

A Study of Consumers' Upgrade Intention of High-technology Products

By

Winn Wing-Yiu Chow

BEng(Hons) (Electrical Engineering), BSc (Computer Science)
The University of Melbourne, Australia

MSc (Electrical Engineering)
California Institute of Technology, USA

Master of Business Administration
The University of New South Wales, Australia

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Business Administration

Newcastle Business School

Faculty of Business and Law

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE

September 2016

Statement of Originality

*The thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library**, being made available for loan and photocopying subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.*

***Unless an Embargo has been approved for a determined period.*

Candidate Signature: _____

Date: 12 Sept 2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Alicia Kulczynski, for her continuous support, encouragement, and advice. She was so kind to offer me advice well before she was officially my supervisor. Her guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis.

Special thanks go to Ass. Prof. Suzanne Ryan. She is one of the kindest persons I have ever met. She not only guided me writing the research proposal, but also introduced Alicia to me.

I have to thank my wife, Nicole Lee, and my son, Chow Yan Yu, for their love and patience. They have always filled my heart with joy.

Finally, I would like to thank all my DBA classmates for their peer support. Without their laughter, this journey would not be as fun.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| Statement of Originality | iii |
| Acknowledgements | v |
| Table of Contents | vii |
| List of Figures | xi |
| List of Tables | xiii |
| Synopsis | xv |
| Abstract | xvii |
| Chapter 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1. Background | 2 |
| 1.2. Adoption and Upgrade of High-technology Products by Consumers..... | 6 |
| 1.3. Research Justification..... | 9 |
| 1.4. Aim of the Research..... | 12 |
| 1.5. Research Questions | 12 |
| 1.6. Proposed Conceptual Framework | 13 |
| 1.7. Research Methodology..... | 15 |
| 1.8. Data Analysis | 15 |
| 1.9. Research Findings | 16 |
| 1.10. Research Significance | 17 |
| 1.10.1. Theoretical Contribution | 17 |
| 1.10.2. Practical Contribution | 19 |
| 1.11. Limitations and Directions for Future Research | 21 |
| 1.12. Thesis Structure..... | 23 |
| Chapter 2 Literature Review..... | 25 |
| 2.1. High-technology Products..... | 25 |
| 2.2. Technology Acceptance and Use..... | 27 |
| 2.3. Technology Acceptance Model | 28 |
| 2.4. Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology | 32 |
| 2.5. Extended Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology | 36 |
| 2.6. Technology Upgrade | 40 |
| 2.7. Satisfaction..... | 46 |
| 2.8. Research Questions | 53 |
| 2.9. Hypotheses | 54 |
| 2.10. Conceptual Framework | 56 |
| Chapter 3 Methodology | 59 |
| 3.1. Research Paradigm..... | 59 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| 3.2. | Research Method..... | 60 |
| 3.3. | Research Design..... | 61 |
| 3.4. | Survey Method..... | 64 |
| 3.5. | Sampling Design..... | 65 |
| 3.6. | Target Population..... | 66 |
| 3.7. | Sampling Frame..... | 66 |
| 3.8. | Sampling Technique..... | 66 |
| 3.9. | Sample Size..... | 68 |
