ESCP EUROPE

University *of* Glasgow | Adam Smith Business School

ELSEVIER

Studying motivations of store-loyal buyers across alternative measures of behavioural loyalty

Mercedes Martos-Partal *, **Óscar González-Benito**

Universidad de Salamanca, Dpto. de Administración y Economía de la Empresa, Campus Miguel de Unamuno, 37007 Salamanca, Spain

Summary This study establishes a theoretical framework and provides empirical evidence related to the motivations and benefits sought by store-loyal customers. From a theoretical perspective, the proposed framework distinguishes utilitarian benefits, such as monetary and time savings, from hedonic benefits, such as shopping enjoyment, innovativeness and impulsiveness. From a methodological perspective, this study suggests the appeal of considering different measures of store-loyal behaviour, particularly those based on consumers' self-assessments, as alternatives to measures based on solely on their budget allocations. The empirical findings indicate moderate consistency between these measures; self-assessment measures are more closely related to consumers' motivational profiles. They also indicate the greater explanatory power of motivational variables compared with socio-demographic variables for characterising store-loyal buyers. Finally, store-loyal buyers' general profile is less price sensitive, more time and service sensitive, less concerned about entertainment and new experiences, more likely to feature planning and more brand loyal.

Introduction

Customer loyalty remains a topic of great interest for firms (Kotler & Keller, 2009; Reichheld, 1996), as well as a core element of relationship marketing (Berry, 1995). Relationship marketing emphasises the business benefits of increasing consumption among existing customers and preventing their loss, rather than working to attract new customers. Creating and maintaining customer loyalty thus constitute strategic requirements for modern business, particularly in

the retail industry. Retailers offer various loyalty programs, including customer cards, discount coupons, special offers and promotions, with the main objective of retaining loyal customers and persuading less loyal consumers to spend more in their stores (Bustos-Reyes & González-Benito, 2006). A loyal customer base in turn exhibits several traits that are beneficial for retailers, including reduced sensitivity to other price and market offers and reduced proneness to seek other alternatives or switch stores (East, Hammond, Harris, & Lomax, 2000; East, Harris, Willson, & Lomax, 1995; Knox & Denison, 2000), increased spending and related sales (Knox & Denison, 2000) and significant communication potential through word of mouth (Bloemer, de Ruyter, & Wetzels, 1999; Gounaris & Stathakopoulos,

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +34 923 294 500x3124; fax: +34 923 294 715.
  E-mail address: mmartos@usal.es (M. Martos-Partal).

2004). Such advantages translate into higher retailer profitability (Chaudhuri & Ligas, 2009; East et al., 1995, 2000; Knox & Denison, 2000).

But not all efforts devoted to increasing customer loyalty produce the expected results. Several studies indicate a clear customer tendency to disperse purchases across stores, especially for frequently purchased products such as food and household items (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004; Baltas, Argouslidis, & Skarmeas, 2010; Flavián, Martínez, & Polo, 2001; Gónzalez-Benito, Muñoz-Gallego, & Kopalle, 2005; Knox & Denison, 2000; Rhee & Bell, 2002). In short, consumers' store choice is notably polygamous. The disappointing performance of loyalty programs might imply insufficient segmentation, because to increase loyalty, especially among their best customers, retail managers likely need to apply selective strategies to the customers with the greatest loyalty potential (Knox & Denison, 2000). Such a selective strategy is feasible only if potentially loyal customers share some common characteristics that make them identifiable and accessible (Baltas et al., 2010). Profiling (potentially) store-loyal customers is a high priority for managers.

In response to this priority, we establish a theoretical framework and provide empirical evidence related to the profiling of store loyal customers. Both sides of the store loyalty equation are approached. On the one side, we focus on motivations of and benefits sought by store-loyal customers as determinants of store loyalty. They are classified into hedonic and utilitarian benefits. If we can identify motivations underlying their store-loyal behaviour, retailers might be able to apply more focused strategies, designed specifically to enhance the loyalty of target consumers. On the other side, we focus on alternatives measurements of behavioural loyalty derived from budget allocation patterns and consumers' self-assessment.

Our contribution is twofold, namely, theoretical and methodological. From a theoretical view, we focus on motivations and benefits sought in shopping and propose a framework that distinguishes utilitarian benefits, such as monetary and time savings or quality searches, from hedonic benefits, such as shopping enjoyment, innovativeness and impulsiveness (versus planning). Most previous studies of store loyalty focus on socio-demographic variables, which seem insufficient to identify loyal customers accurately (East et al., 2000; Mägi, 2003). Less evidence is available regarding whether purchase motivations might help explain store loyalty, despite some suggestions and empirical evidence that such variables have more potential than socio-demographic variables (Konus, Verhoef, & Neslin, 2008; Mägi, 2003). Segmentation by benefits sought offers a deeper sense of the motivational reasons and causal factors underlying consumption and therefore can help determine shopping behaviour more accurately than descriptive factors (Haley, 1995). Moreover, the few studies that relate motivations to store loyalty lack an overriding theoretical framework for integrating shopping motivations. Instead, they tend to study specific motivations (e.g., East et al., 2000; McGoldrick & Andre, 1997), mainly as covariates to be controlled to isolate the effect of other determinants of store loyalty (Ailawadi, Pauwels, & Steenkamp, 2008). Only Mägi (2003) considers the relationship between shopping motivations and store loyalty, by analysing the effect of economic, apathetic and personalising shopping motivations. However, she also concludes that the consideration of other consumer characteristics and motivations might provide greater insight into the motivational drivers of loyal behaviour. In summary, the scarce attention and empirical evidence contained in previous literature strongly indicates the need to provide a more complete, comprehensive framework to analyse the motivational profile of store loyalty.

