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Abstract

As an online and offline integrated service of refund, replacement, and after-sales service, omnichannel is placing itself as a major service used in the online shopping market, as efficiency and an integrated operation system develop according to channel integration due to ICT development. Centered on young people who have recently put importance on in-store experience and direct experience, offline pickup service is reinforced beyond online delivery. This study aims to analyze the effects of a distribution company's brand factors on customer consumption value and satisfaction targeting the omnichannel-based pickup service. The research model was designed to find out whether brand image, identity, attachment, and trust factors affect consumption satisfaction factors through the intervention of emotional and functional consumption value factors. This study targeted 324 consumers using Korea's omnichannel-based pickup service and carried out a questionnaire survey. According to the analysis result, the brand image and brand identity had a positive (+) effect on the emotional value and functional value. Brand attachment and brand trust positively affected emotional value but the hypothesis on functional value was rejected. Hence, brand factors were confirmed to work on improving a consumer's emotional value effectively.

INTRODUCTION

According to Euro Monitor, it was predicted that the global e-commerce market would continue a high-speed growth of 14.4% on average annually for the next five years, so the market ratio is forecasted to reach 19.4% within the retail distribution market. Because contactless consumption has become a daily routine since COVID-19, the growth of e-commerce is projected to accelerate. Therefore, companies have adopted diverse distribution methods such as buy online, pick up in-store (BOPIS), in which consumers pick up goods that have been bought online, or drive through in which goods are received while being in a car. The companies are responding to increased demand and customer needs in such a way (Levenburg, 2005; Verhoef et al., 2007).

Distribution companies offering a smooth customer experience, in which consumers can order and pick up products and use follow-up service without channel restrictions, becomes a key to ensuring competitiveness. Omnichannel users showing order and purchase behavior by frequenting on/offline can use online and offline organically in using information and purchase path. Consequently, the existing competition concept has been changed to a type of coexisting collaboration. As a result, the overall growth of the distribution market can be expected (Fei, 2013), which entails positive effects, including time
and cost savings, conveniences, and efficiency from the consumer perspective. Buy online and pick up in-store (BOPIS) through which goods ordered online can be picked up in a close offline store according to the invigoration of omnichannel is being expanded. The customer-cognitive value of BOPIS is higher by more than 20% compared to online customers (Chatterjee, 2010).

In the omnichannel-based online shopping process, brands having higher brand trust take up more market share. Dorman (2013) implied that critical factors of the brand in online shopping are credibility and professionalism/expertise. Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) analyzed the most influential brand trust concept. Likewise, consumers may select things they intuitively select or, through a careful thinking system, when they encounter shopping selection alternatives. If intuitive preference is strongly formed, brand preference affects selection because a relatively superior alternative exists within goods and services selection alternatives (Devaraj et al., 2002; Bilgicer et al., 2015; Gensler et al., 2012; Pauwels et al., 2011).

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

1.1. Omnichannel-based pickup service

Omnichannel was introduced in the “Mobile Retailing Blueprint 2.0” of the U.S. National Retail Federation (NRT) in January 2011 for the first time. Omnichannel is a coinage combining a prefix “omni” and a word meaning distribution path “channel.” Basically, omnichannel is a service through which consumers can search and buy goods over various channels, including online, offline, and mobile environments. Omnichannel means a consumption environment enabling consumers to feel that they use the same environment in any channel by combining each distribution channel’s characteristics (Wang et al., 2015). This means an ascending integration of customer interaction and communication to create a consistent brand experience, regardless of the channel, platform, and purchasing stage in the sales process (Cummins et al., 2016).

Unlike distribution companies’ existing strategy, which is multi-channel and cross-channel, the diverse information channels and distribution channels affecting consumer behavior are organically integrated and operated in omnichannel. Omnichannel provides the consistency of varieties of customer experiences alongside an increase in shopping convenience and consumer needs. Naturally, it connects with purchase, ensuring differentiated competitiveness and enhancing channel efficiency (Lewis et al., 2014). Omnichannel service enables consumers to buy immediately offline products that they looked for online. The service guides consumers to buy a product out of stock in one offline store that the consumers visited in another offline store nearby. The service may also deliver the product in another store to the consumers’ homes. Omnichannel service makes it possible for a consumer to pick up the desired product in a store close to his/her home or the product to be delivered to the consumer’s home, without carrying the product to the consumer’s home, when he/she wants to buy his/her desired product in an offline store.

