

Paper by: Fahmeena Odetta Moore

Abstract

This paper critically reviewed five articles on motivation from the literature to investigate whether trying new, innovative shopping technology because they are new is a significant reason or motivating factor. The paper also compares motivations for using new technology across studies. The research found that a small percentage of consumers are motivated to try new shopping technology because they are new. The 'novelty' motivation was not included in the findings of all studies. Another finding is that there may be new motivations or reasons for trying an innovative new product because of new or different features. There is considerable overlap in shopper motivations across studies.

Keywords: motivation, hedonic, utilitarian, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, shopping, innovation

Motivations to Use New Technology

Introduction

Motivation is usually associated with employees who need to be motivated to perform well on the job. However, motivation also applies to other activities such as travel, exercise, attending a sports event or using a new system feature.¹ There is a lot of research on the motivations to perform such activities. There has been research on the motivations to travel, such as the motivation to take a cruise (Jones, 2012; Han and Hyun, 2019; Jiao et al., 2021). There has been research on the motivations to attend a sports event (Funk et al., 2007; Jarvis and Blank, 2011; Park et al., 2016). There has also been research on the motivations to use information technology (a system, game or app) (Zsila et al., 2018; Bueno et al., 2020; De Canio et al., 2022). And, there has been a lot more research on motivations.

Understanding the motivation(s) underlying the use of a system, game or app could assist with the design of the system, game or app. Motivations provide details on why users select or continue to use a particular technology. Motivations may also determine the feature(s) the user is interested in.

The purpose of this paper is to review the motivations for using new technologies in retail (for shopping) to investigate whether trying new technologies just because they are new is a significant reason or motivating factor. The paper will review research on motivations from the literature to determine: (1) the similarities in user shopping motivations, and (2) the theories used for explaining motivations as well as the design and methodology of the research to understand motivations. As far as I know, there is no research on the 'novelty' motivation of consumers. This paper was inspired by a paper prepared for a PhD assignment to review 5 journal articles to increase knowledge of qualitative research methods.

¹ Motivation is defined as “the process of starting, directing and maintaining physical and psychological activities; includes mechanisms involved in preferences for one activity over another and the vigor and persistence of responses” (Zsila et al., 2018).

Background

There has been a wave on new innovative technologies for selling goods and services (Pantano, 2014). Some ensure retailers receive the most up-to-date information on the market and on sales. Others support the consumer during shopping. Some recent innovative solutions for consumers include self-service technologies equipped with radio frequency identification (RFID) systems, interactive displays equipped with touch screens, digital signage and applications for mobile phones, gamification, and virtual/augmented reality. Some retailers have not adopted new technologies at the points of sale yet.

Research on new technologies in retail have looked at the users' experience with the technology, how the new technology affects the intent to purchase, and so on. For example, Brandtzaeg and Følstad (2017) noted that there was substantial research on chatbots although there was little on user motivations. Some research looked into users' experiences such as a study that looked into how users perceived the personality of chatbots.

Method

I used Science Direct and Google Search to search for journal articles for this paper. I used keyword searches such as 'paper motivation' and 'paper motivation shopping.' I found a few articles that used qualitative research methods to investigate shopping motivations. Most were quantitative studies. I selected articles on motivation that indicated the technology was new or newly available. I also selected motivation articles that used different research methodologies. All the articles were open access articles.

Results

The following 5 articles indicate that the reasons for trying new technologies are very similar. Two of the 5 articles, Motivation Study 2 and Motivation Study 3, indicate that novelty is a reason or motivating factor for users to try new technologies. Participants provided the “novelty” responses in response to an open-ended question.

Motivation Study 1

The first article by Parker and Wang (2016) explored customer motivations for fashion retail apps. According to the researchers, mobile commerce or m-commerce was relatively new to the fashion industry (they mentioned the “relative newness”) (Parker and Wang, 2016, p.492). Parker and Wang (2016) reported that most research on m-commerce retail motivations focused on non-fashion retail experiences. Fashion retailing is different because of its hedonic/aspirational nature. Information on motivations associated with fashion apps should lead to better designs that would improve the user experience and encourage purchases.

The study was qualitative – a phenomenological study. Parker and Wang (2016) indicated that they used an inductive research approach which means that the researchers used theory as a lens to understand consumer behavior. The research did not set out to test a theory.