From a methodological perspective, we highlight the appeal of measures of store-loyal behaviour based on consumers' self-assessment as alternatives to measures based on budget allocation. Most previous research determines behavioural loyalty on the basis of allocations of budgets or visits across available stores, using objective data from consumer panels (e.g., Ailawadi et al., 2008; Gónzalez-Benito & Martos-Partal, 2012; Kau & Ehrenberg, 1984; Martos-Partal & Gónzalez-Benito, 2011; Mägi, 2003) or subjective estimations from consumers (Baltas et al., 2010; Bustos-Reyes & González-Benito, 2006, 2008; East et al., 2000; Flavián et al., 2001; McGoldrick & Andre, 1997). However, such an approach might obviate some loyalty behavioural patterns by failing to distinguish different shopping situations or specific product categories. For example, a consumer who always purchases dairy products in one store and vegetables in other could seem disloyal from an aggregated viewpoint, because his or her shopping budget is spread across multiple stores. In this case, the consumer's subjective self-assessment of his or her behaviour would provide a more reliable measure of behavioural loyalty and therefore enhance the profile of store-loyal consumers.

In the next section, we present our conceptual framework and review previous research to offer some theoretical support for our proposed hypotheses. After we describe the methodology for our empirical analysis, we present and discuss the findings. Finally, we outline our main conclusions and some implications for marketers.

Conceptual framework

Store loyalty

Dick and Basu (1994) point out that a behavioural approach to loyalty definitions and measures constitutes only a partial assessment of true loyalty. However, it is common in academic literature (Ailawadi et al., 2008; Bustos-Reyes & González-Benito, 2008; East et al., 1995; Knox, 1998; Knox & Denison, 2000). Because it is based on behaviour, it relates to market responses, sales and, ultimately, the retailer's profitability. Even though it is not possible to discern if behavioural loyalty derives from a solid affective link or simply stems from greater convenience or accessibility, retailers aim to foster attitudinal and affective links with customers to the extent that it leads to desirable behaviours that contribute to their profit in the long run. Therefore, a behavioural perspective is the most interesting method for retailers (East et al., 2000) and the one considered in this study.

There are three main approaches to measuring behavioural loyalty (Knox & Denison, 2000): (1) repeat purchases according to the number of store visits, (2) switching frequency, or the degree of successive visits to a store and

the degree of successive switches and (3) the relative budget allocation to the store as the proportion of all expenditures assigned to that main store. The rationale is that loyalty relates to the concentration of visits or expenditures at a specific retailer. However, in practice, most measures aggregate different shopping situations and product categories, which might imply an important bias. For example, if we calculate the share of wallet allocated to a supermarket by aggregating across grocery products, we might miss loyal behavioural patterns for specific product categories or shopping situations. In other words, apparently disloyal behaviour might actually be loyal behaviour, in a more disaggregated analysis. Therefore, we propose that alternative measures based on consumers' self-assessments should be considered as means to overcome this limitation.

Characterisation of store loyalty

Efforts to characterise store loyalty according to sociodemographic data usually employ variables such as income, education, household size and the presence of children in the household. However, empirical evidence indicates that these variables have scarce explanatory power for identifying loyal buyers (East et al., 2000; Mägi, 2003). Despite the well-cited importance of characterisations based on benefits sought–because the real reason for consumption is to obtain the benefits the product offers (Haley, 1995) few empirical generalizations detail the benefits sought by store-loyal buyers. The few findings available are not conclusive. We therefore attempt to delve into consumers' motivations and benefits sought from shopping to develop a more informed profile of store-loyal buyers. Specifically, we distinguish utilitarian from hedonic benefits.

Utilitarian benefits

Utilitarian benefits are primarily instrumental, functional and cognitive. They offer value to the consumer as a means to an end (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). Purchase benefits are utilitarian if they lead to greater utility maximisation, efficiency or economy in consumer purchases (Chandon, Wansink, & Laurent, 2000). Searching for monetary or time savings and for quality constitute utilitarian benefits, because the related outcomes help consumers improve their utility and efficiency (Ailawadi, Neslin, & Gedenk, 2001).

Monetary savings often represent a key purchase motivation, especially for price- and promotion-sensitive consumers. Store loyalty might diminish monetary savings though, because customers must waive the advantages of offers and promotions provided by different retailers; therefore, we expect a negative relationship between store loyalty and monetary savings. Price-focused consumers who perceive significant benefits from comparing prices across brands and stores likely spread their purchases among various stores to obtain the benefits of the best deals. We also expect a negative relationship between price sensitivity and store loyalty; previous empirical evidence supports this effect (Ailawadi et al., 2008; Kim, Srinivasan, & Wilcox, 1999; Laaksonen, 1993; McGoldrick & Andre, 1997; Mägi, 2003). Finally, Kau and Ehrenberg (1984) show that store loyalty tends to decline as a result of frequent price promotions by retailers. Price promotions induce store switching (Ailawadi & Keller, 2004), for two likely reasons. First, promotions of a frequently purchased, high-priced product should lead consumers to make comparisons among stores and find the best price. Second, the promotional mix of items that a store offers, in relation to that offered by other stores, should encourage store substitution (Kumar & Leone, 1988). Previous studies offer empirical evidence of an impact of promotions on store switching (Kumar & Leone, 1988; Walters, 1991), though promotion sensitivity has not been analysed.