An example of omnichannel service is that a product a consumer wants is delivered from a store closest to the consumer’s residential area, or the consumer may pick up the product in the store when a consumer buys a product online (Fulgoni, 2014). For refund, replacement, and after-sales service, consumers may receive an on/offline integrated service. Bell et al. (2015) asserted that customer’s purchasing experience should be enhanced by offering a BOPIS service as a priority task in carrying out omnichannel service. According to Lee (2015), the BOPIS service in the U.S. rose 3% in 2015, compared to 2014, while online delivery service fell 7% due to BOPIS service’s advantage of no need to pay transportation costs and the quick collection of goods. A UPS report showed that cases in which consumers visit a store, to collect the customer-ordered goods and then buy other products additionally, reached 45%. In addition, it said the customer value recognized by customers in BOPIS service is more than 20% higher than customers buying online (Chatterjee, 2010).

Omnichannel provides the same purchasing experience offline, so customers can use both the advantages of online and offline channels (Adobe Analytics,
As the BOPIS service through which a consumer places an order online and collects the ordered products in an offline store is recently increasing, it may be used as a means to reinforce the competitiveness of offline stores that weaken within the market through the following: improvement of brand loyalty, increase in on-demand and shopping experience, and connection online beyond the expansion of customer interactions via omnichannel pickup service diversification (Lim & Dubinsky, 2004).

Consequently, companies should consider service quality improvement paying attention to consumers’ functional and emotional values and differentiated pickup service channel consolidation. Brand effect affects service satisfaction and emotional value affects continuous use intention in omnichannel pickup service, thus there is a need to consider marketing strategy for service brand consolidation and consumers’ emotional value improvement beyond technical approach.

1.2. Omnichannel-based shopping and brand

As channel diversification and the means to communicate with customers increase due to information and communication technology development, companies consolidate strategies that may strengthen brand experience. Channels have become a means enabling consumers to experience integrated brand experience and publicize products for consumers to buy the products (Kotler et al., 2016). Regarding consumer-brand relationships on omnichannel brands, consumers can interact with brands through consumers’ direct brand experience such as showrooming, reverse showrooming, and morooming, while the relationship may develop and be maintained through trust and emotional reactions (Keng et al., 2007).

Lim and Kim (2018) reported that consumers’ experience through omnichannel brands is different qualitatively in comparison with many factors of existing channels. Omnichannel provides a consistent experience to consumers by operating channels in an integrated way, different from the existing single-, multi-, and cross-channel situations, through omnichannel as part to take a note at corporate strategic level (Frazer & Stiehler, 2014). In other words, consumers can interact with a brand through their direct omnichannel brand experience, and the relationship can be developed and maintained through trust and emotional reactions (Gao & Su, 2016).

Experience from a brand perspective focuses on consumer experience acquired through their experience of a firm’s marketing stimulation. It is regarded as the 21st century’s marketing strategy making consumers highly loyal customers by steadily instilling product and brand image into a consumer’s mind through unique services or events, in addition to product sales in a firm’s marketing activities (Schröder & Zaharia, 2008). Min (2016) reported that brand experience through cognition, emotion, and relations, which are brand experience via websites, is a key factor for brand commitment through brand attitude and brand attachment. Um et al. (2012) insisted that loyalty and repeat purchase from the attitude aspect and loyalty from behavioral aspect such as participatory behavior increase as brand identification goes up. In a study on the consumer-brand relationship, Keller (2001) said that brand identification is formed if trust is shaped through experience on the brand. Meanwhile, Sung and Campbell (2009) asserted that consumer-brand relationship increases through interaction.

As shown in the previous studies, brand recognition affects the recognized value or attitude on shopping among consumers who buy products online and pick them up in offline stores. In the purchased product supply/demand channel, the delivery service of Internet shopping has been discussed as a key issue (Verhoef et al., 2015). The reason is that the accuracy, speed, and convenience of delivery services affect brand loyalty and consumer satisfaction towards online shopping companies. However, the pick-up service is activated beyond the delivery service, so the pick-up service needs to reinforce consumer satisfaction and loyalty through brand interaction.

1.3. Brand effects, consumption value, and service satisfaction

Based on the above research model, this study set such four factors as brand image, identity, attachment, and trust as the brand effect factors, composed consumption value as emotional and
functional values, and set the following hypotheses based on the relevant previous studies.