From previous research, the researchers determined motivations could be classified as either utilitarian or hedonic and that both (utilitarian and hedonic) motivations should be considered although fashion retailing is predominantly hedonic. From the research by Arnold and Reynolds in 2003, hedonic motivations (described as multisensory, fantasy, or emotional) include: adventure, social, gratification, role, idea, and value/discount dimensions. The Adventure dimension (also referred to as motive elsewhere) is shopping to experience excitement, adventure and stimulation. The Social dimension involves influences from important others and the effect of interpersonal relationships on the shopping trip. The Gratification dimension is shopping for relief from stress and alleviate negative moods. The Role dimension involves shopping to find the right gift for others. The Idea dimension is shopping to obtain information on new trends and products. The Value/Discount dimension is shopping for value/bargains and sales. From the research by Kim in 2006, utilitarian motivations (described as task or function focused) include: efficiency, cost/value, and achievement. Achievement refers to goal-oriented shopping to find a particular good or service. Table 1 in the article does not show

(misses) the Cost/Value experience. Also from previous research, Parker and Wang (2016) noted that motivation is an individual's desire to perform a task or engage with an activity, which goes together with level of difficulty to perform the task and notification to perform the task (a trigger). Based on the definition of motivation, some of the dimensions above do not seem to qualify as motives.

The researchers collected data from participants via semi-structured interviews. The questions used targeted sub-themes identified in the literature. The sub-themes were: (1) Hedonic motivation to engage with m-commerce with the 6 dimensions, (2) Utilitarian motivation to engage with m-commerce with the 3 experiences, and (3) Behavioral interaction: Ability to engage, Calls to Action (triggers), Time of day for interaction. The sub-themes from the literature were used although they were “old” and probably applied to shopping at brick and mortar stores and maybe online shopping. The researchers noted that the motivations for m-commerce and e-commerce may be different “due to ... different situational interactions” (Parker and Wang, 2016, p.489). Collecting information on the media/channel preference of each participant was a smart way to address the issue. The targeted age groups were: 25-34 and 18-25. The 18 participants were from the campus of the University of Manchester, UK. The researchers performed a pilot test before the interviews to test the validity and usability of the questions. The pilot test resulted in minor changes.

Parker and Wang (2016) performed thematic analysis on the data collected. The thematic analysis was based on methods used in previous research and seemed very thorough. The analysis included text analysis as well as consideration of synonyms.

The top motivating factors from the thematic analysis (the results) include: efficiency shopping (utilitarian) followed by social shopping (hedonic) followed by gratification shopping (hedonic) and then discount shopping (utilitarian). All 18 participants expressed that they were motivated by the efficiency and convenience of an app most of all. Within the utilitarian

category, the reasons provided for Achievement shopping stood out. Six participants indicated that they used the app both to shop and to “have a look” (for unspecified/general browsing). Three participants indicated that they used the app to have a look but these three participants apparently viewed products online and then shop at the store. Consumers who use different channels this way are said to be webrooming or switching from online to offline channels (Hu and Tracogna, 2020). The “have a look” described by the 9 participants suggested that they were checking for updates or the latest information. Based on the responses provided for Achievement shopping, the researchers believed leisure shopping could be added as another dimension of the utilitarian motivation.

The researchers' analysis of responses by all participants revealed that those participants that preferred m-commerce over e-commerce and brick and mortar stores were more comfortable using the app for pressure/gratification shopping (to relief stress) and wanted more hedonic uses. Analysis of motivating factors important for m-commerce led the researchers to conclude that fashion apps are a unique version of e-commerce. The researchers suggested ways to improve fashion apps given the findings.

Motivation Study 2

The second study by Brandtzaeg and Følstad (2017) investigated the motivations for using a chatbot. Chatbots are a fairly new technology that provide services such as customer service, social and emotional support, and entertainment. An example is the chatbot launched by H&M to provide fashion advice from photographs uploaded by users. Understanding the motivations of users will assist with the design of chatbots.

Brandtzaeg and Følstad (2017) used the Uses and Gratification (U&G) theory to develop a theoretical framework. The U&G theory explains use of a specific media (why and how) based on the gratifications experienced when using the media. Gratifications such as the need for

information, entertainment, social interaction, and self-expression have been suggested as motivations for media use.

