Shopping, hedonism and timestyle


Abstract
This paper studies the influence of hedonic gratifications in timestyle, as a mediator variable in “shopping”. Within the theoretical frame of the timestyle concept, we distinguish the cognitive structure – the meaning of time – and the operative structure – the use of time –. We include empirical evidence regarding the mediator role of the hedonic gratifications obtained by “shopping” in both structures. The results show that the interpretation of time favours certain gratifications, and so they stimulate the use of shopping time according to certain patterns. The study data are taken from a sample of 289 women aged between 30 and 50 who both work and live in a metropolitan area.
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1. Introduction

Shopping is an activity that includes the search for products and gratification or hedonic experiences (Babin et al., 1994; Arnold and Reynolds, 2003). Nevertheless, these reasons to buy are subject to certain resources, namely money, time, energy and effort.

While the impact of budgetary restrictions has been broadly studied in marketing, the interactions between shopping motivations, hedonic gratifications and time management is now starting to arouse (Legohérel et al., 2009; Rosen and Turano, 2008; Tilottama and Ratneshwar, 2009).

It seems logical to consider that in an urban society, with its chronic feeling of there never being enough time, that time should be managed as rationally as money is. Therefore, buyers should manage it in the same way they try to manage their money (Okada, 2005).

Just looking around us, or at ourselves, we can see that with a limited budget we are prepared to spend more on certain activities and products than on others. But more important than the amount spent on A or B, the main point is the way we manage our economic resources.

In spite of the fact that spending time is not the same as spending money (Somain, 2001), we can compare the management of both resources. Then we ask ourselves whether time resource management strategies brought about by the hedonic gratifications or rewards exist (Denton, 1994; Wagner, 2007; Gavilán and Blasco, 2008), and that leads us to the original question of this study: What role does the hedonic gratification of shopping play in the use of time?

Because of the broad nature of the question, we must set limits to the study in order to make it possible. As it is not just a motivational study, we only consider the motivations that make us buy something because of the gratification obtained from that action, and not that obtained from searching for a specific product. We consider hedonic motivations as the source of gratification in the “shopping” experience.

Buying is a broad and heterogeneous activity and therefore we just consider one of its aspects: shopping. We know that shopping is an increasingly prevalent leisure time activity both for men and women. Nevertheless it is still more common for women, so in this initial phase we are focusing
our study on the women segment, and in further phases we shall be extending it to the men’s segment.

Finally, we choose the *timestyle* concept to work with the time resource: that is the way of feeling and using time (Cotte et al., 2004) that considers different aspects of it.

Therefore, the objectives of this study are: (a) to examine what we consider may be an important explicative variable of individual differences: how women manage their time in accordance with their hedonic motivations and gratifications, (b) to identify the mediating role the hedonism may play in shopping, and (c) consequently to analyse the relations between the different dimensions of timestyle.

To do so, we propose a series of hypotheses about the relationship between the cognitive time dimensions –time orientation and time pressure–, and the operative time dimensions or the use of time –planning, efficiency and routine– mediated by the hedonic motivations. The data obtained in a homogeneous (from a sociodemographic point of view) sample of women provide us with a structural model for comparing such hypotheses. In the last section of our study we review the contribution and the academic and business implications of our study and propose future research lines.

2. **Time: timestyle**

When studying time we discover that it is not a unique concept. Time may be seen, among many other perspectives, as an objective resource –hours, minutes, seconds–, as rhythm, sequence, a factor of social coordination, or, among many other possible perspectives, as an aspect defining the relation between one person and his environment, depending on the assigned meaning.

The interest in time in social sciences takes us back to the economic theory of time (Becker, 1965) and to the research of Robinson (1977) into the propositive nature of time allocation. Many studies have tried to link time with shopping, considering this merely as a time consuming activity. From this point of view the objective character of time, “clock time”, is emphasised. However, the functional approach has been superseded by the phe-
nomenological, in which the focus is turned on every individual’s time (Zakay and Hornik, 1992), the time that is felt as intensely as cold or heat.

There are many references analysing specific aspects of the time experience (Davies, 1997), routine (Jacobsen and Kooreman, 2005), or the polimonochronic use of time (Lindquist and Kaufman-Scarborough, 2007). Nowadays, this time experience is approached from a broader perspective that has its origins in the timestyle concept.

