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Abstract

By focusing on online stores, this study investigates the repeat purchase intention of experienced online buyers. Prior research on online behavior continuance models perceived usefulness, trust, satisfaction, and perceived value as the major determinants of continued adoption or loyalty, overlooking the important role of habit. Building on previous work in other disciplines, we define habit in the context of online shopping as the extent to which buyers tend to shop online automatically because of learning. Using recent work on the continued usage of IS (IS continuance) and repeat purchase, we have developed a model suggesting that repeat purchase intention is not only a consequence of trust and switching cost, but also of habit. In particular, in our research model, we propose that online shopping habit moderate the influence of trust such that its importance in determining repeat purchase intention decreases as the online shopping behavior takes on a more habitual nature. Integrating prior research on habit, IS continuance, and repeat purchase further, we suggest how antecedents of repeat purchase intention relate to drivers of habitualization. Data collected from 462 of Yahoo!Kimo shopping center’s customers provide strong support for the research model. Results indicate that higher level of habit deflated trust’s effect on repeat purchase intention. The data also show that satisfaction and familiarity are key to habit formation and thus relevant in the context of online repeat purchase.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Online retailing has been an important channel or business model for many firms. In the increasingly competitive online retailing market, the main concern to online sellers has shifted from inducing consumers to adopt their online channels to motivating consumers to make repeat purchases through these channels. A study by Mainspring and Bain & Company (2000) showed that the average customer must shop four times at an online store before the store profits from that customer. Thus, it is important for online sellers to understand the particular reasons why buyers are willing to repeat purchase through those online stores.

Prior research on online behavior continuance models perceived usefulness, trust, satisfaction, and perceived value as the major determinants of continued adoption or loyalty, overlooking the important role of habit. The role of habit is of major and increasing concerns to information systems (IS) and marketing researchers. The IS literature on continuing information technology (IT) use makes a major and conceptual advance, drawing on literature in psychology and social psychology, to posit that much continuing IT use is habitual (Limayem et al., 2007; Hong et al., 2008; Ortiz de Guinea and Markus, 2009). The marketing literature also posits that habit is important predictor of customer loyalty or repeat purchase intention (Rauyruen et al., 2009). Habit can be viewed as an automatic behavioral response triggered by a situational stimulus without being preceded by a cognitive analysis process (Aarts et al., 1998). In some studies, habit moderates the impact of intention on the guidance of IT use (Cheung and Limayen, 2005; Kim et al., 2005; Limayem et al., 2007); in others, habit moderates the relationship between satisfaction and online repurchase intention (Khalifa and Liu, 2007); and in some, habit directly affect continuing IT use (Kim and Malhotra, 2005) or IS continuance intention (Hong et al., 2008).

Therefore, the objective of this paper is to address the following research questions: (1) What are the antecedents of online shopping habit? (2) What are the consequences of habit? (3) Does habit deflate the impact of trust on repeat purchase intention?

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Conceptual Background and Definition of Habit

The concept of habit was introduced in the early days of psychology (e.g., James 1890). Habit is not the same as behavior and thus should not be considered with the latter (Limayem et al., 2007). Habits are behavioral dispositions to repeat past action that develop through frequent performance in a stable context (Ouellette and Wood, 1998).

Trindis (1980) defined habit as "situation-behavior sequences that are or have become automatic….the individual is usually not conscious of these sequences" (p. 204). Verplanken and Aarts (1999) defined habit as “learned sequences of acts that have become automatic responses to specific cues, and are functional in obtaining certain goals or end states” (p. 104). Habits are learned acts and goal-directed. They are gradually laid down in procedural memory through repeated performance. The development of habits requires a certain amount of repetition or practice (Aarts et al., 1998). Habit can be viewed as an automatic behavioral response triggered by a situational stimulus without being preceded by a cognitive analysis process (Aarts et al., 1998). Once a habit is formed, the behavior is performed automatically when the context cue or situational stimulus is encountered (Verplanken, 2006; Wood and Neal, 2007); that is, its performance requires little (if any) conscious attention and minimal mental effort (Wood et al., 2002).