The researchers used a questionnaire to collect information from participants, all chatbot users. The 17-question questionnaire included open-ended questions such as: What is your main reason for using chatbots? Participants were from the U.S. The target age group was 16-55 years.

The researchers analyzed and coded the responses to develop categories of motivation. The categories were: Productivity, Entertainment, Social/relational, Novelty/curiosity, Other. Forty two percent of participants reported that they used chatbots because they are easy, fast to use and conveniently provides useful information – productivity reasons. Twenty percent reported that they used chatbots for entertainment. The entertainment may be positive (fun and entertaining) or negative (because bored). Some (7%) participants reported both productivity and entertainment reasons. Twelve percent of participants reported that they used chatbots for social/relational purposes, specifically to avoid loneliness or improve their interactions with others. Some (5%) participants reported both productivity and social/relational reasons. Ten percent reported that they used chatbots because they were curious or because chatbots were new. Some of the explanations include: “Trying something new,” “They are new and intriguing,” and “Curiosity, mostly, because I have skepticism about the privacy of it and the evidence based knowledge that it is assuming is accurate when answering a question.”

Brandtzaeg and Følstad (2017) noted that older studies included 'curiosity and general interest' as a key gratification associated with media use. Those older studies focused on news consumption and information-seeking from older mass media such as television and newspapers. Those older studies did not touch on motivations related to novel technologies such as chatbots.

Motivation Study 3

The third article, a mixed study by Cai et al. (2018), focuses on live streaming as part of online shopping, a fairly new phenomenon. The goal of the study was to understand the

motivations of users – why they watch live streams when they shop and why they prefer e-commerce sites to include live streaming. The motivations would be useful for determining whether live streams should be incorporated into e-commerce sites or whether live stream platforms should incorporate elements of e-commerce.

The researchers developed a theoretical framework from prior research and applicable theories. Theories selected included “previous motivation theories related to acceptance of information technology as well as theories about online shopping” Cai et al. (2018, p. 82). From previous research, Cai et al. (2018) concluded that consumer shopping motivations could be utilitarian or hedonic and individual motivations could be extrinsic or intrinsic. Utilitarian motivation is associated with functional, practical, convenience, and ease of use while hedonic motivation is associated with fun and enjoyment. In addition to the 4 motivations, perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness are technology-related motivations from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). Both perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness are associated with the utilitarian motivation category and also fall under extrinsic motivation. Enjoyment is associated with intrinsic motivation and hedonic motivation.² For hedonic motivation, Cai et al. (2018) opted to focus on the streamer (rather than the product for sale). The researchers chose measures that indicated how much the viewer liked the streamer – interpersonal attractiveness for how interesting the streamer is, and physical attractiveness for the streamer's outwardly appearance. Based on all this, the first research question, Cai et al. (2018) asked was how the utilitarian, product-related motivations (ease of use and usefulness) and the hedonic,

² The study by Akdim et al. (2022) also used the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) in this way. However, ease of use, usefulness and enjoyment (all three variables) were used in the development of hypotheses in that study. Only two – ease of use and usefulness – were used in the research questions/hypotheses in Cai et al. (2018). Other variables substituted for enjoyment.

In addition to TAM, Akdim et al. (2022) used the Information Systems continuance model as well as the Expectation-Disconfirmation theory which both viewed satisfaction as important for continuance intention. The goal of the study was to: (1) determine the factors that influence the continuance intention to use social mobile apps focusing only on utilitarian and hedonic motivations, and (2) investigate whether the type of app (utilitarian or hedonic) will have an effect on the utilitarian and hedonic factors.

streamer-related motivations (interpersonal attractiveness and physical attractiveness) explain the intention to watch live streaming for shopping.

Cai et al. (2018) did not find an appropriate theoretical framework to explain why users would choose live streaming shopping over other types of online shopping so they posed open questions for the research. The second research question was the open-ended question: Why do people prefer live streaming shopping as opposed to regular online shopping sites?

