Shopping Motivation on Purchase Intention: Can Loyalty Program and Corporate Image Enhance Such Relationship?
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Abstract
Previous studies of shopping motivation as well as research to classify the various customers into group or types. This present study intends to take the first steps towards the development of shopping motivation may have effect on purchase intention with moderating role of loyalty program and corporate image in hypermarket format. The sample of 228 undergraduate and post graduate student where they had visited a hypermarket. Hierarchical regression was conduct to analysis that such of relationship. In this study was divided into 4 model including control variable, predictor variable, two way interaction and three way interaction. The result indicated that shopping motivation was statistically significant can increase purchase intention. Loyalty program and corporate image as not moderating variable, because the two interactions is not significant. However, loyalty program can affect independently (as predictor variable) on purchase intention. Shopping motivation and loyalty program may be the good combination of marketing strategy to increase purchase intention in retail format. In the future research, suggested using another variable such that store atmospheric, promotion strategy or other variable as moderating variable and also general public as respondent is the best sample.
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Introduction
Consumers today enjoy the benefit of huge varieties of products and services to choose from, and prior research has indicated purchase intention may be influenced by variables such as demographic, perceived quality, store name, brand name and price discount (Akhter., 2002; Das., 2013; Grewal et al., 1998). While there has been some studies linking the relationship between shopping motivations to purchase intention on how the process led to increased consumer purchases (CheonYim., 2013), it is possible
that some other factors may strengthen such relationship. In the present study, we proposed that by combing a loyalty program and positive corporate image, consumers may see the potential benefit of rewarding their purchase (Warden et al, 2012) and relationship building with the retailer, and therefore enhance purchase intention (Grewal et al., 1998; Solomon., 1999).

Purchase intention refers to the possibility of a consumer’s willingness to buy the products (Dodds et al., 1991) after evaluating the product and considering it to be worth buying (Keller., 2001). Prior research had indicated that purchase intention can and does influence the actual purchase (Luo et al., 2011; Morrison., 1979). It is a conscious decision making process where consumer actively or passively seeking for relevant information based on their needs, experience, and circumstances. They process such information through making comparison and judgment, and finally come to a decision to buy (Engel et al., 1984). Based on the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen., 1991) framework, purchase intention is presumed to capture the motivational factors that influence the behavior; they are indications of how hard people are willing to try, of how much of an effort they are planning to exert, in order to perform the behavior.

There may be some internal and external factors that may influence the consumer’s purchase intention. One of the most frequently studied internal factors to influence purchase intention is shopping motivation. To begin with, consumers may use the perceived price and perceived quality as a lead to perceived value (Tung & Wildt., 1994). Therefore, their purchase intention is depended on the benefits and value they gained from that perception (Zeithaml., 1988; Dodd et al., 1991; Grewal et al., 1998).

Consumer purchase intention can also be influenced by external factors such as the product, brand, retailer, or timing (Kotler., 2000). Prior research has indicated that various promotion programs have a noticeable influence on consumer purchase intention (Kopalle & Lehmann., 2006). Price discount, brand name, and even the retailer name can also influence purchase intention (Grewal et al., 1998). For instance, advertising information had an impact on consumer purchase intention, not only in terms of the advertised products they intended to buy, the retailer where they wanted to go, but also the degree of effort they took to seek out the products (Shen et al., 2007).

Another external factor to influence purchase intention could be the existence of a loyalty program. Generally speaking, a loyalty program is designed to influence the consumer’s repeat-purchase pattern through offering rewards as a way to encourage, loyal behavior to the organization (Sharp & Sharp., 1997). The collection of reward stamps or points, in turn motivate the consumer and reinforce the repeat purchase behavior (Decie et al., 1971).

Corporate image may also influence purchase intention. Corporate image is usually shaped by a company’s actions and public opinion through media, labor unions, social organizations, industrial associations, and other entities (Blishak., 2007). Prior research has found corporate expertise and corporate social responsibility value are related to purchase intention (David et al., 2005). A customer’s expectation of corporate capability may be enhanced through the quality products or services the company provided, as well as their integrity in
fulfilling formal contracts or announced promise (Rindova et al., 2005). They are more willingly to associate themselves with companies of high reputation to feel self-articulation and self enhancement. As such, the development of a favorable corporate reputation is important for relationship-oriented firms (Kieh & Xie., 2009).