The word timestyle was coined by Feldman and Hornik (1981). These authors define it as an ingredient of the way of life, expressing personal priorities about how to use time.

Timestyle has been studied by Cotte et al. (2001, 2003, 2006) and Usunier and Valette-Florence (2007). Cotte et al. (2001, 2003) define it as a combination of the four aspects of time: social orientation – “time for myself” vs. “time with/for others”–, temporal orientation –more importance given to one of the temporal spaces: past, present or future (Fraisse, 1964)–, planning and poli/monochronicity –preference for doing tasks one by one instead of simultaneously–. On the other hand, Usunier and Valette-Florence (2007) mix the economic and the linear orientation of time –the planned use of time–, temporal orientation, time submission –anxiety and adapting to timetables– and time persistence –mediate or immediate rewards.

It is a multidimensional concept including different aspects of time. Timestyle provides a comprehensive and global point of view of the relation between time and consumer, a relation studied one-dimensionally to date.

Cotte et al. (2004) state that: “timestyles are the personal way of perceiving and using time”. As perceiving and using is not the same thing, we may believe in two levels of timestyle: a cognitive structure –to perceive– and an operative structure –to use.

Bergadaà (1990) described the cognitive structure of time as a combination of personal and cultural time. Personal time is about the degree to which we are conscious of the advance of time, and is responsible for time pressure. In medicine, Friedman and Rosenman (1974), cardiologists, stated the time urgency syndrome diagnosis, also known as hurry disease,
which establishes two different categories of people: Type A –very aware of time and highly pressured by its advance–, and Type B –only slightly aware of time and lightly pressured–. These terms are not used in marketing, but the concept is well known: time pressure (Davies, 1997).

Cultural time leads us to the relation between individuals and their environment, where we may place the temporal orientation concept (Zimbardo and Boyd, 1999). This concept describes the particular moment of advancing time (past, present or future) perceived most intensively by the individual. It is an important factor for understanding the way of acting in different activities that need the use of time, but we have few references about its relation with shopping (Chetthamroinchai and Davies, 2000).

The structure or operative level of the use of time does not appear in the literature described as such, although authors such as Denton (1994) in a research on time-use strategies to enhance the subject’s satisfaction with its timestyle, identifies among others: planning, routine or efficiency. Planning means the tendency to organize activities in advance. Cotte et al. (2004) describe it as a continuous period between the orderly adjudication of discrete units of time to every task, to the lack of order and categories that turns the use of time into something spontaneous and improvised.

Routine means the stable and lasting repetition of behavioural patterns, due to habit, comfort or simplification. Although the term routine is not often used in marketing, its concept is the basis of gaining customer loyalty. Nevertheless, when we talk about time routine patterns there is something differential that we must explain. It is not being loyal to a specific business establishment, but to a selection of them for each one of the product categories, or even to the habit of going to the same retail environment (Jacobsen and Koo reman, 2005).

To finish, the search for efficiency described by Calabresi and Cohen (1968), leads us to the interest of optimizing the use of time. A very reasonable aspect in the management of a scarce resource.

This means that our timestyle structure will be as shown in Figure 1.
3. Hedonic motivations in shopping

It has been a long time since shopping became a way of spending leisure time for many consumers (Tauber, 1972; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982), understanding leisure as the time devoted to a pleasurable activity for the individual, not as mere spare time. The shopping experience includes exploring shops, going window shopping, looking for products and services and acquiring them and goes beyond the product to become a source of gratification in itself, meaning pleasure and entertainment for the consumer. It’s not strange to hear “I like buying” or “shopping is fun”, when people are not even talking about any specific product but about the activity itself, namely visiting and spending time in shops (and perceiving this to be a pleasant activity) (Schmitt, 2006). Nowadays what we consume is not only the products that we buy, but the experience that gives us pleasurable emotions (Schmitt, 2006; Pine and Gilmore, 1998; Lenderman and Sánchez, 2008).

Babin et al., (1994), Arnold and Reynolds (2003), and others, described the sources of this pleasure. Fun and entertainment provided by the experience, acting as an engine of the shopping experience and giving satisfaction or gratification to it.
Shopping is also a way to escape from personal circumstances and minor everyday problems, and this is an incentive to dedicate time to do it as a leisure or evasion activity.

The adventure of exploring shops and products gives a pleasure not necessary related with the amount spent, but with acquiring information about the latest in fashion and trends and is related to individuals involvement with shopping (Pérez Cabañero, 2006).