The researchers used an online survey to collect information from participants on their live streaming experience. The survey had several sections. One section requested responses on the motivations used in the first research question. The items/questions included in this section of the survey were all from previous research (but fell under the motivation categories used in the first research question). For example, usefulness contained seven items such as 'It was useful in getting information about the product' and 'The live stream shows the effectiveness of the product.' The items required a response from a 5-point Likert-type scale (from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree). Another section requested responses on two dependent variables: (1) a utilitarian variable – intention to watch if an individual stumbles upon a live streaming event while searching for a product online, and (2) a hedonic variable – intention to watch a live stream if a shopping website invited their favorite internet celebrity to stream an event for an hour. The celebrity would be the streamer. A five-point Likert scale was used (from Very unlikely to Very likely). Yet another section requested responses on the importance of factors in the user's decision to purchase the product. There were also two open questions. Seventy eight percent of the participants were from the United States. Others were from 12 different countries.

Cai et al. (2018) used linear regression models to model the relationship between motivations (the four motivations as well as 3 decision-making factors as independent variables) and intention to watch (the two intentions as dependent variables). The three decision-making factors were: Liking streamer, Liking product, and Needing product.

The independent variables explained 23-24% of the variation in intention to watch. Based on the variables that were statistically significant, the regression results indicated that a shopper who had utilitarian motives and was looking for a product, would likely watch a live stream if the product was perceived as useful and he or she liked the product. The results also indicated that a shopper who had hedonic motives would likely watch a live stream if the streamer was attractive and he or she liked the streamer. Categorization of participants' responses to questions on why they preferred live streams on e-commerce websites led to eight categories: product demos, product information, excitement about novelty of live streaming, interaction, convenience, hype about the product, wanting other opinions, and deals. Two of the eight categories were about the novelty of the technology and hype about using the technology. Twenty-six percent of participants said they were excited about the novelty of live streaming. The participants wanted a new way to shop. Some of the detailed explanations include: “A new way to shop,” “It is more entertaining than regular online shopping,” and “Most of the times when I want to buy something, I rather search for the live streams because it is more fun than just surfing through shopping websites.” Seven percent of participants were behind the hype category. Those participants said they were influenced to purchase something on live stream by others – others were interested in it which made them curious.

Motivation Study 4

The fourth article by Liang et al. (2022) investigated consumer motivations and attitudes towards mobile self-checkout technology in the fashion industry. Mobile self-checkout is fairly new and has been adopted by few department stores and retailers in the fashion industry. Much research is needed in this area.

The researchers developed a conceptual framework from research/frameworks used in the literature. They started with Kim and Hong's (2011) framework which they then modified based on findings in other studies. From Kim and Hong's framework on hedonic shopping motivations,

the researchers adopted social shopping motivation, idea shopping motivation, and value shopping motivation for use in their model.³ They replaced fashion leadership in Kim and Hong's framework with fashion innovativeness from a study by Batinic et al. Fashion innovativeness seems to include activities related to obtaining knowledge about new innovations and communicating new innovations to others, i.e. activities related to diffusion of new products. The researchers also adopted risk and favorable attitudes from previous research. The researchers developed seven hypotheses using the three hedonic shopping motivations and other selected variables: (1) fashion innovativeness is positively related to each hedonic shopping motivation, (2) fashion innovativeness is positively related to risk, (3) the three shopping motivations are positively related to favorable attitude toward mobile self-checkout, (3) risk is negatively associated with favorable attitude, (4) favorable attitude is positively related to mobile self-checkout frequency, and (5) gender will moderate the path between favorable attitudes and mobile self-checkout frequency. The model therefore expected that favorable attitude toward mobile self-checkout would determine how frequently consumers used the mobile self-checkout and the motivation of the shopper (social shopping motivation, idea shopping motivation, and/or value shopping motivation, which are related to fashion innovativeness) would contribute to that favorable attitude. Risk dampens favorable attitude.

The researchers used an online self-administered questionnaire to collect information from participants in the top 20 metropolitan areas in the U.S. They showed participants a short video of Macy's self-checkout service as an example. Most (128 of 229) participants were male. Ages ranged from 18 to 65 with 76.3% between 19 and 45 years old.