| 3.10. | Questionnaire Design..... | 70 |
| 3.10.1. | Questionnaire Section 1..... | 70 |
| 3.10.2. | Questionnaire Section 2..... | 73 |
| 3.10.3. | Questionnaire Section 3..... | 74 |
| 3.10.4. | Questionnaire Section 4..... | 75 |
| 3.11. | Reliability and Validity..... | 76 |
| 3.12. | Review of Questionnaire Items..... | 77 |
| 3.13. | Data Preparation..... | 77 |
| 3.14. | Method of Analysis..... | 78 |
| 3.15. | Descriptive Analysis..... | 78 |
| 3.16. | Normality Testing..... | 79 |
| 3.17. | Confirmatory Factor Analysis..... | 79 |
| 3.17.1. | Goodness-of-fit of the Measurement Model..... | 80 |
| 3.17.2. | Construct Validity of the Measurement Model..... | 81 |
| 3.18. | Update of the Measurement Model..... | 83 |
| 3.19. | Structural Equation Modelling Analysis..... | 84 |
| 3.19.1. | Goodness-of-fit of the Structural Model..... | 85 |
| 3.19.2. | Relationships between the Constructs..... | 85 |
| 3.20. | Moderation..... | 85 |
| 3.21. | Multi-sample Confirmatory Factor Analysis..... | 86 |
| 3.21.1. | Goodness-of-fit of the Totally Free Multiple Group Model..... | 86 |
| 3.21.2. | Goodness-of-fit Measures and $\Delta\chi^2$ | 87 |
| 3.22. | Multi-group Structural Equation Modelling..... | 87 |
| 3.22.1. | Relationships between the Constructs across the Two Groups..... | 88 |
| 3.23. | Ethics..... | 88 |
| Chapter 4 | Data Analysis..... | 91 |
| 4.1. | Data Preparation..... | 91 |
| 4.2. | Descriptive Analysis of the Participants..... | 91 |
| 4.3. | Normality Assessments..... | 94 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----|
| 4.4. | Confirmatory Factor Analysis | 95 |
| 4.4.1. | Overall Model Fit | 97 |
| 4.4.2. | Goodness-of-fit Measures | 98 |
| 4.4.3. | Construct Validity | 98 |
| 4.4.3.1. | Convergent Validity | 99 |
| 4.4.3.2. | Discriminant Validity | 100 |
| 4.5. | Updated Measurement Model | 101 |
| 4.5.1. | Goodness-of-fit Measures | 104 |
| 4.5.2. | Construct Validity | 105 |
| 4.5.2.1. | Convergent Validity | 105 |
| 4.5.2.2. | Discriminant Validity | 106 |
| 4.6. | Structural Equation Modelling | 106 |
| 4.6.1. | Goodness-of-fit Measures | 108 |
| 4.6.2. | Relationships between the Constructs | 109 |
| 4.7. | Moderation | 110 |
| 4.8. | Multi-sample Confirmatory Factor Analysis | 111 |
| 4.8.1. | Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Totally Free Multiple Group Model 112 | |
| 4.8.2. | Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Constrained Model and $\Delta\chi^2$ | 113 |
| 4.9. | Multi-group Structural Equation Modelling | 114 |
| 4.9.1. | Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Unconstrained Model and $\Delta\chi^2$ | 114 |
| 4.9.2. | Relationships between the Constructs across the Two Groups | 116 |
| 4.10. | Results of Hypothesis Tests | 118 |
| Chapter 5 | Discussion and Conclusion | 123 |
| 5.1. | Discussion of Results | 123 |
| 5.1.1. | Performance Expectancy | 124 |
| 5.1.2. | Effort Expectancy | 125 |
| 5.1.3. | Social Influence | 126 |
| 5.1.4. | Facilitating Conditions | 127 |
| 5.1.5. | Hedonic Motivation | 128 |
| 5.1.6. | Price Value | 130 |
| 5.1.7. | Satisfaction with the Current High-technology Product | 131 |
| 5.1.8. | Satisfaction with the Technology That Supports the Current High-technology Product | 132 |
| 5.2. | Concluding Remarks | 134 |
| 5.2.1. | Factors for Consumers' Upgrade Intention Towards High-technology Products | 135 |

