terror management account of materialism and consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 14*, 219–224.
- Russel, J. A. (1983). Pancultural aspects of human conceptual organization of emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 1281–1288.
- Sánchez-Fernández, R., & Iniesta-Bonillo, Á. M. (2007). The concept of perceived value: A systematic review of the research. *Marketing Theory, 7*, 427–451.
- Schoemaker, P. J. H. (1982). The expected utility model: Its variants, purposes, evidence and limitations. *Journal of Economic Literature, 20*, 529–563.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 221–279.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 1–65.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Howard, J. A. (1981). A normative decision-making model of altruism. In J. P. Rushton (Ed.), *Altruism and helping behavior: Social, personality and developmental perspectives* (pp. 189–211). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I., & Gross, B. L. (1991). Why we buy what we buy: A theory of consumption values. *Journal of Business Research, 22*, 159–170.
- Strull, T. K. (1981). Person memory: Some tests of associative storage and retrieval models. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 7*, 440–463.
- Steg, L. (2003). Can public transport compete with the private car? *LATSS Research, 27*(2), 27–35.
- Steg, L. (2005). Car use: Lust and must. Instrumental, symbolic and affective motives for car use. *Transportation Research A, 39*, 147–162.

- Steg, L., & Vlek, C. (2009). Encouraging pro-environmental behavior: An integrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 29*, 309–317.
- Stern, P. C. (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. *Journal of Social Issues, 56*, 407–424.
- Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. N. (2001). Consumer Perceived Value: The development of a multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing, 77*, 203–220.
- Verplanken, B., & Holland, R. W. (2002). Motivated decision making: Effects of activation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 434–447.
- Vinson, D. E., Scott, J. E., & Lamont, L. M. (1977). The role of personal values in marketing and consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing, 41*(2), 44–50.
- Wakefield, K. L., & Inman, J. J. (2003). Situational price sensitivity: The role of consumption occasion, social context and income. *Journal of Retailing, 79*, 199–212.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means–end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing, 52*(3), 2–22.



# Appendix A

## The Consumer Motivation Scale (CMS)

	VALUE FOR MONEY	QUALITY
Gain	<b>Value for money:</b> I should get a lot for the price I pay <b>Reasonable price:</b> _ should be reasonably priced <b>Economy:</b> _ should be economical  <b>Not wasteful:</b> _ should not be a waste of money <b>Not too expensive:</b> _ should not be too expensive	<b>Well made:</b> _ should be well-made or perform well <b>Quality:</b> _ should be of consistent and high quality <b>Reliability:</b> _ should be reliable (I should know what I get) <b>First class:</b> _ must be of the highest class  <b>Fulfills expectations:</b> _ should fulfill even my highest requirements and expectations
	<b>SAFETY</b>	
	<b>Safe and secure:</b> _ should feel safe and secure  <b>Calm and safe:</b> _ should make me feel calm and safe <b>Security:</b> _ should provide a prolonged and persistent feeling of security <b>Preparation:</b> _ should make me well-prepared in case something unforeseen happens <b>Future needs:</b> Needs that may arise in the future should be taken into consideration	
	<b>STIMULATION</b>	
Hedonic	<b>Avoid boredom:</b> It is important that _ is not too boring or routine <b>Unique:</b> _ should be unique (or provide a unique experience) <b>Stimulating:</b> _ should be stimulating  <b>Exciting:</b> _ should be exciting  <b>Interesting:</b> _ should be interesting	<b>COMFORT</b>  <b>Avoid inconvenience:</b> _ should not be too inconvenient <b>Pleasure:</b> _ should be pleasant and agreeable  <b>Smoothness:</b> _ should be smooth and comfortable <b>Avoid hassle:</b> _ should not be too complicated or strenuous
	<b>ETHICS</b>	
	<b>Good conscience:</b> _ should give me a good conscience <b>Ideals and opinions:</b> _ should be compatible with my ideals and opinions <b>Principle:</b> _ should not violate my principles  <b>Not morally wrong:</b> _ should not be morally wrong <b>Obligations:</b> _ should be compatible with my personal and moral obligations	<b>SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE</b>  <b>Popularity:</b> _ should be popular in my circle of friends <b>Friends' expectations:</b> _ should not go against my friends' expectations of me <b>Liked:</b> _ should be liked by people who are important to me <b>Friends' approval:</b> _ should be approved by my friends <b>Good impression:</b> _ should make a good impression on people who are important to me
Normative		

The items should be displayed in randomized order, and the labels of the higher-order goals and sub-goals (e.g. “Normative”, “Ethics”) should not be visible to the participant. The \_ should be replaced by a suitable word for the application, product type, or setting. E.g., “What matters the most to you when you shop for groceries in your local super market?” “Quality: The food should be of consistent and high quality”. We recommend using a five-, six- or seven-point scale, where only the leftmost and rightmost values are labeled:

Not at all important						Extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	



# Appendix B

---

## Template

**Question:** What matters the most to you when you \_\_\_\_\_?

**Instructions:** Please choose a number between 0 (not at all important) and 5 (extremely important) for each of the statements below. If you think the statement is unimportant or irrelevant, choose 0, but if you think it's completely decisive, then choose 5.

	Not at all important					Extremely important						
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>First class:</b> The product must be of the highest class	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Not wasteful:</b> The product should not be a waste of money	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Interesting:</b> The product should be interesting	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Safe and secure:</b> The product should feel safe and secure	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Friends' approval:</b> The product should be approved by my friends	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Economy:</b> The product should be economical	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Popularity:</b> The product should be popular in my circle of friends	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Avoid boredom:</b> It is important that the product is not too boring or routine	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Reliability:</b> The product should be reliable (I should know what I get)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Not morally wrong:</b> The product should not be morally wrong	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Unique:</b> The product should be unique (or provide a unique experience)	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Value for money:</b> I should get a lot for the price I pay	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Future needs:</b> Needs that may arise in the future should be taken into consideration	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Well made:</b> The product should be well-made or perform well	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Stimulating:</b> The product should be stimulating	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Avoid inconvenience:</b> The product (or use of the product) should not be too inconvenient	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Preparation:</b> The product should make me well-prepared in case something unforeseen happens	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Ideals and opinions:</b> The product should be compatible with my ideals and opinions	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Avoid hassle:</b> The product (or use of the product) should not be too complicated or strenuous	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Quality:</b> The product should be of consistent and high quality	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Calm and safe:</b> The product should make me feel calm and safe	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Pleasure:</b> The product (or use of the product) should be pleasant and agreeable	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Security:</b> The product should provide a prolonged and persistent feeling of security	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Principle:</b> The product should not violate my principles	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Liked:</b> The product should be liked by people who are important to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Friends' expectations:</b> The product should not go against my friends' expectations of me	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Smoothness:</b> The product (or use of the product) should be smooth and comfortable	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Fulfills expectations:</b> The product should fulfill even my highest requirements and expectations	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Reasonable price:</b> The product should be reasonably priced	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Good impression:</b> The product should make a good impression on people who are important to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Obligations:</b> The product should be compatible with my personal and moral obligations	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Not too expensive:</b> The product should not be too expensive	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Good conscience:</b> The product should give me a good conscience	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

