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Abstract

Until now, the majority of the studies exploring motivation underlying housing choices have focussed predominantly on the calculative, economic and utilitarian aspects of a property. There is little work, if any, to date which has investigated motivation underlying consumer home choice in a comprehensive manner, mapping all of the definitive reasons that drive home choices. The main objective for this paper was to produce a theoretical model integrating the effects of motives on residential home choice. Using a photography technique known as ZMET, this study reveals a linkage between eight utilitarian and eleven emotion-based motives, also known as hedonic motives. This paper extends past studies by acknowledging the role emotions play in consumer home choice and their decision-making processes.
Introduction

Although people’s motivations for buying have been looked into rather extensively by academics in real estate (Baryla et al. 2000; Boehm 1982; Findsen 2005; Kendig 1984; Painter et al. 2001), the motivations for choosing a particular home over all available options have been less extensively examined. Very little is known about the motivation that drives people to put their money down for one particular house given the complex array of alternatives and home features. While Gibler and Nelson (2003) urge property researchers to “consider all aspects of non-financial decision factors” (Gibler and Nelson 2003, p.63), Sirgy, Grzeskowiak and Su (2005) noted that “research on motivational factors of housing preference and choice has been scarce” (Sirgy et al. 2005, p.330). More specifically, Coolen and Hoekstra (2001) noted that, “despite the vast amount of research on housing preferences, there seems to have been relatively little attention for underlying motivational micro-level factors such as goals, attitudes and values” (Coolen and Hoekstra 2001, p. 286). It is hence the aim of this paper to examine the motives involved in selecting from amongst alternatives, one particular home.

Literature Review

In many studies touching on motivations for home choice, the physical attributes of a house have been treated as motives for purchase. More often than not, the home is viewed as a bundle of benefits or utility that needs to be traded off against costs. These motives are utilitarian and functional in the sense that these home features are related to the core function of what a home is supposed to be. For example, Park and Lutz (1982) predicted motives for home choice in the form of twenty four basic attributes of homes, some of which included the number of bedrooms, fenced yard, age of home, recreational facilities and the size of garage by using decision plan nets (DPN). DPN is constructed based on a step-by-step interview where the respondent is asked to name in order of importance all attributes that play a role in evaluating the choice alternatives. A more elaborate explanation of the DPN is detailed in Park and Lutz (1981) but for the purpose of this paper, it is suffice to say that the DPN method that Park and Lutz (1982) used in their study assumed that consumers have one primary goal - to select a choice option that features a combination of physical housing attributes which yields the highest evaluation according to some utility function.

In support of this view, an empirical study undertaken with the assistance of the Dunedin City Council in New Zealand found that people do make their choices based exclusively on the utilitarian features of the property (Dennis 2006). The study which collated questionnaire responses from 770 Dunedin households, on attributes such as size of dwelling or section, parking, number of bedrooms, age of dwelling and income size, assumed that these were the sole factors that determine homebuyer’s choices.

An earlier study following a similar approach was conducted by Peter Rossini (1998). The study sought to establish the basic behaviours of home buyers in terms
of their search and purchase patterns, based on a survey of consumers who had recently purchased a property. The survey included a question in which the researcher listed eight main reasons for purchase, including beach location and close proximity to family and friends. Purchasers were asked to rank these in order of importance when deciding to purchase a property. It was not clear, however, how the researchers generated the eight reasons examined. It is possible that the predetermined list created by the researcher biased the findings – consumers were not given the chance to voice their own reasons. Thus, the consumer’s own motives underlying their choice may not have been discovered.

Relevant studies have even narrowed in on investigating the impact of one specific motive on house prices. These motives have included the location of the property (Frew and Wilson 2002), apartment floor numbers (Chau et al. 2001) and water views (Benson et al. 1998; Rodriguez and Sirmans 1994). While these studies have provided insights into specific areas, they have also been based on mathematical formulations with water views, floor numbers and house location represented by economic figures and numbers. This, coupled with the focus on a single factor has meant that other important motives may have been overlooked.