In addition to monetary savings, time savings are relevant. The time available to a household represents a limited resource that must be allocated across multiple activities, including work, leisure, family, shopping and so forth. Consumers thus assess the opportunity costs of their precious time when attempting to maximise behavioural utility (Baltas et al., 2010). Consumers who suffer higher time pressures are more likely to consider time a scarce resource and plan their usage of it carefully (Kleijnen, De Ruyter, & Wetzels, 2007). Therefore, we consider time pressure a benefit sought, in the sense that consumers are motivated to save time. When they face time pressures, consumers benefit more from quicker service, fast access, quick payment and so forth. Their switching costs also are higher, which should make them more store loyal. Although some studies find no significant relationship between the two concepts (East et al., 2000; Sloot, Verhoef, & Franses, 2005), others validate the positive relationship (Flavián et al., 2001). Because previous literature is not conclusive and uses proxy variables to measure time pressure (East et al., 2000; Flavián et al., 2001), we attempt to offer new, clarifying evidence.

Finally, the search for service quality is decisive for store choice. Quality perceptions go beyond the quality of particular products to entail assortment quality and the services joined to a retailer's offer. Greater service quality sensitivity increases consumers' discrimination of the retailer's offer, because services are notable distinguishing features. A quality search therefore should enhance preferences for and loyalty toward particular retailers. Although we find no previous evidence about this effect specifically, we predict a positive relationship between this motivation and store loyalty. In related work, a favourable store image has a positive effect on store loyalty (Ailawadi et al., 2008; Lessing, 1973; Pan & Zinkhan, 2006), and consumers use different cues to develop their perceptions of that image, including goods quality, service quality and sympathy (Mazursky & Jacoby, 1986). Previous empirical evidence shows a positive relationship of store loyalty with goods quality perceptions (Darley & Lim, 1993; Pan & Zinkhan, 2006), service quality (Baker, Parasuraman, Grewal, & Voss, 2002; Pan & Zinkhan, 2006; Sirohi & McLaughlin, 1998; Zeithaml & Berry, 1996) and employees' friendliness (Pan & Zinkhan, 2006) Overall then, we propose:

H1. Price sensitivity and promotional sensitivity relate negatively to store loyalty.

H2. Time pressure relates positively to store loyalty.

H3. Service quality sensitivity relates positively to store loyalty.

Hedonic benefits

The value of the shopping experience has not only a utilitarian but also a hedonic dimension (Babin, Darden, & Griffin, 1994). Hedonic benefits are experimental and affective, which means that consumers appreciate them for their own qualities, not as means to an end (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). We can classify as hedonic those benefits that generate intrinsic stimulation or fun (Chandon et al., 2000) such as shopping entertainment, exploration or new purchase experiences (Ailawadi et al., 2001). We also propose that the search for these benefits relates negatively to store loyalty.

Consumers who enjoy shopping consider the shopping experience itself a pleasure (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). These consumers like to try and buy in different stores, just for the stimulation generated through different store visits (Baumgartner & Steenkamp, 1996). Empirical findings thus indicate that shopping enjoyment has a negative effect on store loyalty (Ailawadi et al., 2008) or no significant relationship (Mägi, 2003).

The wish to explore and have new experiences also evokes characteristics such as innovativeness or impulsiveness (Ailawadi et al., 2001; Baumgartner & Steenkamp, 1996). This propensity is linked to variety seeking (McAlister & Pessemier, 1982), which implies that purchasing is not a routine or monotonous activity. Innovativeness refers to the degree to which a person prefers to try new products and seek different experiences (Midgley & Dowling, 1978), which implies disloyal channel behaviour (Konus et al., 2008). We are unaware of any empirical studies that assess the relationship between innovativeness and store loyalty, but extant reasoning, such as in a channel context, implies a negative relationship. Impulsive buying behaviour instead features spontaneity, thoughtless actions characterised by quick acting or a lack of planning. Impulsive consumers do not plan their shopping and seem unconcerned about how much they spend or the best buy (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). Rather, they gain psychological benefits and pleasure from their impulsiveness, which creates motivation (O'Guinn & Faber, 1989; Weinberg & Gottward, 1984). Consumers appreciate impulsiveness for their own qualities, which in turn should have a negative effect on their store loyalty, because they are spontaneously attracted to various retail options. In brand loyalty studies, empirical evidence supports the negative relationship between impulsiveness and loyalty (Kumar, Ghosh, & Tellis, 1992). Planned buying behaviour instead should have a positive effect on store loyalty. Therefore, we propose

H4. Shopping enjoyment relates negatively to store loyalty.

H5. Innovativeness relates negatively to store loyalty.

H6. Impulsiveness relates negatively to store loyalty.

Mixed benefits

The search for equity brands might suggest a search for utilitarian benefits, such as quality associations (Aaker, 1994; Yoo, Donthu, & Lee, 2000), as well as a search for hedonic benefits related to social image, self-realisation and so on (Fischer, Völckner, & Sattler, 2010; Levy, 1959). In both cases, we anticipate a negative relationship with store loyalty, because consumers shop across different stores, picking their preferred brands. In other words, high brand loyalty should lead to low store loyalty. But this prediction makes sense only in the context of exclusive distribution, when certain retailers sell specific equity brands. Without specialised distribution, as occurs in food, household product and personal care product markets, exclusivity likely appears only among store brands, and the search for those brands leads to greater store loyalty (Ailawadi et al., 2008).

Some consumers might search for equity brands to save time and reduce their purchase risk (Roselius, 1971; Sheth & Venkatesan, 1968). Ailawadi et al. (2001) classify brand loyalty as a cost motivation, rather than a utilitarian or hedonic benefit. Brand switching generates switching costs for consumers, because it takes time to analyse available options, and the consumer suffers if the ultimate purchase involves a less preferred option (Konus et al., 2008). Therefore, brand loyalty represents a tactic to save time (East et al., 2000), and customers may be brand loyal because they hope to simplify their lives. Similarly, they may be store loyal to save time (Carman, 1970). In short, loyalty could indicate a general propensity toward routines, inertial behaviour and high perceptions of switching costs, rather than just an attitude toward the brand or store (East et al., 2000). Previous empirical findings support a positive relationship between brand loyalty and store loyalty (East et al., 2000; Flavián et al., 2001). Since previous research is inconclusive and there are arguments for both a positive and negative relationship, we thus propose:

H7. Brand loyalty relates to store loyalty.