The researchers first tested/validated the measurement of the variables which led to dropping two items of risk and two items of fashion innovativeness. The researchers also tested

³ Kim and Hong used the theory of human motivation (McGuire, 1974) and Sheth's (1983) shopping preference theory to develop a conceptual model for their research on fashion leadership and hedonic motivations of female consumers. They used five hedonic shopping motivations from the research by Arnolds and Reynolds in 2003 (gratification, value, social, idea, and adventure).

overall model fit and then used path analysis with an appropriate model fit to test the hypotheses. To examine differences between men and women, the researchers conducted group comparisons using chi-square tests.

Fashion innovativeness was found to be positively related to social shopping motivation, idea shopping motivation and value shopping motivation. The relationship between fashion innovativeness and idea shopping motivation was strongest, which seemed reasonable since a high interest in innovations in fashion would likely be strongly related to wanting to shop to keep up with new trends. There was a statistically significant positive relationship between both social shopping motivation and idea shopping motivation and positive attitude towards mobile self-checkout. The relationship between value shopping motivation and positive attitude towards mobile self-checkout was not significant. There was a statistically significant positive relationship between attitude towards self-checkout and self-checkout frequency. Relationships that included risk were not statistically significant. Analysis of how the relationship between attitudes towards self-checkout and self-checkout frequency differed between men and women returned a significantly different relationship.

The design of the study implies that self-mobile checkout is inconvenient (utilitarian motives are not included). Some of the hedonic motives from other studies may apply, such as wanting to try the new technology because someone else tried it (which is related to curiosity) and wanting to try something new. However, this may require a more qualitative research design.

It is interesting that the researchers suggested that retailers continue to update the app to make it more user friendly. This is because they believe a more user friendly app would improve consumers' attitudes towards self-checkout (available on the app). This suggests that it is more difficult, if not impossible, to change the consumers' motivations which would then affect the attitude.

Motivation Study 5

The fifth article is an article by Adaji et al. (2020) that investigated how to personalize or tailor online/e-commerce systems for shoppers based on their motivations for shopping. The overarching research question was: “How are e-commerce shoppers influenced by persuasive strategies based on their different motivations to shop online?” (Adaji et al., 2020, p.) Tailoring is a new strategy used by businesses to influence the purchasing decisions of clients. This falls under the use of persuasion (influence strategies) to change how people act or behave without coercion.

Adaji et al. (2020) used a popular typology of shopper motivations from Rohm and Swaminathan (2004) as a starting point. The typology categorized shoppers into 4 categories based on their motivations: convenience shopper, store-oriented shopper, balanced buyer, and variety seeker. The researchers recognized that shopper motivation could also be classified as utilitarian or hedonic based on the value the shopper derived when shopping. Shoppers in the hedonic category buy products for happiness and pleasure rather than how useful the product is.

In addition to the shopper motivation typology, the researchers used a common taxonomy of persuasive strategies to influence the shopping behavior of shoppers by Caldini. Caldini's taxonomy includes the following strategies: reciprocity, scarcity, commitment, authority, consensus, and liking.

Adaji et al. (2020) used an online survey to collect information from participants.⁴ The researchers recruited participants from Amazon Mechanical Turk as well as various online

⁴ In a similar study by van Velsen et al., 2019, the researchers used simple digital mock-ups to provide respondents with an idea of how the screens might look and work. In the study, van Velsen et al. (2019) used the Self-Determination theory (SDT) of motivation, which led to six types of motivation: (1) intrinsic motivation, (2) extrinsic motivation-integrated motivation, (3) extrinsic motivation-identified motivation, (4) extrinsic motivation-introjected motivation, (5) extrinsic motivation-external motivation, and (6) a-motivation. The actual types of motivation based on responses from Dutch participants (to the survey) turned out to be: (1) intrinsic motivation, (2) external regulation, and (3) a-motivation. The researchers also found that there was some overlap between intrinsic motivation and external regulation. People who were intrinsically motivated were sometimes affected by externally motivated rewards or punishments to a high degree, i.e. they were also motivated by external regulation. It was also possible to be motivated intrinsically only.

social media and the news board of their university. Ninety five (95%) of the participants were 49 years old or less, 56% were male, and most lived in North America and Asia.

The researchers first evaluated the measurement of the variables/constructs (relationship between indicators or questions used for each construct) and then used a partial least squares structural model to determine how the shoppers' motivation affected their view/acceptance of the strategies.