While the relationship between shopping motivation and purchase intention has been studied frequently, not much study has been conducted in terms of whether the existence of a loyalty program and positive corporate image together may enhance such relationship. Therefore, the current study aims to explore such relationship in the context of hypermarket, the retail format that accounts for the largest share of global grocery retailer with wide product range, competitive pricing and service quality for differentiation (Hsueh., 2005). We proposed that by combing a loyalty program and positive corporate image, the influence of shopping motivation on purchase intension will be enhanced than shopping motivation alone.

**Literature Review Purchase Intention**

While the definition of purchase intention may vary, it generally refers to the possibility of a consumer’s willingness to buy the products or service they like (Dodds et al., 1991). In other words, purchase intention may represent the likelihood of purchasing a product once again after evaluating the product and consider it to be worth buying (Keller., 2001). Their intentions to purchase arise when the product or service provide the features that meet or satisfy the consumers’ need (Fournier., 1998). Purchase intention can also be defined as an advance plan to purchase certain goods or service in the future. While this plan may not always lead to implementation due to the consumer’s ability to perform (Warshaw & Davis., 1985), it often leads to actual purchase (Luo et al., 2011; Morrison., 1979).

Consumer purchase intention from a retail store is influenced by several external factors such as product, brand, retailer, and timing (Kotler., 2000). Price discount, brand name, and the retailer name can influence purchase intention (Grewal et al., 1998). Information conveyed by advertising also had an impact on consumer purchase intention, measured in terms of the advertised products they intended to buy, the purchase place where they wanted to go, or even the degree of effort they took to seek out the products they wanted to buy (Shen et al., 2007). The various promotion types did have a noticeable influence on consumer purchase intention (Kopalle & Lehmann., 2006). Physical properties of the retail environment designed to create store atmospheric can involve multiple sense to attract consumer and influence purchase behavior (Blackwell et al., 2001).

Consumer purchase intention can also be influenced by internal factors. Prior research showed that psychosocial variables and past behavior were among the best predictors to purchase intention (Robinson & Smith., 2002). Vanity trait, innovativeness, and peer group can also influence purchase intention (Hsiao et al., 2013). Demographic characteristics and group reference can affected purchase intention (Madahi & Sukati., 2012). Prior research suggested that demographic characteristics and their psychological correlates significantly influence the likelihood of purchase intention (Akhter., 2003). As such, the following section will explore the influence of shopping motivation on purchase intention.
Shopping Motivation

Research regarding consumer shopping motivation received wide recognition in 1972 through Edward M. Tauber’s seminal article investigating the question “Why do people shop?”. In the article he hypothesizes that people’s motives for shopping are a function of many variables, some of which are unrelated to the actual buying of products. He developed a number of shopping motivations, with the basic premise that shoppers are motivated by a variety of psychosocial needs, other than those strictly related to acquiring some product. These motives were classified into personal (i.e., role playing, diversion, self-gratification, learning about new trends, physical activity and sensory stimulation), and social (i.e., social experiences, communication with others, peer group attractions, status and authority, and pleasure of bargaining) motives. Shopping thus occurs when a consumer’s need for a particular good is sufficient for allocating time and money to travel to a store to go shopping, or when a consumer “needs attention, wants to be with peers, desires to meet people with similar interests, feels a need to exercise, or simply has leisure time”.

Generally speaking, shopping motivations can be categorized in two aspects, utilitarian and hedonic aspects (Babin et al., 1994). Utilitarian determinant is based on the assessment about the instrumental value of the brand’s product’s functional attributes (Batra., 1990). Utilitarian value is more relevant in explaining shopping as a job or task that has to be done shopping. This type of orientation corresponds to the classical economic model of consumer behavior that depicts the buyer as a problem-solver who is rational and task-oriented (Batra&Ahtola., 1991). The product is purchased in a deliberant and efficient manner. The objective is more towards getting the job done in the shortest possible time. Babin et al. (1994) argued that the utilitarian shopping behavior is characterized by task related, product-oriented, rational, and extrinsic motivations. It is related to necessity, rather than for recreation, and is often described in terms commonly used to evaluate work performance such as (success or accomplishment). A purchase of a product or service is not necessarily needed for shopping to be utilitarian in value since a consumer might only go to the shop for the purpose of collecting information out of necessity.