| | | |
|--------|---|-----|
| 5.2.2. | Relative Importance of Factors for Consumers' Upgrade Intention... | 137 |
| 5.2.3. | Relevance of UTAUT2 for the Explanation of Consumers' Upgrade Intention | 139 |
| 5.3. | Implications..... | 141 |
| 5.3.1. | Theoretical Contributions | 141 |
| 5.3.2. | Practical Implications..... | 145 |
| 5.4. | Limitations and Directions for Future Research | 148 |
| 5.5. | Conclusion | 150 |
| | Appendices..... | 153 |
| | References..... | 175 |

List of Figures

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 1.1 Proposed Technology Upgrade Model | 14 |
| Figure 2.1 TAM..... | 30 |
| Figure 2.2 UTAUT Model..... | 35 |
| Figure 2.3 UTAUT2 Model..... | 38 |
| Figure 2.4 Proposed Technology Upgrade Model | 57 |
| Figure 3.1 Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 80 |
| Figure 3.2 Structural Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 84 |
| Figure 4.1 Participants' Gender..... | 92 |
| Figure 4.2 Participants' Age..... | 93 |
| Figure 4.3 Participants' Recency of Purchase (in Months)..... | 94 |
| Figure 4.4 Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 96 |
| Figure 4.5 Standardised Factor Loadings and Squared Multiple Correlations of the Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model | 97 |
| Figure 4.6 Updated Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model with the Deletion of the Items EE1, FC4 and SAT3 | 103 |
| Figure 4.7 Standardised Factor Loadings of the Updated Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model | 104 |
| Figure 4.8 Structural Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 107 |
| Figure 4.9 Standardised Path Coefficients of the Structural Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 108 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 3.1 Measuring Items for Performance Expectancy | 71 |
| Table 3.2 Measuring Items for Effort Expectancy | 71 |
| Table 3.3 Measuring Items for Social Influence | 71 |
| Table 3.4 Measuring Items for Facilitating Conditions | 72 |
| Table 3.5 Measuring Items for Hedonic Motivation | 72 |
| Table 3.6 Measuring Items for Price Value | 72 |
| Table 3.7 Measuring Items for Satisfaction with the Current High-Technology Product | 73 |
| Table 3.8 Measuring Items for Satisfaction with the Technology That Supports a High-Technology Product | 74 |
| Table 3.9 Measuring Items for Upgrade Intention | 74 |
| Table 3.10 Measuring Items for Demographic Information | 75 |
| Table 3.11 Measuring Item for Recency of Purchase | 75 |
| Table 3.12 Goodness-of-fit Measures | 81 |
| Table 3.13 Summary of the Standards and Their Sources to be Used for the Assessment of the Construct Validity of the Measurement Model | 83 |
| Table 4.1 Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 98 |
| Table 4.2 CR and Discriminant Validity (AVE and Squared Correlations) of the Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 100 |
| Table 4.3 Construct Validity Measures of the Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 101 |
| Table 4.4 Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Updated Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 105 |
| Table 4.5 CR and Discriminant Validity (AVE and Squared Correlations) of the Updated Measurement Model for the Technology Upgrade Model | 106 |
| Table 4.6 Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Structural Model for the Technology Upgrade Model..... | 109 |
| Table 4.7 Standardised Path Coefficients, <i>t</i> Values, <i>p</i> Values and Variance-explained Estimate of Upgrade Intention | 109 |
| Table 4.8 Participants' Recency of Purchase | 111 |
| Table 4.9 Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Totally Free Multiple Group Model | 112 |
| Table 4.10 Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Constrained Model | 113 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 4.11 $\Delta\chi^2$ between the Totally Free Multiple Group Model and the Constrained Model..... | 113 |
| Table 4.12 Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Structural Model with all the Path Coefficients Estimated Separately for the Two Groups | 115 |
| Table 4.13 Goodness-of-fit Measures of the Structural Model with all the Path Coefficients Constrained to be Equal for the Two Groups | 115 |
| Table 4.14 $\Delta\chi^2$ between the Structural Model with Unconstrained Path Coefficients and the Structural Model with Constrained Path Coefficients | 116 |
| Table 4.15 Standardised Path Coefficients, <i>t</i> Values, <i>p</i> Values and Variance-explained Estimate of Upgrade Intention for the Recency of Purchase RECENT Group | 116 |
| Table 4.16 Standardised Path Coefficients, <i>t</i> Values, <i>p</i> Values and Variance-explained Estimate of Upgrade Intention for the Recency of Purchase OLD Group..... | 117 |
| Table 4.17 Hypotheses 1–6 and a Summary of the Results | 119 |
| Table 5.1 Summary of the Results | 135 |
| Table 5.2 Relative Importance of Factors for Consumers' Upgrade Intention | 137 |
| Table 5.3 UTAUT2 for the Explanation of Consumers' Use and Upgrade... | 139 |

Synopsis

Consumers' upgrading of high-technology products rapidly grows in importance, but is still under-researched. This research aims to investigate the consumer upgrading intentions relating to high-technology products. It expands the prior research on technology acceptance and use in the information systems literature, and consumer upgrade behaviour in the marketing literature, to propose a technology upgrade model. The model extends the most recent extended unified theory of acceptance and use of technology model (UTAUT2) and incorporates two different concepts of satisfaction: satisfaction with a high-technology product, and satisfaction with the underlying technology of a high-technology product. Recency of purchase is hypothesized to moderate the effects of consumer beliefs about a high-technology product on consumer upgrade intentions. Results from a quantitative, cross-sectional study involving an anonymous questionnaire survey of a sample of 410 degree and sub-degree university students in Hong Kong provided empirical support for the model. The results showed that the model is more useful and powerful than the UTAUT2 model for explaining consumer upgrade intentions. The model explained 46.4% and 57.8% of the variation in upgrade intentions for consumers who had purchased a smartphone less than or equal to 12 months previously, and for consumers who had purchased a smartphone more than 12 months previously respectively. This research makes several significant theoretical contributions. Firstly, it extends the generalisability of the UTAUT2 from a consumer acceptance and use context to a consumer upgrade context. Secondly, it explains the contradictory result on the effect of satisfaction on consumer upgrade intentions in prior research. Most significantly, this research showed that the two different concepts of satisfaction regarding a high-technology product were two of the most significant

factors that explain consumers' upgrade of technology. Lastly, it reveals that a technology upgrade decision is similar to a technology acceptance decision when recency of purchase is old, but is more similar to a technology continued use decision when a purchase had been made recently (that is, 12 months or less). This research also indicates several practical implications for marketing managers. Marketers are advised to focus on hedonic motivation in order to attract consumers who made an earlier purchase to upgrade. Marketers should also focus less on price competition but more on product differentiation based on innovation and customer support services to promote upgrades.