Empirical analysis

Study scenario and data

For the empirical analysis, we focus on food purchases by Spanish households. Specifically, we use data provided by the TNS household panel (now KantarWorldpanel), which represents the Spanish population. For each household, we obtain information about annual expenditures (second half of 2007—first half of 2008) on food products, disaggregated by retail chains. We focus on 12 major retail chains that operate in the Spanish grocery industry: Mercadona (15.78% market share), Carrefour (12.57%), Eroski (8.62%), Alcampo (5.36%), Dia (12.79%), Hipercor (0.80%), Caprabo (2.37%), Lidl (3.93%), Dinosol (0.39%), Consum (1.31%), Ahorramas (1.11%) and Miquel Alimentación (0.26%). The 2008 Annual Food Distribution Report (Alimarket., 2008) ranks these chains as the top 12 (in order) in terms of sales value in the Spanish market. The data also indicate each household's expenditures with each of these 12 top retailers and the aggregated expenditures for 'other retailers'. The food category data provide specific expenditures in several categories: dry food, canned, milk and shakes, beverages, frozen food, dairy, cheeses, cakes and pastries and cooked dishes. We use this budget allocation information as our first measure of store loyalty.

We compute the store loyalty of each household according to its greatest share of wallet. Starting with the expenditure distribution across retail chains, we calculate the degree of loyalty as the share of wallet in that chain. Because we have data for the top 12 retailers, we filter the sample to include only households for which the maximum share of wallet can be identified. That is, we investigate only households whose share of wallet with one specific top-12 food retailer was not inferior to the share of wallet devoted to 'other retailers'. We thereby ensure that the preferred chain for each household appeared among the selected retail chains.

The households' socio-demographic data also are available in the household panel; we obtain information about each household's social class, size and presence of children.

KantarWorldpanel conducted an 'Opinions and attitudes survey' among these panellists in July 2008. Of the more than 160 questions, we include only those related to benefits sought and store loyalty. For the empirical analyses, we combine both data sources and investigate households that provide full information across them. The final sample thus includes 885 households.

Measures

Store loyalty measures

We adopt a behavioural perspective on store loyalty and use both panel and survey data. We can measure store loyalty according to observed buying behaviour (from the household panel) or stated buying behaviour (from consumers' self-assessment, obtained through the survey). The measure from the household panel reflects the share of wallet with the main retailer (i.e., where the household assigns most of its expenditures). This variable is thus bounded between 0 and 1. We also considered several other possible measures of behavioural loyalty based on budget allocations, including one based on entropy (Bustos-Reyes & González-Benito, 2008) and the measure suggested by Popkowski Leszczyc and Timmermans (1997). In both cases, the results were similar to those obtained with the share-of-wallet measure at the main retailer.

The measure of store loyalty based on consumers' self-assessment reflected the items in the questionnaire related to store loyalty, which were scored on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The two items that measure store loyalty are (1) 'I usually go to the same store' and (2) 'I visit different stores to do my shopping' (reversed). For the loyalty measure, we take the mean across both items, then re-scale the resulting variable to range from 0 to 1 instead of 1 to 5.

The first question of interest is the degree of congruence between the store loyalty measures. The significant and positive Pearson correlation in Table 1 indicates that these variables are moderately related and represent different aspects of store loyalty. The self-assessment approach thus might effectively capture loyal behaviour that we cannot be detected when computing share of wallet after aggregating all food purchases.

Shopping motivation measures

Regarding customer's motivations for and benefits sought from shopping, we use items from the questionnaire, in line with our proposed theoretical framework. Therefore, we consider items related to utilitarian and hedonic benefits, measured on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). For this measure, we ran a principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation to identify the underlying dimensions of benefits sought. The factor analysis produced eight different factors, largely consistent with the motivations in the theoretical framework. As we expected, three of them relate to utilitarian motivations: (1) price and promotion sensitivity, (2) time pressure and (3) service quality sensitivity. Four other factors refer to hedonic motivations: (4) shopping enjoyment, (5) innovativeness, (6) impulsiveness and (7) planning. We initially expected that planning would be opposed to impulsiveness, but planned purchases actually appear to represent independent, compatible qualities. This finding is in line with previous research that suggests that impulsive buying goes beyond lack of planning because it might happen only for specific situations and product categories

Table 1 Descriptive analysis.

	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Budget allocation[*]				
Share of wallet at the main store	0.56	0.16	0.24	1
Self-assessment[*]				
Composed scale	0.54	0.18	0	1
Control variables				
Accessibility	0.14	0.09	0.01	0.43
Social class 1 (low)	0.15			
Social class 2 (medium—low)	0.25			
Social class 3 (medium)	0.38			
Social class 4 (high)	0.21			
Household size	3.06	1.15	1	8
Children in the household	0.43	0.49	0	1

[*] Pearson correlation between store loyalty variables = 0.36 ($p < 0.05$).

(Rook, 1987). Finally, we included a factor corresponding to (8) brand loyalty. We summarise the selected items, descriptive and factor loadings in Table 2. In the subsequent analysis, we use the factor scores to measure benefits.