The more frequently we perform a behavior, the more likely it becomes habitual. The formation of habit requires the behavior to be performed repeatedly and frequently, in a stable environment for a reasonable amount of time. Stable contexts facilitate this propensity to perform repeated behaviors with minimal cognitive monitoring (Wood et al., 2002). A stable context means that situational cues and relevant goals of individuals are similar or the same across consecutive situations (Limayem et al., 2007). The change in context presumably disrupts the automatic cuing of action (i.e., the activation of the learned response pattern) and thereby frees it from stimulus control. People might fail to act on their habits when contexts change because the new contexts invite a reevaluation of intentions, and
people are acting on their new intentions (Wood et al., 2005).

2.2 Antecedents of Habit

We now turn to a discussion of the antecedents of habit with a focus on the conditions under which online shopping habits are more likely to form. Knowledge about antecedents of habits is not only helpful in understanding how and why online shopping habit arise, but may also prove useful in deriving practical guidelines designed to assist online seller in influencing habit development among its buyers (Limayem et al., 2007).

From a thorough review of the general habit literature, it has become evident that there are three primary antecedents to habit development: frequency of prior behavior, satisfaction, and familiarity. Limayem et al. (2007) modeled frequency of past behavior as an antecedent of habit. According to Self-Report Habit Index (SRHI) (Verplanken and Orbell, 2003), frequency of past behavior is a characteristic of habit. Therefore frequency of past behavior is not considered as an antecedent of online shopping habit in this study. Limayem et al. (2007) modeled comprehensiveness of usage as an antecedent of IS habits. Comprehensiveness of usage refers to the extent to which an individual makes use of the various applications offered under the umbrella of a single IS systems. Online shopping involves understanding and knowledge not only about the website interface but also the online shopping procedures and online seller. Considering the difference between IS usage and online shopping, the present study considers familiarity as an antecedents of online shopping habit instead of comprehensiveness of usage.

2.3 Habit as a Moderator

The literature on habit maintains that the automaticity of behaviour lessens the need to access intention (see Aarts et al., 1997). If individuals are habitually performing a particular behavior, the predictive power of intention is weakened. Thus, the more a behavior is performed habitually, the less cognitive planning it involves. Limayem et al. (2007) applied the concept to continued IS usage and argued that habit plays a moderating role in the relationship between intention and actual behavior. Khalifa and Liu (2007) examined the moderating role of habit between satisfaction and online repeat purchase intention. They suggested that the effect of the determinants of on online repurchase intention may be contingent upon the development of the habit of using the online channel. Satisfaction may not necessarily lead to intention to return to an internet store in the absence of an online shopping habit. Similarly, the present study theorizes that effect of trust on online repurchase intention may be contingent upon the development of the online shopping habit. Little research has been done to examine the moderating effect of habit in the relationship between trust and online repeat purchase intention.

2.4 Measures of Habit

Triandis (1980) noted that habits can be measured by the frequency of occurrence of behavior. Two alternative measures of habit strength have been proposed: the Response Frequency measure and the Self-Reported Habit Index. The Response Frequency (RF) measure (Verplanken et al., 1994) assesses generalized habits across different situations (e.g. car use when travelling to different locations). The RF measure has two inconveniences. First, because participants are supposed to respond as quickly as possible, it is difficult to use in self-administered questionnaires. Another inconvenience is that the RF measure requires pilot and pretest work for every new habit or habit context (Verplanken et al., 2005). The Self-Report Habit Index (SRHI) (Verplanken and Orbell, 2003) is a 12-item instrument to assess a respondent’s subjective experience of several features of habits. Those features are a history of repetition, lack of awareness, lack of control, mental efficiency, and expressing self-identity. The SRHI has been shown to have excellent internal reliability, high test–retest reliability, to correlate well with the RF measure and past behavior measures, good convergent validity, and can differentiate between behaviors that are performed with different frequencies (Verplanken and Orbell, 2003).