In this study we measure pleasure according to a general system for measuring hedonic motivations that does not specify each one of its dimensions, thereby enabling us to maximise the calmness of the model.

Consumer type studies, based on motivations, establish an interval. The ends of this interval are: Recreational consumer, enthusiast (Arnold and Reynolds 2003), or hedonist (Baker and Haytko, 2000), who enjoys the shopping experience. At the opposite end there is the pragmatic consumer looking for the useful or functional side of shopping (Bellenger and Korgaonkar, 1980; Babin et al, 1994), who considers the experience as unrewarding.

The former consider shopping as a priority when deciding their leisure time, and they consider it as something pleasant. On the other hand, the latter see shopping as a chore and will try to spend as little time as possible on it.

4. Hypotheses

4.1. Relation between the cognitive structure of time and hedonic gratifications

We hypothesize that certain ways of temporal orientation and time pressure predispose the customer to obtain highest levels of hedonic gratifications while shopping.

Of the three temporal orientations, that which focuses on the present is centred in the immediate present, –Carpe Diem of the Renaissance, that is: grasp the moment–Those individuals oriented to the present, feel themselves stimulated by the search of immediate hedonic gratifications. They appreciate the incentives that make consumption experiences different
from each other, more than the incentives with long term rewards (Hendler and La'Tour, 2009). Moreover, the orientation to the present favours the understanding of shopping as an experience itself (Chetthamrongchai and Davies, 2000).

In other words, present orientation could be considered as a precedent of the hedonic gratifications which predispose the consumer to evaluate the excitement provided by the experience, the comfort in the shop and the interaction with the goods and personnel (Wagner, 2007).

**H1a: Individuals with a present temporal orientation will obtain highest hedonic gratifications from the shopping experience than those with a future temporal orientation.**

Time pressure is a key aspect of time management. It is true that the idea of scarcity is always subjective, because we don’t know how much time we have left, but obviously people experience scarcity when they feel a surplus between what they want to do and the time they have to do it.

The growth of time scarcity feeling can be explained through the analysis of cultural circumstances in our societies. The flexibility of hours and the apparent speed that the new technologies provide us with increases our expectations to undertake more and more tasks with greater demands on the quality of their outcomes, resulting in time pressure (Shaw, 1998).

Based on these facts we posit that those individuals with high time pressure will perceive little hedonic gratification when shopping, because they feel that this activity competes with many others from a long list.

Please note that we are not talking about having time but about the feeling of having time, and that is why those who feel that they have time may get hedonic gratification and be attracted by shopping.

We suggest the following hypothesis relating time pressure and hedonic motivations:

**H1b: Individuals with low levels of time pressure will obtain highest hedonic gratifications from the shopping experience than those with high levels of time pressure.**
4.2. The relation between hedonic motivations and time operative structure

We hypothesize that hedonic gratifications obtained from shopping influence the way people use time. As noted by Denton (1994), when a person is dissatisfied with its consumption decisions, he develops tactics to restore the desired satisfaction level. Therefore, there is a relationship between the operative structure of time and the gratifications obtained from shopping.

Also the investigations that study hedonism vs. utilitarianism corroborate the relationship between time and hedonism. Consumers are more willing to devote time to the hedonistic activities and money to utilitarian activities (Okada, 2005).

It’s not very likely that those people who get hedonic motivations when shopping, and perceive it as a kind of leisure, will need to do any planning (Cotte et al., 2006). Shopping is a pleasant activity, difficult to forget. Therefore they do not need to put it in their diaries in the same way that they do not plan when to read, take a walk or dedicate their time to any other leisure activity. For them, the efficiency as a main objective has no sense because their ultimate objective is to obtain the satisfaction provided by the experience.

Finally, for these people the routine, defined as the repetition of a pattern of use of time in order to simplify decision-making and shorten the processes, is not attractive. Precisely the exploration of new shops and the element of surprise associated with the unknown adds interest to the experience (Schmitt, 2006).

By contrast, when motivations are exclusively utilitarian: search of convenience, product value, product quality, or the mere satisfaction of needs (Wagner, 2009), the person becomes more prone to maximize utility, and therefore he plans the moment with different priorities, and allocates certain amount of time to each task – tries to be efficient and repeats what in the past has shown to be a good option, to avoid risk and the time spent in decision making (Rosen and Tourano, 2008).