Control measures

Although previous research indicates the low explanatory power of socio-demographic variables for characterising store loyalty, we include them in the analysis as control variables. Specifically, KantarWorldpanel gathered information about each household's social class, size and presence of children younger than 6 years. KantarWorldpanel split the social class measure into four socioeconomic groups: low (social class 1), medium–low (social class 2), medium (social class 3) and high-medium to high (social class 4). These classes are assigned using detailed data about households' properties, equipment and habits, though we did not have access to disaggregated data in this regard. Household size is a count variable, ranging from 1 to 8, where 8 represents households with 8 or more members. The presence of children younger than 6 years is a binary variable that equals 1 when the household has young children. In Table 1, we summarise the socio-demographic profile of the sample.

In addition, we tried to control for households' accessibility to competing retailers, which might determine some spurious or forced loyalty. We did not have information about each household's address of course, but we could determine the province where households reside and therefore computed an accessibility measure at this level of geographical aggregation. The measure of accessibility for each household consists of the proportion of the selling area belonging to the main retailer within the province in which the household resides. The greater the presence of the main retailer, the higher the behavioural loyalty to that retailer should be. In Table 1, we provide descriptive statistics for this variable.

Analysis and findings

Our dependent variables feature two measures of store loyalty: share of wallet and self-assessment. The independent variables relate to benefits sought from shopping and socio-demographic variables.

Because both store loyalty measures range from 0 to 1, we use a logistic regression adapted to the resource allocation context (i.e., fractional logistic regression; Papke & Wooldridge, 1996). Therefore, we propose:

$$\pi_i = \frac{e^{\alpha + \beta X_i + \lambda Z_i}}{1 + e^{\alpha + \beta X_i + \lambda Z}},$$

where π_i indicates the store loyalty measure for household i; α is a parameter that quantifies average customer loyalty toward the retailer; X_i is a vector that measures the benefits sought for household i; and β is a vector of the parameter that captures the effect of the benefits sought on store loyalty. Furthermore, Z_i is a vector of variables that characterise the household's socio-demographic traits and accessibility to main retailer, and λ is a vector of the parameters to estimate. These vectors indicate the effect of the control variables on store loyalty. Our model estimation

consists of an adaptation of the maximum likelihood procedure used for qualitative dependent variables.

In Table 3 we report the estimation results for both loyalty variables. The role of socio-demographic variables does not appear relevant or significant in general, though the medium–low social class relates positively to subjective store loyalty. As expected, the effect of accessibility is significant and positive. This effect captures the spurious loyalty derived from better accessibility to the main retailer.

With respect to a characterisation that is based on the benefits sought from shopping, the findings are consistent with our proposed theoretical framework. We observe moderate consistency for both measures of store loyalty, with some differences. Self-assessment of loyal behaviour does not necessarily coincide with observed behaviour across all grocery products; the Pearson correlation between both measures of loyalty is 0.36. These differences influence the characterisation. In general, the explanatory power of benefits sought is greater for loyalty based on self-assessment than for loyalty based on share of wallet, possibly because the former measure uncovers loyal patterns undetected by panel data. Moreover, it may go further than just behaviour and include elements related to feeling or emotional links with the retailer, which ultimately would imply attitudinal loyalty.

With respect to utilitarian benefits, the results support H1; furthermore, H2 receives support only for the loyalty measure based on share of wallet, and H3 is confirmed only for the loyalty measure based on self-assessment. Greater price and promotional sensitivity relate negatively to store loyalty. In contrast, time pressure favours store loyalty, and the relationship is significant for store loyalty measured by share of wallet, consistent with our discussion of the closer relationship between the measure based on self-assessment and attitudinal loyalty. Thus, it seems that behavioural store loyalty might be generated by the need to save time, not just by attitudinal loyalty. Greater service quality sensitivity also increases store loyalty, at least for the self-assessment–based measure.

The findings provide some evidence in support of the hedonic benefits hypotheses, H4–H6. Shopping enjoyment relates negatively to store loyalty for both measures of behavioural store loyalty. We also observe a negative relationship between innovativeness and store loyalty; in this case, the relation is significant only for the loyalty measure based on self-assessment. We attain the same result for impulsiveness, related negatively to the same measure of loyalty. In general, seeking entertainment and exploration seem to exhibit an inverse relationship with store loyalty. The finding for planning also corroborates our proposals; greater purchase planning provokes greater store loyalty, at least for the measure based on share of wallet.

Finally, the results support the proposed hypothesis about brand loyalty, H7. For store loyalty based on self-assessment, we observe a positive relation with brand loyalty. As a routine behaviour, brand loyalty helps the consumer save time, and that behaviour is consistent with store loyalty. The lack of effect on the store loyalty measure based on budget allocation might be a consequence of the limitations of this kind of measure. The search for equity brands might spread households' budgets across different stores as they look for their preferred brands, even if these

Table 2   Item descriptions and exploratory factor analysis.

Factors	Item	M	S.D	Factor scores[*]								V.E
				F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	
Utilitarian benefits												
Price and promotional sensitivity (F1)	I compare prices to take advantage of special offers.	3.87	0.72	0.75								9.05
	I look for products on offer.	3.56	0.78	0.71								
	I like to take part in package promotions.	3.64	0.81	0.70								
	I use the discount coupon when I have the chance.	4.01	0.83	0.67								
	I like to take part in promotions that offer an extra amount of product or a different product.	3.40	0.95	0.57								
	I keep informed about promotions by store feature and displays.	3.69	0.80	0.62								
Time pressures (F2)	I have time enough for cooking (reversed).	3.31	1.11		0.66							5.99
	I would like to have more time for cooking.	3.27	0.89		0.71							
	It seems that I never have free time.	3.48	1.01		0.75							
	I am a busy person and often eat quickly.	3.06	1.01		0.73							
Service quality sensitivity (F3)	I don't mind paying more for quality.	3.50	0.73			0.46						7.75
	When I go shopping, I prefer to go to a more organised store, even if it is more expensive.	3.21	0.79			0.86						
	When I go shopping, I prefer to go to a more caring store, even if it is more expensive.	3.26	0.80			0.91						
	When I go shopping, I prefer to go to a store with kind salespeople, even if it is more expensive.	3.33	0.80			0.85						
Hedonic benefits												
Shopping enjoyment (F4)	I enjoy shopping.	3.41	1.01				0.71					4.93
	I like to waste a little time as possible when I shop (reversed).	3.36	0.91				0.69					
	I like to spend time browsing the store before to decide what I am going to buy.	2.94	0.90				0.49					
	I like to talk with people when I go to shopping to make the purchase into a more social experience.	3.04	0.90				0.43					
Innovativeness (F5)	In general, I am one of the first to buy a new product.	2.50	0.77					0.79				10.10
	I used to be one of the first one to try a new brand.	2.49	0.81					0.78				
	I like to try new products.	3.06	0.76					0.74				
	I like to try new brands.	3.07	0.70					0.76				
	I enjoy taking risks by buying new products.	2.56	0.75					0.70				