In other words, the hedonic shopping behavior refers to recreational, pleasurable, intrinsic, and stimulation-oriented motivations (Nguyen et al., 2007). The purchase of the goods may be incidental to the experience of shopping. People buy so they can shop, NOT shop so they can buy (Langrehr., 1991). Hedonic shopping motivation would act on shoppers’ buying behavior in the grocery section of a superstore (selling primarily utilitarian products) differently than in a shopping mall (selling predominantly hedonic products) because utilitarian products that are the dominant items for sales in the grocery section of a superstore will not satisfy consumers’ hedonic shopping desires. (Yi-Cheon et al., 2013). It is possible consumers engage in shopping as a form of leisure-time enjoyment, and resulting in three overarching themes: shopping as hunting, shopping as scouting, and shopping as socializing (Backstrom., 2011).

Furthermore, a consumer may “enjoy” most product benefits by just observing or trying the product or service without purchasing it, thus shopping with or without purchase can provide hedonic
value to the consumer. Hedonic values might also account for impulse purchases and compulsive buyers (Yu & Bastin., 2010).

According to Rook (1987), the need to purchase than a need for a product is more important for these consumers. Excitement, a deep sense of enjoyment such as getting a good bargain during shopping excursion, and escapism, the thrill of bargaining and haggling, may accompany the adventure of a shopping trip that the shopping experiences is more significant than the mere acquisition of the products.

Consumers who perceive shopping as an enjoyable experience (i.e., a hedonic event) tend to have a more positive mood, and thus are more inclined to increase their intended and actual purchases (Gutierrez., 2004). Behavioral outcome such as satisfaction, word-of-mouth and re-patronage intention are influenced more by the hedonic aspects of shopping than the utilitarian aspects (Reynold & Arnold., 2006). That greater hedonic shopping motivation is significantly linked to increased consumer purchases (Yi-Cheon et al., 2013).

To sum up, consumer’s purchase intention may be influenced by based on both hedonic and utilitarian shopping motivations in most cases., but for some shoppers hedonic motivations may predominate while for others utilitarian needs would (Westbrook & Black., 1985). Therefore, it is proposed that shopping motivation will have a positive influence on purchase intention.

**H1 There is positive relationship between shopping motivation and purchase intention.**

**Loyalty Program**

Loyalty programs are structured marketing efforts which reward, and therefore encourage, loyal behavior. Loyalty programs comprise of integrated systems of marketing actions and communications that aim to increase loyalty, repeat buying, and switching costs by providing economical, hedonist, informational, functional, and sociological or relational rewards (Gwinner et al., 1998; Gable et al., 2008). Loyalty programs are set apart from other forms of promotions by their long-term nature and deliberate emphasis on preserving customer retention and intensifying purchase frequency. Loyalty programs have been shown to have a positive impact on not only retaining current customers, but also encouraging customers to make a higher share of their product category purchases from the sponsoring firm (Lewis., 2004).

Loyalty programs, as one of the most common customer loyalty schemes, ultimately enable firms to create a relationship that is based on interactivity and individualization accompanied by personalized direct marketing techniques and communication. On the other hand, loyalty programs are distinguished by being more direct in lifting average purchase frequency and purchase amount. They explicitly reward customers for combining their purchases within the same brand (Sharp & Sharp., 2007).

Dowling and Uncles (1997) have explored how rewards are linked to loyalty programs. They divide the impact of rewards to indirect and direct effects. Indirect effects induce loyalty mainly to the program, not the product itself or store in this case. Direct effects on the other hand support directly the value proposition, where the
product is the primary reward, not the incentive. Loyalty programs offer a range of rewards as they stimulate customers to react within purchases. Yet, reaction such as a purchase decision or repeat purchase occurs only if the customer perceived the utilities of a reward outweighs the costs associated (e.g. membership fees, switching costs, repeat purchase obligations) (Meyer-Waarden., 2008). The rewards could be in the forms of real cash, bonus points, vouchers and so on, but despite the various forms, customers are usually able to perform conversion of the rewards value into the equivalent cash value (Furinto., 2009).

Applied to loyalty program, intrinsic rewards motivate people to act to obtain a benefit that matches their individual purchase goals; extrinsic incentives motivate them to act to obtain a benefit separate from their purchase target. Heterogeneous intrinsic or extrinsic motivations probably depend on customers’ individual characteristics and purchase orientations, such that purchasers are not intrinsically motivated by the same rewards (Deci & Ryan., 2000).