A further reason explored to explain home choice motivation is apartment numbers. Chau, Ma and Ho (2001) assumed that superstitious Chinese buyers would pay more for apartments on lucky floor numbers such as 8, 18 and 28. Hence, the “lucky” floor is turned into a mathematical variable known only as FL in an equation where (P) is the natural logarithm of actual transaction price and SA is the saleable floor area. Their datasets consisted of transaction records of 12,308 apartment units in a housing estate in Hong Kong. The analysis was done by evaluating numbers based on their formulated equation. It could be argued that superstition is an underlying non-economic factor that drives Chinese homebuyers to increase their bid for a house but the researchers chose to examine motivation from a structural rather than from a consumer perspective. A subjective factor such as “luckiness” is converted into a utilitarian attribute that can be equated to a certain amount of economic value. This methodology provides interesting information regarding the influence of house numbers on a consumer’s home choice but it also raises a major question about the potential of other less tangible motives that influence consumer home choice. It also does not answer questions as to whether consumers are aware of their decision to purchase homes with numbers.

Other researchers have also examined luck as a motive for paying high prices for their homes. Bourassa and Peng (1999) examined the concept of luck from the perspective of feng shui, literally translated from Chinese to mean wind and water. In this study, Bourassa and Peng adopted a quantitative technique known as hedonic price analysis which values all abstract constructs as utility-bearing attributes (Griliches 1971; Rosen 1974). House numbers were selected to represent variables for good and bad luck – three, six and eight were considered good while four was considered bad. It was concluded that a lucky number added between 2.4 and 4.8 percent more value to a property. The outcomes from the study also implied that lucky house numbers are motivations for why Chinese buyers are prepared to pay higher prices for their homes. It can be appreciated that this study highlighted an
important motive for people (from a particular culture) buying homes. The researchers have considered feng shui as an important aspect of consumer motivation underlying home choice. However, similar to Chau, Ma and Ho (2001), the fact that they focussed on only one factor means that they may have missed other important motives besides feng shui.

Location has been found to be an important pull motivation and determinant of a property’s value. Frew and Wilson (2002) collected data on 670 apartments in Portland, Oregon including rent, location and amenities. The driving distance to the city centre, highway and intersection between highways was plotted on a map to include variables on access to transportation. These distance variables were then processed using regression analysis. The findings showed people pay substantially less for apartments more than ten miles outside the city centre and concluded that there is a significant connection between apartment location and the prices people pay.

An indication that there may be more to “distance to town” that motivates people’s home choices is made in a study by Lindberg et al (1989) who examined the role of consumers’ belief-value structures as motivation in the context of residential choice. A list of twelve life values (comfort, excitement, family, freedom, happiness, health, inner harmony, leisure, money, pleasure, security and togetherness) on a 13-point scale ranging from -6 to +6 was given out to thirty six respondents. They were required to rate their perceived life values as well as another list consisting of twelve housing attributes (cost, size and age of property; distance to downtown, friends and relatives, recreation, schools and work; neighbourhood facilities; noise level; reputation and transportation). In each of these housing attributes, four different levels were constructed and given quantifiable definitions. For example, size of the house was given four levels of 102, 66, 50 or 40 square metres while the attribute neighbourhood facilities was given very good, rather good, rather poor and very poor. Five to ten days later, the respondents were presented with the same lists again and asked to rate how much each of the housing attributes facilitated the attainment of the twelve life values. Results were generated using computational analysis. The study found that the housing attributes believed to have the strongest impact on value fulfillment were size of the house, distance to recreation and transportation facilities and that these attributes have the largest impact on the attainment of comfort, freedom and family. In contrast, the attributes with the least rated impact were age of the home and distance to downtown. This finding seems to contradict the results found by Frew and Wilson (2002) discussed above. The study was limited however, by the fact that the respondents were students and not real home purchasers. It was felt that a different methodology design could have added to the richness of the data as it would have allowed the researchers to assess the “real” motivations that guide real homebuyers to their “actual” home choice.