Table 2 (*continued*)

Factors	Item	M	S.D	Factor scores[*]								V.E
				F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	
Impulsiveness (F6)	I tend to spend money without thinking.	2.17	0.87						0.69			4.80
	I often buy things just because I see it on store shelves.	2.11	0.90					0.42	0.47			
	I spend more money at the store than I intend.	3.26	0.92						0.58			
Planning (F7)	I make a shopping list before leaving home and I stick to it.	3.31	0.97							0.62		5.20
	I plan my shopping to be more efficient.	3.61	0.78							0.60		
	I try to follow a strict budget when I go shopping.	2.96	0.84							0.75		
Mixed benefit												
Brand loyalty (F8)	I consider myself brand loyal.	3.06	0.87								0.72	9.04
	I tend to buy brand name products.	2.78	0.86								0.56	
	To me, it is important what brand I buy.	3.23	0.77								0.65	
	If I like a brand, I rarely try another brand.	3.30	0.84								0.63	
	When I find a brand that is like me, I keep buying it.	3.90	0.63								0.65	
	I prefer to keep loyal to the brands that I have bought before rather than try another brand.	3.52	0.80								0.61	
	I tend to buy the same brands.	3.85	0.60								0.58	
Total variance												56.88

M = mean, S.D. = standard deviation, V.E = variance extracted.
[*] Factor scores higher than 0.4.

consumers always purchase the same brands in the same stores.

Conclusions and implications

This article proposes a theoretical framework for characterising store-loyal buyers, together with empirical evidence related to such consumers in the Spanish retail context. Our first challenge has been to demonstrate the explanatory potential of consumers' shopping motivations for characterising store-loyal consumers. Previous research has mainly focused on socio-demographic variables. To meet this challenge, we have classified consumers' motivations according to utilitarian and hedonic benefits. Regarding utilitarian benefits, we consider monetary and time savings as well as service quality. Regarding hedonic benefits, we consider shopping enjoyment, innovativeness, impulsiveness and planning. Additionally, we consider brand loyalty as a mixed benefit. Our second challenge has been to find an appropriate way to measure store loyalty. In this regard, we compare two alternative approaches based on budget allocation and self-assessment, respectively. Previous research has mainly focused on budget allocation data from point of sale' scanners or consumer panels. However such an approach may hide loyalty patterns within product categories or shopping occasions, and those patterns can be uncovered by considering self-assessment data from surveys.

Our findings indicate moderate consistency between the measures, though the one based on self-assessment is much more related to the motivational profile of consumers. That result evidences that different approaches to measure store loyalty may lead to quite different views of that concept and its determinants. The empirical findings also indicate that store-loyal buyers' general profile is less price sensitive, more time and service sensitive, less concerned about entertainment and new experiences, more likely to feature planning and more brand loyal. These results indicate the greater explanatory power of motivational variables compared with socio-demographic variables for characterising store-loyal buyers.

If a retailer hopes to achieve a portfolio of loyal buyers, an effective strategy is to adopt a selective strategy focused solely on these buyers. To apply that strategy, the retailer needs to recognise common characteristics shared by the loyal customers. Whereas socio-demographic variables are useful to distinguish loyal customers, motivational variables

Table 3 Relationship between store loyalty and benefits sought in shopping.

	Budget allocation (share of wallet at main store)		Self-assessment (composed scale)	
	Unstandardised Coefficients	Standardised Coefficients	Unstandardised Coefficients	Standardised Coefficients
Utilitarian benefits				
Price and promotional sensitivity	−0.08***	−0.48***	−0.29***	−1.60***
Time pressure	0.04*	0.24*	0.03	0.16
Service quality sensitivity	0.01	0.06	0.08***	0.45***
Hedonic benefits				
Shopping enjoyment	−0.05***	−0.30***	−0.18***	−0.99***
Innovativeness	−0.02	−0.13	−0.06***	−0.03***
Impulsiveness	0.01	0.09	−0.04*	−0.23*
Planning	0.05**	0.31**	0.01	0.07
Mixed benefit				
Brand loyalty	0.02	0.12	0.15***	0.81***
Controls				
Accessibility	1.34***	0.72***	0.76***	0.38***
Social class 4 (high)	−0.01	−0.02	0.06	0.12
Social class 3 (medium)	0.07	0.19	0.06	0.14
Social class 2 (medium−low)	−0.01	−0.04	0.12**	0.32**
Household size	−0.02	−0.14	−0.02	−0.13
Children in the household	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.11
Likelihood ratio test	***		***	
ρ^2	0.008		0.038	

* $p < 0.10$.
** $p < 0.05$.
*** $p < 0.01$.

are useful to decide what marketing strategies and tactics are more appropriate to get a better response from these customers.