The perceived benefits associated with loyalty program are diverse and relate to multiple consumer motivations and purchase orientations (Warden et al., 2012). Recent studies have shown that hedonic benefits evoke promotional emotions of cheerfulness and excitement, whereas utilitarian benefits evoke preventive emotions of confidence and security. Both emotions would eventually lead to post-consumption satisfaction, word of mouth referrals and repurchase intentions (Chitturi., 2008). Based on the literature review, is proposed that:

\[ H2 \text{ Loyalty program has a positive moderating effect in the relationship between shopping motivations to purchase intention} \]

**Corporate Image**

Corporate image is described as the overall impression made on the minds of the public about a firm (Kotler., 2000). Corporate image is the sum of the public’s beliefs, ideas, and impressions of an organization (Bos., 2007). Corporate image is shaped by a company’s actions as well as by factors that have a direct or indirect impact on public opinion, such as media, labor unions, social organizations, industrial associations, and other entities (Blishak., 2007). Corporate image helps consumers obtain a better understanding of the products offered by specific corporations and further mitigate their uncertainty while making buying decisions (Robertson & Gatignon., 1986).

Customers are also more willing to associate themselves with companies of high repute, as part of self-articulation and self enhancement. As such, the development of a favorable corporate reputation is important for relationship-oriented firms (Kieh & Xie., 2009). Perceived quality and prominence, which can enhance customers expectation of corporate capability in providing excellent products or services and integrity in fulfilling formal contracts or announced promise (Rindova., 2005). Loudon and Bitta (1988) believed that consumers are more inclined to buy products with a good corporate image to lower purchase risk. It is possible that corporate image has a positive effect on purchase intentions. Corporate professionalism and a good and trustworthy image can keep consumers, who in turn increase in numbers and sales due to word-of-mouth; more importantly, compared to other corporations, this can better help expand market share, enabling a corporation to remain successful (Huang et al., 2014).
For instance, green image of retail industry can influence hedonic and utilitarian shopping value (Jamaliah., 2012). This suggests that shopping value is important in the customer’s shopping experiences that were translated into excitement and fulfillment for the customers. For this reason, retailers have to provide the shopping environment that could enhance customers’ experiences. Yu and Bastin (2010) found that hedonic value of consumer shopping experience has an influence on impulse buying behavior. To summarize, it is proposed that there exists a relationship with shopping motivation, corporate image and purchase intention.

H3 Corporate image has a positive moderating effect in the relationship between shopping motivations to purchase intention.

Method Sample and Data Collection

Participant in this study were 110 undergraduate and 118 postgraduate student in National Central University and student in National Taiwan University of Technology. The non probability sampling method, it called convenience sampling were used to allow for obtaining sample quickly (Aaker., 2013). The questionnaire comprised questions related to the constructs needed for this study and demographic of the respondents. We use likert scale with 7-point rating scale that requires the respondent to indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement. (Hair., 2007)

To answer the research hypothesis, the analysis use hierarchical regression. For the hierarchical regression have four step, for the first step is to verify all control variables such that gender, age, birth, siblings, work experience and monthly expenses may be influence the purchase intention. Second step, we insert shopping motivation, loyalty program and corporate image, and the third step interaction term between shopping motivation and loyalty program, shopping motivation and corporate image, loyalty program and corporate image. The fourth step tried to use the three way interaction term (Aiken and West (1991) within three variables are shopping motivation, loyalty program and corporate image.

Respondent Characteristic

In the research consist of 228 respondents, which male 115 and female 112. Around 104 of the respondents are between 18 to 21 years. And also 104 respondents are between 22 to 25 years another respondent between 26 to 29 years are 12 respondent, the last respondents above 30 are 2 respondent. In this research also included birth order and siblings, for the first birth order we have 96 respondents, second birth order 84 respondents and above three 40 respondent. Number of siblings one we have 27 respondents, 119 respondents for two siblings, and number of siblings above 3 is around 70 respondents. All of the sample are student who have work experience are 171 respondents, with the work experience less than 1 years are 72 respondents, 1 to 3 years are 71 respondent. Above 3 years work experience are 24 respondents. Around 43 respondents didn’t have work experience. About shopping is closely connected with monthly expenses, so we included in the demographic variable. Monthly expenses (NT dollar) 5000 and below are about 73 respondents, 5001 – 10000 are 107 respondents, 10001 – 15000 are around 22 respondents, 15001 – 20000 it about 7 respondent, 20001 – 30000 are 11 and the last 30001 and above are 3.
Analysis and Discussion