The literature reviewed in this section as summarised in Table 1, shows that past research has been useful in identifying a selection of less tangible factors that underlie home purchase choices.
Table 1: Empirical Studies Exploring Motives in Consumer Home Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Utilitarian Motives</th>
<th>Hedonic Motives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Bourassa and Peng 1999)</td>
<td>House numbers</td>
<td>Not investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chau et al. 2001)</td>
<td>Apartment floor numbers</td>
<td>Not investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Coolen and Hoekstra 2001)</td>
<td>Number of bedrooms, size of kitchen, type of house, etc</td>
<td>Privacy, order, tradition, safety, enjoyment of nature, pleasure, comfort, freedom, independence, enjoyment of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dennis 2006)</td>
<td>Size of dwelling or section, parking, number of bedrooms, age of dwelling and income size.</td>
<td>Not investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frew and Wilson 2002)</td>
<td>Location of the property</td>
<td>Not investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lindberg et al. 1987)</td>
<td>Size of the house, distance to recreation and transportation facilities, etc</td>
<td>The attainment of comfort, freedom, and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Park and Lutz 1982)</td>
<td>24 basic attributes of homes, some of which include age of home, location, neighbourhood, resale value, size of home, tax amount, size of home, number of bedrooms, etc.</td>
<td>Not investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rossini 1998)</td>
<td>Low price, view/outlook, hills location, beach location, close to city, close to work, close to families, friends/relatives.</td>
<td>Not investigated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These studies have suggested that factors such as luck, superstition and views (which are subjective aspects of choice) are factors that consumers consider important when deciding on the home that they want to purchase. However, each study only concentrated on investigating the impact of one motivational factor (such as location or neighbourhood) on another real estate variable (such as house prices), rather than to map definitively all the factors that motivate a consumer’s home choice. Although having varied intentions, these studies treated motivational factors as utilitarian attributes - the focus on their impact on house prices restricted the insights they might have gained into consumers’ home buying process, their consumption experience and the motivations for their ultimate home choice. This focus may have led either to important attributes being missed from the study, or results concentrating on outcomes and attributes which are unimportant to the homebuyer. Within marketing, studies as early as 1924 have suggested that consumers do possess with them a set of hedonic, emotional desires that impact on their product choices (Copeland 1924). Yet, much of the existing research in real estate has tended to focus on how consumers are conscious, calculating individuals who evaluate the functional and utilitarian worth of products rationally.

The earliest attempt to examine hedonic motivation was found in a pilot study conducted by Coolen and van Montfort (2001) to uncover psychological factors that
“may tell us something about the meaning housing attributes have for people” and “their motivations for specific housing preferences” (Coolen and van Montfort 2001, p.3). The aim of the pilot study was to explore the feasibility of using means-end chain and laddering interviews in the study of preferences for housing attributes. Therefore, the means-end theory, its measurement, its analysis procedure and its theoretical perspectives were the emphasis in the discussion of this article rather than the results. However, the researchers did arrive at a general conclusion that people’s preferences for housing attributes are motivated by a significant range of reasons ranging from functional to psychosocial motives. The motives were listed as privacy, order, tradition, safety, enjoyment of nature, comfortable, pleasure, freedom, independence and the enjoyment of life.

The most recent studies highlighted a pertinent issue when examining home purchases – that of homebuyers’ emotions and their responses to emotional energies (Creagh and Munro 2007; Khoo and Ndubisi 2008). The articles highlighted that extant academic literature in housing choice has provided a biased picture by either discounting the role played by emotion or conceptualising emotion as an irrational construct that prompts unsustainable over-investment (Creagh and Munro 2007).

Munro and Smith’s (2008) study found that fear and desperation have provoked people to pay above the valuation for their homes. A total of 21 buyers in their study paid up to 10 percent more than the valuation price for their homes while a further 21 home purchasers paid between 10 to 32 percent more than the valuation price. Respondents in their study reported experiences such as, “go as high as we could to get something we wanted”, “just decided to bid what we could afford rather than what it seemed worth”, “make them an offer they can’t refuse”, “empty the piggy bank” (Creagh and Munro 2007p. 358). For these people, the economic factor of price and the rational information of market valuation “seemed to have no useful function” (Creagh and Munro 2007, p.358). While most studies attributed house price appreciation to economic factors, Munro and Smith (2008) have outlined some important social reasons and attributed the reasons for such phenomenon to the relationships between people and objects (Creagh and Munro 2007, p.363). The same study also outlined the homebuyers’ “feelings that override economic rationality” and concludes that what encourages people to pay a premium is their feeling that the property (not the price) is right.