Under these premises, we present the following hypotheses:
H2: Hedonic shopping motivations are negatively related to (a) the planning of the shopping activity, (b) the search of efficiency in the use of time and (c) the adoption of routine patterns.

5. Method: Sample, questionnaire, and measures
The survey respondents were 289 women living in the metropolitan areas of Spain’s two biggest cities: Madrid and Barcelona. Data were collected in October 2008 and respondents were asked to fill out a personal questionnaire containing 17 items on a 5-point agree-disagree Likert scale structured in three differentiated sections. Section 1 of the questionnaire assessed timestyle items. Section 2 contained measures for the hedonic motivations. Demographics were collected in section 3. (see Table 1). Respondents were asked to think about general shopping in stores and/or shopping centres, excluding grocery shopping, with the difference between both activities being emphasised.
The questionnaire is coherently structured, with the first questions being about time related to shopping. These are followed by questions related with hedonic shopping motivations in order to avoid biases due to the influence that the questions about motivations cold exert upon those concerning use of time.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations and loading estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>LOADING ESTIMATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hedonic Motivations</strong> (adapted from Babin et al., 1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 I enjoy shopping</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Shopping is exciting</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Shopping is a real pleasure</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Shopping is stimulating</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET1 When I go shopping I try to make the most of my time</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET2 When I go shopping, I like to use my time efficiently</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Orientation</strong> (adapted from Usunier and Valette Florence (2007))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT1 When I go shopping, I often do not have a clear idea of what I am going to buy *</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT2 Usually, I use or enjoy whatever I buy as soon as I have bought it *</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT3 When I go shopping I try to think of the future and anticipate my needs</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong> (adapted from Cotte et al. (2006))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP1 I make a list of what I need before I go shopping</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP2 I usually plan the order in which I intend to buy each article</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Pressure</strong> (adapted from Rastegary, Thayer y Colvin, 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT1 When I go shopping I am always in a rush *</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT2 I walk slowly when I go shopping</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 I always buy in the same shops</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 I easily get used to going to the same shops</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 I always do the shopping in the same place</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 Usually, I go shopping to the same shops</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse ordered items.
Whenever possible, existing literature was used as the source of the measurements. These items, together with others developed specifically for this study, were pretested with respondents using a preliminary version of the questionnaire.

A number of previous marketing studies were used to measure the temporal dimensions: time orientation was measured using a three-item scale adapted from Usunier and Valette Florence (2007) to the field of shopping; time pressure was measured using a two-item scale based on Landy, Rastegary, Thayer and Colvin (1991), also adapted to a shopping situation. Planning was measured by way of a two-item scale adapted from Cotte et al. (2006). Two and four items respectively were developed to measure efficiency and routine. Hedonic shopping motivations were measured using a five-item scale adapted from Babin et al. (1994).

6. Results

Data analyses were conducted in two phases. First, the factor structure, reliability and validity of all latent constructs in the model were assessed. Subsequently, the parameters of the structural model shown in Figure 2 were estimated.

6.1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Reliability, and Validity

The measurement model with all 6 factors and 17 indicators was subjected to confirmatory factor analysis. Inspection of the model revealed a respectable fit. $\chi^2$: (103) = 120.2;  $p = 0.12$; Comparative Fit Index (CFI): 0.993; Goodness of Fit Index (GFI): 0.949; Normed Fit Index (NFI): 0.953; Tucker Lewis Index (TLI): 0.991; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA): 0.026.

The reliability measures can be assessed from the measurement model by the composite reliability estimates, exceeding the recommended 0.70 threshold for all different constructs, extracted variance estimates exceeding the recommended 0.50 threshold, and coefficient alpha estimates ranging from 0.736 and 0.896 (Nunnally, 1978; Fornell and Lacker, 1981). Therefore, we have evidence of construct reliability. The results obtained are given in Table 2.
Convergent validity can be assessed from the measurement model by determining each indicator’s estimated maximum likelihood (λ). Loading on the underlying construct is high, and significant (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988; Levy and Varela, 2006). In our study all factor loadings exceed 0.60 and were highly significant (p< 0.001).