3 RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

Figure 1 presents the proposed model. Repeat purchase intention refers to the subjective probability that an individual will continue to purchase products from the online vendor or store in the future.
Habit

Online shopping habit is defined as the extent to which buyers tend to shop online automatically because of learning. Prior research comparing TRA and related theories with habit as an antecedent of behavioral intentions has shown that habit directly affects behavioral intentions (Leone et al., 1999; Trafimow, 2000; Verplanken et al., 1998). Gefen (2000) noted that habitual previous preference to use an online shopping website directly and strongly increased user intentions to continue using the same online shopping website again. Support for the role of habit on repeat purchase intention is provided by Gefen (2000) and Rauyruen and Miller (2009).

According to Fornell (1992), habit is one the factors that constitute the switching cost. According to Murray and Häubl (2007), habits of use that are specific to a particular online store create a switching cost that can render consumers locked in to that store as long as their consumption goal is congruent with the one that was active when these habits of use were developed. When online shopping becomes a habitual behavior, buyers may develop strong emotions toward the online store and perceive high cost to learn a new website interface and understand the seller. Therefore, the stronger the habit becomes, the higher the cost to switch to another online store. Support for the role of habit on switching cost is provided by Hong et al. (2008).

An important precondition for the development of habit is that the behavior in question is performed repetitively. The more experience a buyer have in online shopping, the more likely it is the behavior will become habitual. Prior research indicates that trust is a significant predictor of initial purchase intention (Gefen et al., 2003a) but insignificant on repeat purchase intention (Brown and Jayakody, 2008). Trust may be a threshold or hygiene factor, which loses power to affect behavior after initial purchase (Van der Heijden et al., 2003). As buyers gain experience with the online shopping and its sellers, the level of “uncertainty” declines and the influence of trust declines. As a consequence of repeating the same behavior successfully over and over again (e.g., more experience of successful online shopping), the increasing automaticity of the behavior suppresses, more and more, the need to engage in active cognitive processing (e.g., trust evaluations) (James 1890). Therefore, the more experience a buyer have in online shopping, the more likely it is the behavior will become habitual and then the more likely the predictive power of trust on repeat purchase intention will be weakened. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed.

**H1:** Online shopping habit is positively related to repeat purchase intentions.

**H4:** Online shopping habit is positively related to switching cost.

**H5:** Stronger online shopping habit reduces the influence of trust on repeat purchase intention.

Switching Cost

Switching costs are defined as the costs that consumers associate with the process of switching from one supplier to another (Burnham et al., 2003). Switch cost may include searching, transaction and learning costs, discounts for loyalty, habit, emotional costs and cognitive effort, together with the
financial, social and psychological risk (Fornell, 1992). Switching costs represent an impediment to exploring new suppliers (Wathne et al., 2001). To the extent that individuals perceive costs or barriers to exit, they will tend to remain with their supplier (Burnham et al., 2003; Lee et al., 2001). High switching cost remains customers from changing the buyer-seller relationships. Therefore, an increase in switching cost will lead to an increase in repeat purchase intention. Support for the role of switching cost on online repeat purchase intention is provided by Chang and Chen (2008) and Matos et al. (2009). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H2: Switching cost is positively related to repeat purchase intentions.**

**Trust**

In general, trust is viewed as a set of specific beliefs dealing primarily with the benevolence, competence, and integrity of another party (Doney and Cannon 1997). According to TRA (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980), trust can be viewed as a behavioral belief that creates a positive attitude toward the transaction behavior, which in turn leads to transaction intentions (Pavlou and Gefen 2004). Lack of trust prevents buyers from engaging in online shopping because they are unlikely to carry out transactions with sellers who fail to convey a sense of their trustworthiness, mainly because of fears of seller opportunism (Hoffman et al. 1999). Indeed, prior research shows that trust plays a pivotal role in driving repeat purchase intention (Zboja and Voorhees, 2006). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H3: Buyers’ trust in the online seller is positively related to their repeat purchase intentions.**

**Familiarity**

Familiarity refers to a customer's degree of understanding and knowledge about the website interface, online shopping procedures, and the online seller. An important precondition for the development of habit is that the behavior in question is performed respectively repeated in stable contexts (Limayem et al., 2007). With sufficient frequency, the buyer gain adequate practice of the transaction process, which implies that his or her familiarity with the online shopping behavior tends to increase such that the behavior can subsequently be performed with almost no cognitive effort (Limayem et al., 2007).