Brand image refers to subjective association or emotion on service attributes and can be a complicated concept shaped in a consumer’s mind (Faircloth et al., 2001). Brand image is a subjective and psychological result shaped by consumers’ emotional inner state, so it may be formed as a positive or a negative image of goods or services. An image recognized cannot be easily changed and, therefore, it is a significant factor for the differentiation of companies (Salinas et al., 2009). Brand image may directly affect consumer’s consumption value.

Brand identity is a concept in which diverse factors affecting consumer recognition formation on brand are integrated. Brand identity can mean the homogeneity, conformity, unity, identity, and independence that a brand makes in a consumer’s mind (Aaker, 1991). Madhavaram et al. (2005) recognized brand identity as part of brand assets and saw the integrated brand sensing positioning or individuality recognized by consumers as brand identity. Brand identity may directly affect consumers’ consumption value and behavior in the process of using products and services or in the process of buying them (Srivastava, 2011).

Brand attachment means an emotional commitment to any particular emotion on a brand (Japutra et al., 2014). The starting point of studies on attachment towards a specific brand can be found from an attachment theory of psychology (Dolbec & Chebat, 2013). Brand attachment is indicated by the intensity of the consumer’s cognitive and emotional solidarity (Bidmon, 2017). Attachment to a specific brand affects consumers from a psychological interaction aspect as indicated in brand consumption behavior.

Brand trust becomes basic in constructing the positive relationship between companies and consumers and draws consumers’ commitment and loyalty to the brand (Sung & Kim, 2010). Consumers rely on brand trust in decision-making, such as product purchases (Ha, 2004). When looking at previous studies, if consumer trust towards a specific brand is constructed, it is connected to positive evaluation and an intention to purchase; therefore, the importance of trust is emphasized (Chinomona, 2016).

Finally, consumption value is the expression of a basic desire and an objective that a consumer wants to achieve, and it is a belief leading a consumer’s thinking and behavior. The consumer value can be divided into functional and emotional values (Wang et al., 2013). Consumption value can be seen as part of an individual’s consumption behavior and can also be regarded as standard, belief, and trust where consumers judge and act. Consumption value factors enormously affect satisfaction, loyalty, and mouth-to-mouth intention, leading to consumers’ consumption behavior (Arslanagic-Kalajdzic et al., 2020; Sousa & Voss, 2006; Holbrook, 2006; Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Anderson & Fornell, 2000).

Based on the theoretical basis above, the following hypotheses were set:

H1: Brand image on omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect consumption value.

H2: Brand image on omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect functional consumption value.

H3: Brand identity on the omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect emotional consumption value.

H4: Brand identity on the omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect functional consumption value.

H5: Brand attachment to omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect emotional consumption value.

H6: Brand attachment on omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect functional consumption value.

H7: Brand trust towards omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect emotional consumption value.
H8: Brand trust towards omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect functional consumption value.

H9: The emotional value of omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect service satisfaction.

H10: The functional value of omnichannel-based pickup service upon online shopping will positively affect service satisfaction.

2. METHOD

2.1. Research model

This study empirically analyzed the effects of online shopping brand effect factors on consumption value and shopping customer service satisfaction using the omnichannel-based pick-up service when consumers do online shopping. This study composed four brand effect factors, namely brand image, brand identity, brand attachment, and brand trust, as the independent variables. Consumption value was composed of emotional and functional values, and customer service satisfaction served as the independent variable. Through this, a research model, as shown in Figure 1, was designed.

2.2. Measurement variable and data collection

This study composed the questions as shown in Table 1 through the previous studies to analyze the hypotheses. These were measured using a five-point Likert scale from one point, “Strongly disagree” to five points, “Strongly agree.”

This study carried out an online questionnaire survey targeting general consumers in their 20s to 50s (residing nationwide), having experience of using the online shopping omnichannel-based convenience store pick-up service. The questionnaire survey was carried out for eight days in May 2021, and a total of 352 copies of the questionnaire responses were collected. The study analyzed 324 copies of the questionnaire responses except for the copies with insincere responses. For data analysis, descriptive statistics and exploratory factor analysis were performed using SPSS 24.0. For hypotheses verification, AMOS 25.0 was used for confirmatory factor analysis and path analysis, based on the structural equation.