This conclusion is consistent with the experiences echoed by the homebuyers in a pilot study conducted by Khoo and Ndubisi (2008): “Though we were very nervous, we decided to go with the bigger home. We simply took a gamble and hoped that we would have no problem making the payments”; “The home literally struck us … my husband and I. We both really liked it and were excited. We knew this was the place we wanted” and “We didn’t even go into the house. As soon as we saw it from the outside, we knew it was the one. We put an offer on the house without even looking inside” (Khoo and Ndubisi 2008, p.127). The descriptions from homebuyers during these interviews help to suggest that there may be other important constructs that real estate researchers need to address.
Meanwhile, the mainstream literature and the business press have already emphasised the significance of emotional experience and influence in the home-buying decision-making process (De Roos & Somers 2000; Fahy 2006; Hamilton 2006; Newland 2002). For instance, Dolf de Roos (2002), a reputable name in the New Zealand residential property investment field, recommends that sellers adopt numerous ways of improving the look of their properties by playing on their emotions, some of which includes putting up a new front fence, painting, putting in a new letter box, landscaping, putting up new curtains and even as far as changing the door knobs. Another prominent New Zealand investor, Olly Newland (2002), advises home sellers to spend money on “new switches and taps” rather than “on wiring and plumbing” because “most buyers are only interested in the shiny paint and chrome finish (p. 172).” This highlights the potential role of emotion as an interfering influence on the decision-making process and ultimately the consumer’s choice of home.

While there is adequate evidence that people stretch their banks to buy the homes they fall in love with (Creagh and Munro 2007; Khoo and Ndubisi 2008), it is significant that to date, the question of what prompts people to fall in love with the home still remains unanswered. The non-economic constructs that induce such feelings remain to be investigated and the non-calculative factors that trigger the “This is it!” feelings in consumer home choice have not yet been explored in academic research. There is a need for a more comprehensive examination of the multiple and varied hedonic reasons that motivate consumer home choice because a combination or interaction of these factors could contribute to the culmination of the consumer home choice. This paper intends to further existing work on home buyer motivation by incorporating all the possible factors that drive consumer home choice.

**Methodology**

The respondents were twelve potential home buyers who were sourced from open homes by real estate agents, mortgage brokers and an advertisement placed in the Staff Bulletin at the University of Otago. This sample size is similar to that employed in past research using ZMET which has generally included samples of eight to sixteen respondents (Christensen and Olson 2002; Lee et al. 2003; Sease 2005; Vorell et al. 2003). Moreover, while the sample size for this study was not determined in advance, a minimum of twelve interviews were planned in consultation with Professor Gerald Zaltman himself.

Two conditions were set to qualify home buyers as participants in this study: (1) the home buyer had to be looking to buy a home as a residence for themselves, that is, they were not buying a property as an investment; (2) the home buyer had to be looking to buy in the near future, that is, they were seriously considering purchasing a home. The first criterion was set to draw the distinction between home buyers and investors because investors may be motivated by different factors than are individuals buying a residential property. It also set the boundaries for the research and precluded investors’ decision-making from the study. The second condition ensured that only genuine home buyers who were currently making home choice decisions were included in the study. This criterion was evaluated through a brief
interview with participants to determine their goals for purchasing a home and their arrangements for financing the purchase.