Discriminant validity relates to low correlations between latent variables, under 0.50 (Lévy and Varela, 2006). Results indicate that all inter-factor correlations range from -0.30 to 0.47. Also discrimination between constructs is evident since the extracted variance estimates of all latent dimensions, ranging from 0.60 to 0.78, exceed all squared phi correlations, ranging from 0.048 to 0.496 among constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

### Table 2. Reliability, extracted variance, and coefficient alpha of the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Extracted variance</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Orientation</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Pressure</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Factor</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Inter-factor correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Orientation</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Pressure</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Factor</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>-0.401</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>-0.474</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The diagonal entries are the extracted variance estimates.

6.2. Structural Model and Hypothesis Tests
Since the measurement model was found to be satisfactory, the hypothesised structural model proposed in Figure 2 was then estimated.

The structural model also reveals a respectable fit: $\chi^2: (112) = 152.07, p = 0.007$; Comparative Fit Index (CFI): 0.983; Goodness of Fit Index (GFI): 0.938; Normed Fit Index (NFI): 0.940; Tucker Lewis Index (TLI): 0.980; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA): 0.037.

Additionally, the modification indices indicate that the model fit would improve if a new path, not considered at the beginning of the study, was added. Time pressure exerts a positive influence in the efficient use of time. Those women with high levels of time pressure tend to be more efficient in their use of time when they go shopping. The respecified model achieves the following fit measurements:

$\chi^2: (111) = 136.76, p = 0.049$; Comparative Fit Index (CFI): 0.989; Goodness of Fit Index (GFI): 0.943; Normed Fit Index (NFI): 0.946; Tucker Lewis Index (TLI): 0.987; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA): 0.030.

The standardized path coefficients, critical ratios and p-values are shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>C.R</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Orientation</td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Hedonic Motivations</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-2.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Pressure</td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Hedonic Motivations</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>2.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Motivations</td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Planning</td>
<td>-0.404</td>
<td>-5.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Motivations</td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Efficiency</td>
<td>-0.411</td>
<td>-6.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Motivations</td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Routine</td>
<td>-0.417</td>
<td>-6.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Pressure</td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ Efficiency</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
<td>-3.386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Structural Model: Standardized Path Coefficients
Results confirm that there is a negative and significant relationship between future temporal orientation and the obtaining of hedonic shopping gratification (H1a; p < 0.01). Therefore, we can state that women with a future temporal orientation obtain less hedonic gratification while shopping than those with a present temporal orientation.

Results also show a positive and significant relationship between low levels of time pressure and the obtaining of high levels of hedonic gratification. (H1b; p = 0.01). Those women with low time pressure will obtain more hedonic gratification while shopping than those who are really pressured by time. H1a and H1b are therefore supported.

Regarding the effects between hedonic gratification and the use of time, we found that there is a negative and significant relationship between the obtaining of hedonic gratification and time planning (H2a; p < 0.01), efficiency in time use (H2b; p < 0.01), and routine in the use of time (H2c; p < 0.01).

Given these results we could state that those women who obtain more hedonic gratification tend to plan the time they devote to shopping less thoroughly, tend to be less efficient in their use of time and use it in a less routine way. Therefore, H2a, H2b and H2c are supported.

7. Conclusions: contribution, limitations, directions for future research and implications for retailers

The interest of this study lies in two different aspects, the first of which is the study of timestyle in the specific situation of shopping. This point is quite unusual in marketing research if we bear in mind that most of the research into timestyle deals with time as a side of personality, therefore assuming that it is a stable personal characteristic present in all aspects of life. Without entering into considerations about whether this is true or not, we simply analyse timestyle in shopping. This fact has led us to implement the construct by adopting a structure consistent with existing approaches (Usunier and Valette-Florence, 2007; Cotte, et. al 2001, 2003).

Secondly, we believe that it is interesting to note that the experience and management of this resource is mediated by the hedonic gratification
obtained by consumers. In other words, the way people experience time makes it easier to obtain a certain gratification and this fact leads to different time usage patterns when shopping. The results support the existence of an intrinsic pleasure in the activity of shopping (Schmitt, 2006; Pine and Gilmore, 1998; Lenderman and Sánchez, 2008), the importance of which is highlighted. It is not only the fact that for some women shopping is rewarding, but also that the greater the satisfaction they receive, the less efficiently and thoroughly they plan their time. They find pleasure in what they are doing and do not try to maximize another objective other than entertainment. They do not need to employ time saving patterns or routines.