Our empirical evidence delineates a store-loyal buyer profile; retailers can use this information to segment their customers. The loyal segment contains utilitarian consumers who are very concerned about the opportunity costs of their time, more so than the pleasures of shopping. The loyal customer's characteristics should help define the retailer's strategy: Focus on ease of purchase and convenience to minimise the customer's time loss, offer an assortment that includes brands to which the customer is loyal and ensure good service quality.

This study also suffers some limitations that suggest further research directions. First of all, our models are incomplete. Our goodness of fit measures suggests that the explanatory power of the motivational determinants considered in our study is limited. However, we do not consider the effects of other store loyalty determinants. For example, other motivations, such as social interaction, or more precise measures of accessibility, such as store proximity (Bell, Ho, & Tang, 1998), might provide a better explanation of the spurious loyalty component. Additionally, our measures of benefits sought were computed from questions about general shopping. Since they might vary across product categories and retail sectors, the use of category-specific measures could improve their explanatory power.

The use of longitudinal data (patronage data over time) might also help to capture differences across product categories and shopping occasions. Finally, our measure of share of wallet at the top 12 retailer chains ignores store loyalty to small retailers. Sample selection requirements derived from this limitation might involve some biases.

Acknowledgments

References

Aaker, D. A. (1994). *Gestión del valor de la Marca: Capitalizar el valor de la marca*. Madrid: Díaz de Santos.

Ailawadi, K. L., & Keller, K. L. (2004). Understanding retail branding: Conceptual insights and research priorities. *Journal of Retailing, 80*, 331−342.

Ailawadi, K. L., Neslin, S. A., & Gedenk, K. (2001). Pursuing the value-conscious consumer: Store brands versus national brand promotions. *Journal of Marketing, 65*, 71−89.

Ailawadi, K. L., Pauwels, K., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2008). Private label use and store loyalty. *Journal of Marketing, 72*(3), 19–30.

Alimarket. (2008). Informe anual de distribución alimentaria.

Babin, B. J., Darden, W. R., & Griffin, M. (1994). Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20*(4), 644–656.

Baker, J., Parasuraman, A., Grewal, D., & Voss, G. B. (2002). The influence of multiple store environments cues on perceived merchandise value and patronage intentions. *Journal of Marketing, 66*(2), 120–141.

Baltas, G., Argouslidis, P. C., & Skarmeas, D. (2010). The role of customer factors in multiple store patronage: A cost-benefit approach. *Journal of Retailing, 86*(1), 37–50.

Baumgartner, H., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (1996). Exploratory consumer buying behavior: Conceptualization and measurement. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 13*(2), 121–137.

Bell, D. R., Ho, T.-H., & Tang, C. S. (1998). Determining where to shop: Fixed and variable costs of shopping. *Journal of Marketing Research, 53*(3), 352–369.

Berry, L. (1995). Relationship marketing of services-growing interest, emerging perspectives. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 23*(4), 236–245.

Bloemer, J., de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (1999). Linking perceived service quality and service loyalty: A multi-dimensional perspective. *European Journal of Marketing, 33*(11/12), 1082–1106.

Bustos-Reyes, C. A., & González-Benito, O. (2006). Papel del formato comercial en la lealtad al establecimiento minorista. *Información Comercial Española*(January–February), 269–288.

Bustos-Reyes, C. A., & González-Benito, O. (2008). Store and store format measures based on budget allocation. *Journal of Business Research, 61*, 1015–1025.

Carman, J. M. (1970). Correlates of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing Research, 7*, 67–76.

Chandon, P., Wansink, B., & Laurent, G. (2000). A benefit congruency framework of sales promotion effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing, 64*(4), 65–81.

Chaudhuri, A., & Ligas, M. (2009). Consequences of value in retail markets. *Journal of Retailing, 85*(3), 406–419.

Darley, W. K., & Lim, J. S. (1993). Store-choice behavior for pre-owned merchandise. *Journal of Business Research, 27*, 17–31.

Dick, A., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 22*(2), 99–113.

East, R., Hammond, K., Harris, P., & Lomax, W. (2000). First-store loyalty and retention. *Journal of Marketing Management, 16*(4), 307–325.

East, R., Harris, P., Willson, G., & Lomax, W. (1995). Loyalty to supermarkets. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research, 5*, 99–109.

Fischer, M., Völckner, F., & Sattler, H. (2010). How important are brands? A cross-category, cross-country study. *Journal of Marketing Research, 47*(5), 823–839.

Flavián, C., Martínez, E., & Polo, Y. (2001). Loyalty to grocery stores in the Spanish market of the 1990s. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 8*(2), 85–93.

Gónzalez-Benito, O., & Martos-Partal, M. (2012). Role of retailer positioning and product category on the relationship between store brand consumption and store loyalty. *Journal of Retailing, 88*(2), 236–249.

Gónzalez-Benito, O., Muñoz-Gallego, P. A., & Kopalle, P. K. (2005). Asymmetric competition in retail store format: Evaluating inter- and intra-format spatial effects. *Journal of Retailing, 81*(1), 59–73.

Gounaris, S., & Stathakopoulos, V. (2004). Antecedents and consequences of brand loyalty: An empirical study. *Journal of Brand Management, 11*(4), 283–306.

Haley, R. I. (1995). Benefit segmentation: A decision-oriented research tool. *Marketing Management, 4*(1), 59–62.

Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: Emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *Journal of Marketing, 46*(Summer), 92–101.

Kau, K. A., & Ehrenberg, A. S. C. (1984). Patterns of store choice. *Journal of Marketing Research, 21*(November), 399–409.

Kim, B.-D., Srinivasan, K., & Wilcox, R. T. (1999). Identifying price sensitive consumers: The relative merits of demographic versus purchase pattern information. *Journal of Retailing, 75*(2), 173–193.