Familiarity can influence trust, in two ways. First, familiarity can build trust when the vendor shows trustworthy behavior. Second, familiarity provides a framework within which specific favorable expectations from the trusted party can be made (Gefen, 2000). If an individual is familiar with a certain situation, he or she is likely to perceive less complexity and uncertainty in the special situation (Luhmann, 1989). The individual knows about the object’s trustworthiness and a trusting decision can be easier made. Increased familiarity means a better understanding of what is happening during the interaction with the vendor through the website (Gefen, 2000). Consequently, increased familiarity should improve buyers’ beliefs about the seller’s benevolence, competence, and integrity. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed.

**H6: Familiarity is positively related to online shopping habit.**

**H7: Familiarity is positively related to trust in the online seller.**

**Satisfaction**

In this study, satisfaction refers to a buyer’s feelings of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing the perceived performance (or outcomes) of online shopping in relation to his or her expectations. Satisfactory experiences with a behavior are a key condition for habit development as they increase one’s tendency to repeat the same course of action again under similar circumstances (Aarts et al., 1997). Thorngate (1976) noted that “If a response generated in an interaction is judged to be satisfactory, it will tend to be reproduced under subsequent, equivalent circumstances from habit rather than thought”. Support for the role of satisfaction on habit is provided by Limayem, et al. (2007). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H8: Buyers' satisfaction is positively related to their online shopping habit.**

**Utilitarian Value**

Utilitarian value reflects the acquisition of products in an efficient manner and can be viewed as
reflecting a more task-oriented, cognitive, and non-emotional outcome of shopping (Babin et al., 1994; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). The “two-appraisal” model of satisfaction evaluation (Oliver, 1989) posits that cognitive interpretation and related processes of product/service usage lead to satisfaction. Similarly, Oliver (1997) pointed out that consumption events are capable of satisfying needs at functional and psychological levels. Babin et al. (1994) propose that utilitarian value should influence customer satisfaction and they empirically show strong correlations of utilitarian value ($r=.53$, $P < .001$) with satisfaction. Jones et al. (2006) indicated that utilitarian value had a significant effect on satisfaction in the traditional retail context. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H9: Utilitarian value is positively related to buyer satisfaction.**

**Hedonic Value**

Hedonic value reflects the value received from the multisensory, fantasy and emotive aspects of the shopping experience (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982). Most human behaviors are intrinsically pleasure-seeking (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982), and buyers typically desire a feeling of pleasure from a service experience (Carbone and Haeckel, 1994). The “two-appraisal” model of satisfaction evaluation (Oliver, 1989; Weiner, 1986) also posits that affective responses arising from evaluation of the outcomes of product/service usage lead to satisfaction. Jones et al. (2006) indicated that hedonic value had a significant effect on satisfaction in the traditional retail context. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H10: Hedonic value is positively related to buyer satisfaction.**

## 4 Research Methodology

### 4.1 Measurement Development

A pretest of the questionnaire was conducted using 10 Ph.D. students with online shopping experience. Finally, a large-scale pretest with 162 customers of the target online shopping store was conducted to confirm the measurement properties of the final items. For all the measures, a seven-point Likert scale was adopted with anchors ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

### 4.2 Survey Administration

The research model was tested with data from Yahoo!Kimo shopping center’s customers. Yahoo!Kimo shopping center is a widely used online shopping store in Taiwan. A banner with a hyperlink connecting to our Web survey was published on a number of bulletin board systems and virtual communities and individuals with online auction experience were cordially invited to support this survey. The Web survey yielded a total of 462 complete and valid responses for data analysis. Table 1 lists the demographic information of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 ~</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Frequency</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>Internet Experience</td>
<td>&lt; 6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(times in one year)</td>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12~</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>11~</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Demographic Information of Respondents (N = 462)*

### 4.3 Data Analysis

Data analysis utilized a two-step approach as recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). The first step involves the analysis of the measurement model, while the second step tests the structural
relationships among latent constructs. SmartPLS 2.0 was used to assess both the measurement model and the structural model.