Participants were asked to contact the researcher when they had placed an offer on a home or attended an auction for the purpose of bidding for a house. After placing an offer for a home, the respondents were then asked to take and/or collect eight to twelve photographs and/or pictures that represented their reasons for the choice of the house that they had chosen to purchase. The number of images (between eight and twelve) to be brought in by the participants was stipulated in ZMET, duplicated in past research (Catchings-Castello 2000; Christensen and Olson 2002; Lee et al. 2003; Sease 2005; Vorell et al. 2003) and confirmed through email communication with Zaltman. The photographs varied from respondent to respondent but many included nature-based images such as trees, water views, hills, mountains, lawns and flowers. Other photographs comprised family members, pets, buildings and items from their travel, just to name a few. These photographs were then used in an in-depth interview lasting between sixty and ninety minutes. During the interview, the ten core steps in implementing the ZMET procedure were followed. Table 2 outlines these steps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td><strong>Storytelling.</strong> Participant describes the content of each picture they have taken or brought. The interviewer from refrain from interpreting pictures during interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td><strong>Missed Images.</strong> Participant describes the picture(s) that he/she was unable to obtain and explains their relevance. Missed pictures may have important relevance too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td><strong>Sorting Task.</strong> Participant sorts pictures into meaningful groups and to provide a label or description for each pile. This helps to establish themes or constructs that are relevant to the participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td><strong>Construct Elicitation.</strong> A structured interview where basic constructs and their interconnections are elicited using images as stimuli. This involves a modified version of Kelly Repertory Grid technique and the laddering technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td><strong>The Most Representative Picture.</strong> Participant indicates which picture is most representative and gives reasons for the choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td><strong>Opposite Images.</strong> Descriptions are elicited of pictures that describe the opposite of the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td><strong>Sensory Images.</strong> Descriptions are elicited of what does and does not describe the concept in terms of colour, emotions, sound, smell, taste and touch. Sensory thoughts are images too and hence important to capture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td><strong>Mental Map.</strong> Participant creates a map or causal model using the constructs that have been elicited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9</td>
<td><strong>Summary Image.</strong> Participant creates a summary image or montage expressing the topic under study by using digital imaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 10</td>
<td><strong>Consensus Map.</strong> Researcher creates a map or causal model involving the most important constructs from the interview transcripts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from: Zaltman 1997*

**Findings and Discussion**

The main objective for this paper was to produce a theoretical model integrating the effects of motives on residential home choice. The steps in ZMET addressed this objective when Step Ten resulted in a map demonstrating all key motives as mentioned by the respondents in the study. Figure 1 illustrates this map.
Figure 1: Model Showing Utilitarian versus Hedonic Motives for Consumer Home Choice

- **Utilitarian Motives**
  - N = number of respondents interviewed, N=12
  - Connections are made by four or more respondents
  - The number to the left of the hyphen in the bottom set of numbers shows the number of times this construct was an origination point in a relationship with another construct
  - The number to the right of the hyphen shows the number of times this construct was a destination point in a relationship with another construct

- **Hedonic Motives**
  - N = number of respondents interviewed, N=12
  - Connections are made by four or more respondents
  - The number to the left of the hyphen in the bottom set of numbers shows the number of times this construct was an origination point in a relationship with another construct
  - The number to the right of the hyphen shows the number of times this construct was a destination point in a relationship with another construct
The main findings from this study are the nineteen key motives found to influence consumer home choice – eight were utilitarian and eleven were hedonic. The eight utilitarian constructs include: done up, potential, project, warmth, views, space, outside living and nature. Done up and project are bipolar, in that they are opposites. Potential although highly related to the house as a project, was also mentioned by respondents who bought done up properties with the plan to expand and add value. Potential therefore, is viewed as an economic factor. From the consensus map, it can be seen that except for potential which doubles as a start point as well as an end point, all eight constructs are beginning points leading onto other constructs. This means each of the eight constructs is utilitarian in nature because each was chosen with the intention to accomplish a functional or practical task. The utilitarian value of these constructs have already been confirmed by past property researchers. More specifically, the impact of these utilitarian constructs on house prices has been analysed. For example, properties with views have been studied in comparison to properties without and it was found that good views do fetch higher prices (Bourassa et al. 2003; Rodriguez and Sirmans 1994). The economic value of nature such as landscaping, trees and green areas have also been calculated and established (Des Rosiers et al. 2002; Luttik 2000; Morancho 2003). A house that is done up, upgraded or renovated is undeniably more expensive than houses that are not as the outlay for renovation would have been factored into the sale price. Likewise, the cost of insulation or heating appliances for warm houses, a deck or a patio for outside living, additional rooms and floor space can be estimated and priced accordingly.