The researchers found that the balanced buyer is most affected by the commitment strategy, the convenience shopper is the most strongly affected by scarcity, the store-oriented shopper is most strongly affected by consensus, and the variety seeker is most strongly affected by authority. The researchers did not make it clear that their study verified the 4 shopper motivations. The participants had to have been mapped to a shopper motivation and then associated with persuasive strategies.

Summary and Discussion

Table 1 provides a summary of motivations by study. Most of the motivations are based on ideas from previous research. A breakdown or summary of motivations by age or location (if applicable) from the studies would have been useful.

Table 1

Summary of Motivations by Study

Study	Motivations
1	Top 3: Efficiency/convenience (a utilitarian motive), Social (a hedonic motive), Gratification (a hedonic motive) Others: Cost/value (a utilitarian motive), Achievement (a utilitarian motive) Adventure (a hedonic motive), Role (a hedonic motive), Idea (a hedonic motive), and Value/discount (a hedonic motive). Also Leisure shopping (a hedonic motive).
2	Productivity (easy, fast, convenient), Entertainment, Social/relational, Novelty/curiosity, Other

3	Usefulness (a utilitarian motive) Physical attractiveness of streamer (a hedonic motive) Also product demos, product information, excitement about novelty of live streaming (Novelty), interaction, convenience, hype about the product, wanting other opinions, and deals (Value/cost). (reasons for live stream preference on e-commerce sites)
4	Social shopping motivation (a hedonic motive), Idea shopping motivation (a hedonic motive) and Value shopping motivation (a hedonic motive) which are all related to fashion innovativeness. No utilitarian motive – on purpose
5	Convenience shopper, Store-oriented shopper, Balanced buyer, and Variety seeker

Table 2 summarizes the major theories or inputs used to guide/frame the research in each study.

Table 2

Summary showing Major Theories/Inputs by Study

Study	Motivations
1	Arnold and Reynolds (2003) hedonic typology Kim (2006) utilitarian typology
2	Uses and Gratification (U&G) theory
3	Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)
4	Kim & Hong's (2011) framework which used 5 of 6 motivations from the Arnold and Reynolds (2003) hedonic typology
5	Typology of shopper motivations from Rohm and Swaminathan (2004) Caldini's taxonomy of persuasive strategies

From results of the studies, the most important motivation for using a new technology is convenience/usefulness. Users want new technology to be easy, fast, and convenient. Only a small percentage of users want to try a new product/service because it is new. Surprisingly, there did not seem to be much correlation or much of a relationship between shoppers who liked to shop to obtain information on new trends and products and the shoppers who liked to try a new

product/service because it was new. It is important to note that there may be new motivations or reasons for trying an innovative new product because of new or different features. As an example, live streams introduce a streamer along with the new motivating factor 'physical attractiveness of streamer.' However, 'physical attractiveness of streamer' can be viewed as the attitude of the shopper towards the streamer. More research is needed on how motivation and attitude influence the shopper to try new technology both separately and together. How the new technology alters the motivation of the shopper also needs to be considered.

References

- Adaji I, Oyibo K and Vassileva J (2020). E-Commerce shopping motivation and the influence of persuasive strategies. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 67. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2020.00067>
- Akdim, K., Casalo, L. V., & Flavián, C. (2022). The role of utilitarian and hedonic aspects in the continuance intention to use social mobile apps. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102888>
- Batinic, B., Wolff, H.-G., & Haupt, C. M. (2008). Construction and factorial structure of a short version of the Trendsetting Questionnaire (TDS-K) A cross-validation using multigroup confirmatory factor analyses. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 24(2), 88-94.
- Brandtzaeg, P.B., & Følstad, A. (2017). Why people use chatbots. *Internet Science INSCI 2017*, 10673. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70284-1_30
- Bueno, S., Gallego, M. D., & Noyes, J. (2020). Uses and gratifications on Augmented Reality games: An examination of Pokémon Go. *Applied Sciences*, 10, 1644. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app10051644>
- Cai, J., Wohn, D. Y., Mittal, A., & Sureshabu, D. (2018). Utilitarian and hedonic motivations for live streaming shopping. *Association for Computing Machinery, TVX 2018 - Proceedings of the 2018 ACM International Conference on Interactive Experiences for TV and Online Video*, 81-88, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3210825.3210837>
- Carroll, J., Hopper, L., Farrelly, A. M., Lombard-Vance, R., Bamidis, P. D., & Konstantinidis, E. I. (2021). A scoping review of augmented/virtual reality health and wellbeing interventions for older adults: Redefining immersive virtual reality. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frvir.2021.655338>