4.3.1 Measurement Model
Reliability was examined using the composite reliability values. Table 2 shows that all the values were above 0.7, satisfying the commonly acceptable level. The convergent validity of the scales was assessed by two criteria (Fornell and Larcker, 1981): (1) all indicator loadings should be significant and exceed 0.7 and (2) average variance extracted (AVE) should exceed 0.50. All items exhibited a loading higher than 0.7 on their respective construct, and as shown in Table 2, all the AVEs ranged from 0.63 to 0.90, thus satisfying both the conditions for convergent validity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Mean (STD)</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Value (UV)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>5.43 (1.16)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonic Value (HV)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.77 (1.26)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (SA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>5.13 (1.10)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity (FA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.64 (1.00)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habit (HA)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.73 (1.31)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust (TR)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.86 (1.15)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching Cost (SC)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.52 (1.47)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Purchase Intention (RI)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>5.31 (1.04)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Constructs

Discriminant validity was tested using the following two tests. First, an examination of cross-factor loadings indicates good discriminant validity, because the loading of each measurement item on its assigned latent variable is larger than its loading on any other constructs (Chin, 1998). Second, the square root of the AVE from the construct is much larger than the correlation shared between the construct and other constructs in the model (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

4.3.2 Structural Model
In PLS analysis, examining the structural paths and the R-square scores of endogenous variables assesses the explanatory power of a structural model. Figure 2 shows the results of structural path analysis. All paths exhibited a P-value less than 0.05. The significance of all paths was assessed with 500 bootstrap runs. Overall, the base model accounted for 59% of the variance of repeat purchase intention (Figure 2). Thus, the fit of the overall model is fairly good.

* p < .05,  ** p < .01,  *** p < .001

![Figure 2. SEM Analysis of the Research Model](image)
5 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Summary of Results

The results of this study indicate that utilitarian value and hedonic value have direct and positive effects on satisfaction. The results also show that hedonic value is a stronger predictor of repeat purchase intention than utilitarian value.

The results of this study indicate that satisfaction and familiarity are important antecedents of habit. The results show that satisfaction ($\beta = 0.54$) is a stronger predictor of habit than familiarity ($\beta = 0.19$). A possible explanation for the dominant importance of satisfaction is that a buyer’s major shopping goals are to pursue utilitarian and hedonic value. Satisfactory experiences with the shopping goals increase one’s tendency to repeat the same course of action again under similar circumstances. Therefore, satisfaction plays a dominant role in habit development.

The results of this study indicate that trust has a significant effect on repeat purchase intention. Van der Heijden et al. (2003) suggest that trust is a threshold variable. This means that once a certain evaluation level is reached, the variable no longer contributes to repeat purchase intentions. Our findings indicate that trust has not reached the threshold level in the minds of many of our respondents, and thus it is still a significant predictor of repeat purchase intentions.

Switching cost has a positive influence on repeat purchase intention. However, its effect is relatively weaker than habit and trust. A possible explanation is that there are other well-known and trustworthy online shopping stores that have similar website interface and shopping procedures and also offer good service. Switching to another new online seller will not involve hidden cost/charges and will not result in unexpected hassle. Therefore, switching cost is not a highly influential determinant of repeat purchase intention.

Habit has a positive influence on switching cost and repeat purchase intention. Habit also negatively moderated the influence of trust on repeat purchase intention. The results suggest that the stronger the habit, the lesser predictive power of trust on repeat purchase intention. Trust includes both emotional and cognitive dimensions. Habit is an automatic behavioral response triggered by a situational stimulus without being preceded by a cognitive analysis process. Therefore, when the online shopping behavior is repeatedly and satisfactorily executed and becomes habitual, the need to engage in cognitive evaluation of the online seller’s trustworthiness will be suppressed.

5.2 Implications for Theory

The extent of explained variance in satisfaction implies that utilitarian value and hedonic value are possibly among the most important antecedents of satisfaction. Satisfaction and familiarity are possibly among the most important antecedents of habit. From a seller’s perspective, it would be especially unfortunate to interpret our results to imply that utilitarian value is not unimportant in forming online shopping habit. The appropriate interpretation is that when the impact of hedonic value is taken into account, individuals put more emphasis on hedonic value than on utilitarian value when evaluating the formation of habit.