The purpose of the study was to explore the relationship within shopping motivation on purchase intention in hypermarket format in Taiwan. Thereafter, we proposed that loyalty program and corporate image will be enhanced that such relationship. We put both variable as moderating variable between shopping motivation and corporate image. Table 1 below described the result for the descriptive statistic:

| Variable              | Cronbach Alpha | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Purchase Intention    | 0.72           | 4.4059| 0.89872        |
| Shopping Motivation   | 0.96           | 4.5186| 0.76489        |
| Loyalty Program       | 0.94           | 4.5942| 0.90676        |
| Corporate Image       | 0.96           | 4.5318| 0.72406        |

Table 2 show the summary result of hierarchical regression. For the first model, demographic variables such that as gender, age, birth order, number of siblings, work experience and monthly expenses were used as control variable. We use 5 % level of significant, all those six is not significant. The second model, concerned with two way interaction term within two moderating variable and all the result was not significant. The last model, fourth model, tried to use three way interaction terms. The interesting finding was the three interaction terms were statistically significant, with p value 0.003 and t value -3.058.

| Variables             | Model 1         | Model 2         | Model 3         | Model 4         |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| (Constant)            | β    | t    | p    | β    | t    | p    | β    | t    | p    | β    | t    | p    |
| Gender                | .003 | .973 | .357 | .044 | .630 | .530 | .014 | .125 | .213 | .023 | .704 | .457 |
| Age                   | -.095 | -.575 | .297 | -.094 | -.661 | .510 | -.104 | .190 | .923 | .097 | .756 | .457 |
| Birth                 | -.078 | -.886 | .378 | -.088 | -.904 | .349 | -.078 | .176 | .928 | .097 | .756 | .457 |
| Siblings              | .066 | .579 | .564 | .031 | .338 | .736 | .043 | .488 | .626 | .043 | .488 | .626 |
| Work Experience       | .281 | .290 | .290 | .023 | .256 | .799 | .043 | .488 | .626 | .043 | .488 | .626 |
| Monthly Expenses      | .185 | .183 | .071 | -.162 | -.181 | .073 | -.174 | .187 | .291 | .187 | .291 | .187 |
| Shopping Motivation   | .383 | .328 | .002 | .342 | .357 | .001 | .501 | .429 | .000 | .501 | .429 | .000 |
| Loyalty Program       | .280 | .269 | .009 | .290 | .254 | .012 | .412 | .353 | .001 | .412 | .353 | .001 |
| Corporate Image       | -.080 | -.625 | .533 | -.108 | -.837 | .404 | -.007 | .051 | .960 | -.007 | .051 | .960 |
| SM_LP                 | .106 | .896 | .373 | .169 | 1.463 | .146 | .146 | .146 |
| SM_CI                 | -.137 | -.116 | .248 | -.120 | -.106 | .291 | -.291 | -.291 |
| LP_CI                 | .190 | 1.495 | .138 | .125 | 1.006 | .317 | .317 | .317 |
| SM_LP_CI              | -.342 | -.305 | .003 | -.342 | -.305 | .003 | -.342 | -.305 |
| R²                    | .054 | .309 | .346 | .036 | .054 | .054 | .054 | .054 |
| F                     | 1.052 | 5.375 | 4.619 | 5.323 | 5.323 | 5.323 | 5.323 | 5.323 |
| ΔR²                   | .054 | .256 | .036 | .054 | .054 | .054 | .054 | .054 |
| ΔF                    | 1.052 | 13.320* | 1.934 | 9.353* | 9.353* | 9.353* | 9.353* | 9.353* |
To explore the effect of moderating variable, the two way interaction within predictor and moderating variable should be significant, if the model is not significantly different, it mean that not a moderator variable but simply an independent predictor variable (Sharma et al.,1981). Loyalty program is significant, but corporate image isn’t significant. The result shows that, there is not significantly different within two way interaction. Loyalty program is independently capable can influence purchase intention (independent predictor), but does not apply for corporate image. The conclusion is we reject H2 and H3, its means that loyalty program and corporate image couldn’t make strength the relationship within shopping motivation and purchase intention.