- De Canio, F., Fuentes-Blasco, M. and Martinelli, E. (2022). Extrinsic motivations behind mobile shopping: What drives regular and occasional shoppers? *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 50(8/9), 962-980.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-10-2021-0489>
- Friedländer, M. B. (2017). Streamer Motives and User-Generated Content on Social Live-Streaming Services. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice*, 5(1), 65-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1633/JISTaP.2017.5.1.5>
- Funk, D. C., Toohey, K., & Bruun, T. (2007). International sport event participation: Prior sport involvement; destination image; and travel motives. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7(3), 227-248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184740701511011>
- Han, H., & Hyun, S. S. (2019). Cruise travel motivations and repeat cruising behaviour: impact of relationship investment. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(7), 786-805.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1313204>
- Hu, T., & Tracogna, A. (2020). Multichannel customer journeys and their determinants: Evidence from motor insurance. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 54, 1-.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.102022>
- Indrawati, I., Ramantoko, G., Widarmanti, T., Aziz, I.A. and Khan, F.U. (2022). Utilitarian, hedonic, and self-esteem motives in online shopping. *Spanish Journal of Marketing - ESIC*, 26(2), 231-246. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJME-06-2021-0113>
- Jarvis, N., & Blank, C. (2011). The importance of tourism motivations among sport event volunteers at the 2007 World Artistic Gymnastics Championships, Stuttgart, Germany. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 16(2), 129-147.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2011.568089>

- Jiao, Y., Hou, Y., & Lau, Y. (2021). Segmenting cruise consumers by motivation for an emerging market: A case of China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12:606785.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.606785>
- Jin, B., Kim, G., Moore, M., & Rothenburg, L. (2021). Consumer store experience through virtual reality: Its effect on emotional states and perceived store attractiveness. *Fashion and Textiles*, 8(19). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40691-021-00256-7>
- Jones, V. (2012). Motivations to Cruise: An itinerary and cruise experience study. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18(1), 30-40. <https://doi.org/10.1375/jhtm.18.1.30>
- Kim, H. & Hong, H. (2011). Fashion leadership and hedonic shopping motivations of female consumers. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*. 29. 314-330.
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X11422819>.
- Kwon, K., & Jain, D. (2009). Multichannel shopping through nontraditional retail formats: Variety-seeking behavior with hedonic and utilitarian motivations. *Journal of Marketing Channels*, 16(2), 149-168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10466690802477418>
- Liang, Y. & Lee, S. & Workman, J. E., (2022). Consumers hedonic shopping motivations of using mobile self-checkout in fashion retail stores. *International Textile and Apparel Association Annual Conference Proceedings*,78(1). doi:
<https://doi.org/10.31274/itaa.13778>
- Liu, Y. (2014). Motivation and attitude: Two important non-intelligence factors to arouse students' potentialities in learning English. *Creative Education*, 5, 1249-1253.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.514140>
- Pantano, E. (2014). Innovation drivers in retail industry. *International Journal of Information Management*, 34(3), 344-350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.03.002>

- Park, J., Suh, Y. I., & Pedersen, P. M. (2016). Examining spectator motivations in Major League Baseball: A comparison between senior and non-senior consumers. *Sport Management International Journal*, 12(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.4127/ch.2016.0110>
- Parker, C., & Wang, H. (2016). Examining hedonic and utilitarian motivations for m-commerce fashion retail app engagement. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 20(4), 487-506. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-02-2016-0015>
- van Velsen L., Broekhuis, M., Jansen-Kosterink, S., & op den Akker, H. (2019). Tailoring Persuasive Electronic Health Strategies for Older Adults on the Basis of Personal Motivation: Web-Based Survey Study, *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(9), e11759. <https://doi.org/10.2196/11759>
- Zsila, A., Orosz, G., Bóthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., Király, O., Griffiths, M., & Demetrovics, Z. (2018). An empirical study on the motivations underlying augmented reality games: The case of Pokémon Go during and after Pokémon fever. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 133, 56-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.06.024>