A major finding of the study is the moderating role of habit in the relationship between trust and repeat purchase intention. Our results suggest that the impact of trust on repeat purchase intention alters under contingency conditions. Trust should be a relatively good predictor of repeat purchase intention in an unstable context, but in a stable context, where the online shopping behavior is presumably under direct control of stimulus cues, its predictive validity should decline. It is important to search for moderating variables that turn simple main effects into more insightful conditional relationships. Evidence presented suggests that a deeper understanding of trust and repeat purchase intention is possible when interactions are taken into consideration.

In various studies on online repeat purchase, authors report that no significant relationship exits between trust and repeat purchase intention (e.g., Brown and Jayakody, 2008). Apparently, these studies contract the mainstream view established in the field. Adding habit as a moderator provides a
possible way to explain these cases. This study suggests that circumstance might exist under which this effect is partly or even entirely suppressed. In these cases, trust could no longer be regarded as a reliable predictor of repeat purchase intention. It would be interesting to know if, in the extreme case, when the suppressing effect of habit is essentially nullifying the effect of trust, the online shopping habit becomes the main driver of repeat purchase intention.

5.3 Implications for Practice
Satisfaction is the key to the formation of online shopping habit and utilitarian value and hedonic value are important drivers of satisfaction. Although utilitarian value is not the dominant predictor of satisfaction, providing utilitarian value is largely under the control of sellers. Online sellers should ensure that they are providing adequate utilitarian value to buyers before attempting to focus on other aspects of their website development. Shoppers having successfully obtained the desired products at a particular online store will remember the positive experience and thus are likely to be satisfactory. Although, convenience might be the inherent instead of dominant benefit of online shopping, online sellers should provide convenient ways for buyers to collect products and pay. In addition, online stores should provide wide selection of products and rich and up-to-date product information that are in demand to increase their competitive advantage. Obtaining useful product information and desired goods are, of course, a primary reason for experienced buyers to choose the Internet as an alternative purchasing channel. Thus, sellers should provide an online shopping environment characterized by a wide variety of products, rich and up-to-date product information, usually offering discount and gifts, and ease of shopping and accessibility. In addition, the significant influence of familiarity on habit suggests that online stores should provide user-friendly shopping procedures and product search mechanism.

The impact of hedonic value is relatively stronger than that of utilitarian value, and thus online sellers should pay more attention to the hedonic value that build consumers’ satisfaction, such as sensory stimulation, stress relief, role playing, bargain seeking, keeping up with new trends, and social interaction. Effectively delivering such benefits to buyers can also increase habit formation. To attract buyers who are motivated by different hedonic reasons, online sellers may need to focus on the experiential aspect of the Web site, positioning the shopping experience as an adventure or a chance to release stress or alleviate a negative mood (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003).

Online sellers should be cautious in employing switching costs as a mechanism for customer repeat purchase because switching costs might be neutralized by competing firms (for example, by providing similar Web site interface and shopping procedures) (White and Yanamandram, 2007). When customer dissatisfaction is an ongoing phenomenon, customers may remain due to high switching cost, but engage in coping behaviors (Jones et al., 2000) such as electronic word-of-mouth (EWOM) and electronic boycott (E-Boycott). Therefore, online sellers should ensure that they are providing adequate utilitarian value and hedonic value to increase customer satisfaction.

5.4 Limitations and Future Research
First, the results may have been impacted by self-selection bias. Our sample comprises only active online consumers. Individuals who had already ceased to purchase products from Yahoo!Kimo shopping center might have different perceptions. Therefore, the results should be interpreted as only explaining repeat purchase intentions of current online shopping customers. Whether the results can be generalized to non-customers or to disaffected customers will require additional research. Second, as the data are cross-sectional, all the statistically supported relationships can only be viewed as tentative and associational.

According to Gefen et al. (2003b), research on trust has identified a number of trust antecedents: knowledge-based trust, institution-based trust, calculative-based trust, cognition-based trust, and personality-based trust. Future research could verify whether those trust antecedents have direct influences on repeat purchase intention and whether habit moderates their influences.
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