This finding of three way interaction can be considered to the future research, even though to overcome the three ways interaction not easier interpretation (Dawson., 2014). Because the researcher was can’t clearly identify the three variables who give the contribution which can make the results significant. However, not much study has been conducted to explore within shopping motivation, loyalty program and corporate image taken together may enhance purchase intention. The future research need to deeply explore the literature review among them. Table 3 below would be described the result of research:

### Shopping Motivation on Purchase Intention

While previous studies have identifies the existence of purchase intention, the purpose of this study was explore the relationship within shopping motivation on purchase intention in hypermarket format. Consumer’s today seems like to be more convenient and comfortable doing shopping in hypermarket, because they can shop at one place which can fulfill all their need. Generally, hypermarket was provides a lot of product such that daily needs, clothes, cosmetics, electronic etc.

We proposed that shopping motivation may be the internal factor can influences the consumer’s purchase intention. In this study trying to figure out if there is positive relationship within shopping motivation and purchase intention. The result has been found that there is significant relationship within shopping motivation and purchase intention. It means that shopping motivation can increase purchase intention. This finding was appropriate with Babin et al. (1994) argued that shopping motivations influence consumers’ purchasing behavior, it is assumed that shopping motivations affect consumers’ intention and behavior.

Consumption activities however may produce both hedonic and utilitarian outcomes during shopping. In most cases, shoppers make a purchase based on both

| Statement | Result |
|-----------|--------|
| H1 There is positive relationship between shopping motivation and purchase intention. | Accepted |
| H2 Loyalty program has a positive moderating effect in the relationship between shopping motivations to purchase intention | Rejected |
| H3 Corporate image has a positive moderating effect in the relationship between shopping motivations to purchase intention | Rejected |

**Table 3. Summary of Hypothesis**
hedonic and utilitarian motivations, but for some shoppers hedonic motivations may predominate while for others utilitarian needs would (Westbrook & Black., 1985). Hypermarkets with ever larger areas dedicated to a greater variety of products that can feed shoppers’ hedonic shopping desires (Weitz & Whitfield., 2010), while maintaining other areas stocked with grocery products in tight grid formats that are primarily orientated toward satisfying utilitarian needs (Sloot et al., 2005). Research undertaken by Farhangmehr et al. (2000) found that hypermarkets are preferred choice for customers who frequently purchased packaged goods, due to its low prices and convenient one-stop shopping.

The related study found that bringing happy value became the influence factors to consumers’ buying intentions. Dawson et al. (1990) proposed that bringing happiness value was a powerful factor to encourage consumers to purchase. Consumers who perceive shopping as an enjoyable experience (i.e., a hedonic event) tend to have a more positive mood, and thus are more inclined to increase their intended and actual purchases (Gutierrez., 2004). In contrast, utilitarian desires tend to be more task-oriented, or extrinsic motivation. A purchase of a product or service is not necessarily needed for shopping to be utilitarian. Basically, the attraction of utilitarian products in a hypermarket may be weaker than those of hedonic products.

Finally, this study provides that shopping motivation closely related to purchase intention. Purchase intention is the most important predictor of consumer purchase behavior. To increase purchase behavior, can take advantage of consumer motivation such that hedonic shopping motivation. Thus, investments in more space for rest areas, restaurants, and snack bars in a hypermarket that encourage social interactions among shoppers should eventually lead to greater idea to increase purchase intention.

Moderating Effect

In this study, we tried to give the moderating effect may be can strengthen the relationship for predictor variable to dependent variable. However, only a few researchers have taken the mediating role of loyalty program and corporate image into consideration when investigating shopping motivation and purchase intention. Interestingly, the result of the study can give the contribution to the future literature who want to deeply reviewing such that relationship between various variable.