Abstract

Consumers are adopting new technologies more readily and replacing high-technology products with improved versions more frequently. This phenomenon is most apparent regarding smartphone adoption and upgrading. Although substantial theoretical and empirical research has been undertaken to explain users' acceptance and use of technology, consumers' upgrading of high-technology products remains largely under-researched.

This research investigates the consumer upgrading intentions relating to high-technology products. The study will undertake this through formulating a technology upgrade model that expands the most recent extended unified theory of acceptance and use of technology model. This study will incorporate three different concepts: satisfaction with a high-technology product, satisfaction with the underlying technology of a high-technology product, and recency of purchase. A quantitative, cross-sectional study involving an anonymous questionnaire survey was conducted on a sample of 410 degree and sub-degree university students in Hong Kong. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to assess the measurement model validity of the technology upgrade model. Structural equation modelling analysis with multi-group analysis was used to assess the structural model validity of the technology upgrade model, the relationships between the constructs, and the moderating effect of recency of purchase. Empirical support is evident for the proposed technology upgrade model's applicability to the consumer upgrade context. The variance explained in consumer upgrade intentions was substantial. The model explained 46.4% of the variation in consumer upgrade intentions for consumers who had purchased a smartphone less than or equal to 12 months previously; this was 57.8% when the purchase had been made more than 12

months previously. This suggests that the proposed technology upgrade model is useful and powerful for explaining consumer upgrade intentions regarding high-technology products.

The major findings from testing the proposed technology upgrade model reveal the following:

1. The proposed technology upgrade model (as a development of the extended unified theory of acceptance and use of technology model, incorporating satisfaction and recency of purchase) is relevant and powerful for explaining consumer upgrade intentions relating to high-technology products.
2. Prior research on the extended unified theory of acceptance and use of technology model suggests that seven significant factors influence consumer acceptance and use intention (Venkatesh, Thong, & Xu, 2012). In contrast, this research shows that only four factors—effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating conditions and hedonic motivation—are significant in relation to consumer technology upgrades.
3. This research verifies that two different concepts of satisfaction relate to consumer technology upgrades. These are satisfaction with the current high-technology product, and satisfaction with the technology that supports the current high-technology product. While consumers who are dissatisfied with their current high-technology product are more likely to upgrade, satisfaction with the technology that supports the current high-technology product actually influences upgrading intentions. This research shows that these satisfaction-related concepts are two of the most significant factors that explain consumer technology upgrades.

4. This research also shows that consumers made significantly different considerations regarding upgrading decisions when recency of purchase was greater than 12 months and less than or equal to 12 months. When recency of purchase was greater than 12 months, consumers were driven to upgrade more strongly by effort expectancy, social influence and hedonic motivation. However, these consumers were not driven by facilitating conditions. When recency of purchase was less than or equal to 12 months, consumers who were satisfied with their current high-technology product were reluctant to upgrade. However, those who were more satisfied with the technology supporting their current high-technology product were more attracted to upgrades linked to gaining further benefits from the technology.

This research seeks to identify the significant factors that influence consumer upgrading intentions regarding high-technology products. This research reveals that the proposed technology upgrade model incorporating satisfaction and recency of purchase is more applicable and powerful than the extended unified theory of acceptance and use of technology model for explaining consumer upgrading intentions regarding high-technology products. Additionally, the research results suggest that a technology upgrade decision is similar to a technology acceptance decision when recency of purchase is greater than 12 months, but is more similar to a technology continued use decision when recency of purchase is less than or equal to 12 months.

This research indicates several practical implications for marketing managers of consumer technology vendors in product design, promotion, pricing and customer support. The findings show that consumers who wait longer to make an upgrade perceive hedonic motivation as vital. Hence, marketers are advised to focus on the

development of new features or the 'look and feel' that will make the usage experience enjoyable for these customers. Consumers are increasingly regarding high-technology products as essential. Therefore, consumers may become insensitive to price when considering an upgrade. Marketing managers should focus less on price competition and more on product differentiation. Finally, only consumers who are satisfied with using a technology but are no longer satisfied with their current high-technology product will consider upgrading to an improved product. In evaluating consumer satisfaction and potential for an upgrade, marketing managers must measure not only consumer satisfaction with the current high-technology product, but also their satisfaction with the technology that supports the product.