It is also noted that the results are consistent with the more frequent typologies found in the literature: the recreational buyer (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003) or hedonic buyer (Haytko and Baker, 2000) and the pragmatic, utilitarian or functional buyer (Bellenger and Korgaonkar 1980; Babin et al., 1994), thereby adding a new dimension to its description as subjects living the shopping experience in a peculiar manner.

The academic research stresses the importance of understanding the role of individual differences in consumer behaviour. In this regard, we find that the idea of maximization that Schwart (2002) proposes, is intuitively very attractive. A maximizer is a rational, well organized, good planner, and efficient person who, as a result of its ambitions to maximize, is victim of a high time pressure and their profile is opposed to that of the satisfied who has to settle for good options, although not the best, to devote to enjoyment. Our results confirm the existence of both profiles with characteristics that fully coincide with those already described.

Some of the relationships had been anticipated in early studies. Chet-thamrongchai and Davies (2000) carried out a typology of buyers of grocery shops, in which the hedonic cluster was comprised of individuals with a clear present orientation.

There are authors such as Hendler and LaTour (2009) who call the present-oriented, present-hedonist emphasizing the clear hedonistic nature of these people focused on the today, here and now.
In this line, Pascual Soler et al. (2008) found that the image of supermarkets delivered as holistic view was a matter of preference in the choice of establishment.

However, in the relationship between hedonic gratification and planning, our approach contradicts the results of Cotte et al., (2006). In their more recent work they suggest the opposite idea, namely that there is a negative relationship between time planning style and the hedonic gratification sought. From our point of view, hedonic gratification leads to a less time planned style due to the influence the former exerts on the latter as a motivator variable. The opposite would imply accepting that consumers plan their shopping activity in order to obtain greater gratification, with timestyle planning becoming the motivational variable.

There are, however, several limitations to this work. Some are common in academic research, such as the sample size. Others are due to the need to narrow the research down, such as the fact of studying only women in the context of shopping, which reduces the scope of our conclusions.

Both issues motivate us to continue this line of research in order to try to obtain more representative conclusions that ultimately will allow us to specify the role of hedonic gratification from the experience of shopping in time management.

Other possible original direction for further research could take up again the proposal made by Hornik (2008) and analyze the influence of circadian rhythm in the hedonic shopping motivations – is it just as pleasant to go shopping in the morning, at midday or in the afternoon?, at what time are the hedonic gratifications higher and what type of cognitive activities are associated? –, All this on the assumption that this pace produces changes in visual, logic and space cognitive efficiency.

The implications of these results are also interesting for retailers with respect to a specific aspect: the power of the experience factor in-store. The physical environment such as atmosphere or product display, etc. and the relational aspects such as the possibility of interacting with others are also sources of experiences (Wagner, 2009).

Transforming the fact of buying into an experience is a way to increase gratification, and through it retailers can access customers less concerned
about time management. It is true that these experience seeker customers are reluctant routine planners and show little loyalty when it comes to choosing the places where they will buy due to their interest to explore. It is precisely for this reason that stores are obliged to change their offering and to surprise their customers with each new visit.

The power of the experience is such that it is not only transforming the marketing of retail outlets, but also the communication and the role of the customer. Today, more than before and more than ever the customer wants to take part, wants to be the main character. He does not want to see advertisements, but is ready to spend two hours in a shop either reading a book or drinking a coffee.

But as the client who seeks and obtains hedonic gratification from shopping coexists with those for whom shopping has a less stimulating meaning, stores can not abandon the more traditional aspects of management such as category management, good signage, or the possibility of quick checkouts in order to satisfy buyers who plan more efficiently and are potentially more loyal.

There are also new challenges in the short term that retailers should take into account bearing in mind the diversity of their consumers. We are referring here to the dynamic pricing strategies (Bansal and Manglaras, 2009) and the expansion of business hours. For the maximizer or utilitarian type of client, dynamic pricing strategies can be an important factor to be considered when planning their purchases if they wish to achieve the objective of buying adequately.

But it is likely that the shops combine extended business hours policy with high prices, at least in those moments of the day or week when the competition is weaker. In this way we could anticipate that the future outlook for this type of women will be more complicated.

Finally, this paper notes, with the described limitations, our original hypothesis, namely that time management, as well as money management, is influenced by the meaning of time for each of us and by the gratification we get when these are attached to a specific activity.
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