A superficial analysis of the initial reasons provided by respondents to explain their home choice would suggest that utilitarian factors were driving home choice behaviour, but careful assessment revealed that many of these utilitarian factors were underpinned by hedonic motives. Space, for instance, embodies a calculative, economic factor because it is typically used to refer to the expanse of a surface of a three-dimensional area such as the size of the property, the number of bedrooms and garage space. In fact, existing property studies tend to interpret this motive based on economic theory using life cycle models. They have attributed reasons for space and expansion of space to economic reasons such as expansion of family members (Kendig 1984). This present study extends the economic view and argues that the underlying motives for space and the potential expansion and alteration of space are to create a sense of identity (through the opportunity to personalise the home and to indulge in one’s hobby and activity); to enjoy the company of friends and families; to replicate past experiences (the construct of space is linked to autobiographical memories) and to create a sanctuary for themselves (through having privacy, peace and quiet). In addition, the underlying motive for the construct of ‘nature’ was associated with the desire to be comfortable, to have fun, to seek solace, to have privacy, to indulge in the things they like to do and to just be themselves. The consensus map reveals that the motives for home choice are hedonic and represent a drive in support of higher-order goals such as the desire to be peaceful, to be relaxed and to enjoy one’s privacy. Thus, the findings illustrate that a relationship exists between people’s houses and themselves and the homebuyers saw their home choice as a symbol that reinforces the way they wanted to live.

Another important feature of the consensus map is the overall end state, which is a construct that serves as a destination point for most other constructs in the map. In this study, the major
overarching goal as can be seen in Figure 1, is autobiographical memories or memories of past personal experiences (Baumgartner et al. 1992). It is an overall end construct that four other constructs are linked to. Every home buyer, to lesser or greater degrees, indicated that they bought a home because fundamentally, it was related to what they had or did not have in the past. This means that the construct autobiographical memories is bipolar in nature, that is, both positive and negative memories drive people to their home choice in the present. The fact that autobiographical memories is an overall end state also suggests that autobiographical memories may be a deep-seated motive that underpins many of the other motives mentioned by respondents. Research in psychology has shown that understanding people’s earliest memories and defining memories provide insights to their judgment process (Bruner 2003; Mosak and Di Pietro 2006; Singer 2004). Consumer researchers have taken this further by examining the effect of consumer’s past memories on the consumer-brand relationship (Braun-LaTour et al. 2007; Sierra and McQuitty 2007) but its influence in the decision-making process for the consumption of homes have not been identified until this study.

Implications and Conclusion

From a practical standpoint, this study contributes by examining the value of residential property from the perspective of consumer behaviour and argues that underlying motives such as human emotion can significantly disrupt the many long-established models of property value assessments commonly used in today’s market. When evaluating and estimating the value of real estate, the focus of value has always been in the application of product settings. This conceptualisation usually adopts an economic approach where a property’s value is notably determined by its utilitarian attributes such as age, land size, location and number of bedrooms. Gibler and Nelson (2003) have already warned that a valuation of property based on solely physical attributes may fail to capture the value buyer places on the ability of the property to satisfy non-financial and non-physical needs (Gibler and Nelson 2003). This paper has demonstrated that although a house may bring economic benefit of capital gains, it is the underlying hedonic benefits of these utilitarian attributes that consumers value. Thus, the subjective nature of value should be recognised and equated with the overall assessment of worth considering all relevant evaluative criteria. In sum, this study has stressed the impact of human and emotional factors in residential real estate valuation.

The development of a new model not only describes and explains the motives that drive consumer home choice but also conceptualizes the link between eight utilitarian and eleven emotion-based motives. The map demonstrated that although consumer motives comprise both utilitarian and hedonic factors, it seems as if hedonic motives were a more dominant trigger for home choice because all utilitarian motives in the consensus map ultimately lead to a hedonic motive. The model generated by the consensus map is by no means universal but its results provide a richer understanding of an important purchase in the consumers’ lives. It is hoped that this model gives future researchers a framework to access meanings necessary for understanding homebuyer choice. In a larger context, this model will also allow researchers closer examination of the mechanics of these influences on the housing market and its demands.
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