Kleijnen, M., De Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (2007). An assessment of value creation in mobile services delivery and the moderating role of time consciousness. *Journal of Retailing, 83*(1), 33–46.

Knox, S. (1998). Loyalty-based segmentation and the customer development process. *European Management Journal, 16*(6), 729–737.

Knox, S., & Denison, T. (2000). Store loyalty: Its impact on retail revenue. An empirical study of purchasing behaviour in the UK. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 7*, 33–45.

Konus, U., Verhoef, P. C., & Neslin, S. A. (2008). Multichannel shopper segments and their covariates. *Journal of Retailing, 84*(4), 398–413.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. (2009). *Marketing management* (13th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kumar, V., Ghosh, A., & Tellis, G. J. (1992). A decomposition of repeat buying. *Marketing Letters, 3*(4), 407–417.

Kumar, V., & Leone, R. P. (1988). Measuring the effect of retail store promotions on brand and store substitution. *Journal of Marketing Research, 25*(2), 178–185.

Laaksonen, M. (1993). Retail patronage dynamics: Learning about daily shopping behavior in contexts of changing retail structures. *Journal of Business Research, 28*(1/2), 3–174.

Lessing, P. (1973). Consumer store images and store loyalties. *Journal of Marketing, 37*(4), 72–74.

Levy, S. J. (1959). Symbols for sale. *Harvard Business Review, 37*(4), 117–124.

Mägi, A. W. (2003). Share of wallet in retailing: The effect of customer satisfaction, loyalty cards and shopper characteristics. *Journal of Retailing, 79*(2), 97–106.

Martos-Partal, M., & Gónzalez-Benito, O. (2011). Store brand and store loyalty: The moderating role of store brand positioning. *Marketing Letters, 22*(3), 297–313.

Mazursky, D., & Jacoby, J. (1986). Exploring the development of store images. *Journal of Retailing, 62*(2), 145–166.

McAlister, L., & Pessemier, E. (1982). Variety seeking behavior: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Consumer Research, 9*(3), 311–322.

McGoldrick, P. J., & Andre, E. (1997). Consumer misbehavior: Promiscuity or loyalty in grocery retailing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 4*(2), 73–81.

Midgley, D., & Dowling, G. R. (1978). Innovativeness: The concept and its measurement. *Journal of Consumer Research, 4*(4), 229–242.

O'Guinn, T. C., & Faber, R. J. (1989). Compulsive buying: A phenomenological exploration. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16*(2), 147–157.

Pan, Y., & Zinkhan, G. M. (2006). Determinants of retail patronage: A meta-analytical perspective. *Journal of Retailing, 82*(3), 229–243.

Papke, L. E., & Wooldridge, J. (1996). Econometric methods for fractional response variables with an application to 401(k) plan participation rates. *Journal of Applied Econometrics, 11*, 619–632.

Popkowski Leszczyc, P., & Timmermans, H. (1997). Store switching behavior. *Marketing Letters, 8*(2), 193–204.

Reichheld, F. (1996). *El efecto lealtad. Crecimiento, beneficios y valor último*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Rhee, H., & Bell, D. R. (2002). The inter-store mobility of supermarket shoppers. *Journal of Retailing, 78*, 225—237.

Rook, D. (1987). The buying impulse. *Journal of Consumer Research, 14*(September), 189—199.

Roselius, T. (1971). Consumer rankings of risk reduction methods. *Journal of Marketing, 35*(January), 56—61.

Sheth, J., & Venkatesan, M. (1968). Risk-reduction processes in repetitive consumer behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research, 5*, 307—310.

Sirohi, N., & McLaughlin, E. (1998). A model of consumer perceptions and store loyalty intentions for a supermarket retailer. *Journal of Retailing, 74*(2), 223—245.

Sloot, L. M., Verhoef, P. C., & Franses, P. H. (2005). The impact of brand equity and the hedonic level of products on consumer stock-out reactions. *Journal of Retailing, 81*(1), 15—34.

Sproles, G. B., & Kendall, E. L. (1986). A methodology for profiling consumers' decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 20*(2), 267—280.

Walters, R. (1991). Assessing the impact of retail price promotions on product substitution, complementary purchase, and inter-store sales displacement. *Journal of Marketing, 55*(April), 17—28.

Weinberg, P., & Gottward, W. (1984). Impulsive consumer buying as a result of emotions. *Journal of Business Research, 10*(1), 43—57.

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. (2000). An examination of selected marketing mix elements and brand equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 28*(Spring), 195—211.

Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing, 60*(2), 31—46.

MERCEDES MARTOS-PARTAL (Ph.D., University Carlos III of Madrid) is Assistant Professor of Marketing at the University of Salamanca. Her current research interests focus on the private-label phenomenon, relationship marketing issues and analyses of the consumer packaged goods industry. She has published in international journals such as *Journal of Retailing, Marketing Letters, Journal of Advertising Research, International Journal of Market Research, Journal of Marketing Management, Journal of Retailing and Consumer Service, Journal of the Academy of Business Education, International Review on Public and Non Profit Marketing* and *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*.

ÓSCAR GONZÁLEZ-BENITO has a degree in Mathematics from the University of Salamanca (1995), a MSc degree in Marketing from UMIST (UK) (1997) and a Ph.D. in Economics and Management Sciences from the University of Salamanca (1999). He is Professor of Marketing at the University of Salamanca. In addition to publications in some of the most well-recognized Spanish marketing and management journals, he has published in international journals such as *Journal of Retailing, European Journal of Marketing, Journal of Business Research, Industrial Marketing Management, International Journal of Market Research, British Journal of Management, Marketing Letters, OMEGA* and *Small Business Economics*.