Another important contribution of the current study is that we identified the moderating variable within shopping motivation may increase the relationship between them namely loyalty program and corporate image. In this research show that both loyalty program and corporate image is not moderating variable. Both variable can’t influence and make the relationship strength to purchase intention. Loyalty program can affect purchase intention independently (as predictor variable). This finding was similar with Lewis (2004) suggested that loyalty programs are an explicit attempt to enhance retention and to purchase more frequently. It is worth considering that a loyalty program may be effective on a number of repeat-purchase loyalty measures. According Sharp & Sharp (1997) loyalty program is designed to influence the consumer’s repeat-purchase pattern through offering rewards as a way to encourage, loyal behavior to the organization.
Loyalty programs are very familiar with kind of reward. Rewards and incentives can further encourage customers to try new products, pay premium prices, or increase multi-pack purchase. The rewards could be in the forms of real cash, bonus points, voucher and so on, but despite the various forms, customers are usually able to perform ‘conversion’ of the rewards value into the equivalent cash value (Furintoi., 2009). Loyalty programs offer a range of rewards as they stimulate customers to react within purchases. Yet, reaction such as a purchase decision or repeat purchase occurs only if the customer perceived the utilities of a reward outweighs the costs associated (Meyer-Waarden., 2008). How much a consumer can benefit from a loyalty program depend on investment in the relationship with the firm.

After customers have enrolled in a loyalty program, repeat purchase behavior should increase if the program provides an adequate level of utilities and lower costs. The ability of a program to drive repeat buying thus depends on its rewarding of repeat purchases, and the effects should be contingent on the kinds of gratifications offered. Loyalty programs specifically emphasize repeat purchase over time, thus, rarely benefit members on a single purchase.

The result was in contrast with corporate image in which the result is not significant. The prior research suggested that corporate image has a positive effect on purchase intentions. Corporate professionalism and a good and trustworthy image can keep consumers, who in turn increase in numbers and sales due to word-of-mouth; more importantly, compared to other corporations, this can better help expand market share, enabling a corporation to remain successful (Huang et al., 2014). Consumer will engaged with company has better reputation, because in their mind company with better reputation can provide providing excellent products or services, and integrity in fulfilling formal contracts or announced promise.

Managerial Implication

The proposed model shows that greater shopping motivation is significantly linked to increased consumer purchases. Given these findings, the use of many marketing stimuli in a hypermarket that satisfy shoppers’ with high shopping motivation can be beneficial in increasing retail sales. Specifically, retail managers are required to execute both internal and external marketing efforts. As for the internal effort that aims to stimulate shoppers’ primary shopping motivation, hypermarket may want to sell a wider variety of hedonic and utilitarian product products. Selling many hedonic products in a hypermarket would eventually enhance the sales of an array of utilitarian products by providing shoppers with the opportunity of exploring hedonic products on the same shopping trip. It can serve as a motivator for shoppers to visit that store over others.

The results of this study may help retail grocery managers improve their decisions about loyalty programs. It is not reasonable to assume that an improved customer relationship will automatically stimulate more demand and greater store loyalty, because most consumers buy only what they need and have good reasons to remain loyal to multiple stores.

Limitations of Research

We believe that the results from this study will provide many additional areas needing further investigation, of which we only mention a few. First, this research uses convenience sampling, which may imply that the result is not generalizable.
to the whole population. Future research using different respondents and settings is recommended. Second, our results are specific to hypermarket and probably cannot be generalized to other sectors. Further research in other areas should test how these and other factors influence program effectiveness, though such efforts might be difficult in industries that lack market wide scanner-panel data on competitive purchasing.

Third, we could not control the behavioral condition in our research designed, we measured the attitudinal dimension while ensuring that the behavioral condition was met in the sample selection process. Nevertheless, there might have been potential problems in the sample selection process.

Conclusion

Shopping motivation can significantly affect to purchase intention. Shopping motivation may be a key marketing strategy concept and differentiation because it addresses what consumers want and believe they get from purchasing products and/or services. Understanding consumer shopping motivations is a precondition for companies to survive in today’s competitive marketplace. Retailer can take advantage from consumer shopping motivation to create the new strategy to increase their buying intention that can make large sales.

Loyalty program is one of the perspective may influence consumer shopping motivation. But, in this study as moderating variable it can’t make the association within shopping motivation on purchase intention more strength. Thus, loyalty program can affect independently (as predictor variable) on purchase intention. This finding consistent with previous study, that loyalty program can influence buying intention. Although the effectiveness of loyalty programs depends on the program’s design that can attract and improve consumer shopping motivation. However, it is clearly possible to alter repeat-purchase patterns, at least to a small degree, and loyalty programs are probably the only marketing effort which deliberately focuses on bringing about such change.

Corporate image also not as moderating variable, because there is not significantly different. Corporate image can’t make strength and affect the relationship between shopping motivation and purchase intention. Whereas, prior study suggested that corporate image have impact on consumer who want to go shopping.
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