2.3. Demographic information of the data

According to the composition ratio, analysis of the questionnaire participants, males and females were 53.7% and 46.3%, and males were slightly higher. As for age, 36.4% were in their 30s, and 34.6% were in their 20s, which took up high ratios, whereas 20.4% were in their 40s and 8.6% were at least in their 50s. Concerning occupation, company employees were 60.84%, students – 11.4%, and professionals – 11.4%. In addition, public officials were 5.4%, homemakers were 4.3%, and the self-employed were 3.4%. Concerning education
level, university graduates were 78.2%, graduate school graduates were 13.3%, the currently enrolled in universities were 10.8%, and high school graduates were 7.7%.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Reliability and validity of results

As for the factor loadings based on values of 0.5 and more, they were all between 0.604 and 0.815, and all were good. Complex reliability was between 0.804 and 0.880, and high significance was secured. T values based on 6.5 and more were all statistically significant. Cronbach’s alpha value was between 0.703 and 0.803, and the value was more than 0.6; therefore, convergent validity was secured (Table 2). The analysis result of the measurement model’s trust and convergent validity was confirmed to be good. Regarding the structural equation measurement model’s goodness of fit, the Goodness-of-Fit-Index (GFI) value was 0.901. Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit-Index (AGFI) was 0.887, Normal Fit Index (NFI) was 0.893, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was 0.058. Therefore, all the composition values were statistically significant.

The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value was between 0.508 and 0.710, and it was good. As a result of analyzing correlation coefficients, the correlations between each potential variable were significant, and it was confirmed that valid judgment was ensured (Table 3).

3.2. Hypothesis testing

As a result of the structural model’s goodness-of-fit, \( \chi^2(p) \) was 451.383 (0.000), GFI was 0.894, NFI was 0.882, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was 0.933, TLI (Tucker Lewis Index) judging the explanation power of the structural model was 0.919, RMR (Root Mean Square residual) was 0.036, AGFI (Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit-Index) was 0.860, RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) was 0.060. Overall, the composition values of goodness-of-fitness were good, and so the model’s goodness-of-fitness was significant.

According to the hypothesis verification, two hypotheses were rejected among ten hypotheses.
Table 2. Results of reliability and convergent validity test

| Category          | Variable | Standard Loadings | Standard Error | t (p)    | CR   | AVE | Cronbach's alpha |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|----------|------|-----|-----------------|
| Brand image       | BI1      | 0.682             |                |          |      |     |                 |
|                   | BI2      | 0.759             | 0.097          | 12.089***| 0.818| 0.600| 0.712           |
|                   | BI3      | 0.683             | 0.101          | 11.016***|      |     |                 |
| Brand identity    | BIT1     | 0.731             |                |          |      |     |                 |
|                   | BIT2     | 0.604             | 0.074          | 10.133***| 0.806| 0.584| 0.713           |
|                   | BIT3     | 0.792             | 0.079          | 13.16*** |      |     |                 |
| Brand attachment  | BA1      | 0.710             |                |          |      |     |                 |
|                   | BA2      | 0.794             | 0.096          | 13.138***| 0.827| 0.616| 0.803           |
|                   | BA3      | 0.788             | 0.095          | 13.057***|      |     |                 |
| Brand trust       | BT1      | 0.775             |                |          |      |     |                 |
|                   | BT2      | 0.815             | 0.068          | 14.572***| 0.880| 0.710| 0.791           |
|                   | BT3      | 0.782             | 0.071          | 14.005***|      |     |                 |
| Emotional value   | EV1      | 0.626             |                |          |      |     |                 |
|                   | EV2      | 0.651             | 0.105          | 9.634***  |      |     |                 |
|                   | EV3      | 0.737             | 0.098          | 10.561***|      |     |                 |
|                   | EV4      | 0.716             | 0.097          | 10.345***|      |     |                 |
| Functional value  | FV1      | 0.626             |                |          |      |     |                 |
|                   | FV2      | 0.698             | 0.108          | 10.076***| 0.806| 0.511| 0.734           |
|                   | FV3      | 0.585             | 0.096          | 8.795***  |      |     |                 |
|                   | FV4      | 0.642             | 0.1            | 9.461***  |      |     |                 |
| Service satisfaction | SS1   | 0.729             |                |          |      |     |                 |
|                   | SS2      | 0.715             | 0.087          | 12.042***| 0.859| 0.669| 0.718           |
|                   | SS3      | 0.758             | 0.09           | 12.739***|      |     |                 |

Note: Measurement model fit: $\chi^2(\text{p})$ 448.373(0.000), RMR 0.032, GFI 0.901, AGFI 0.887, NFI 0.893, TLI 0.916, CFI 0.912, RMSEA 0.058, * means $p < 0.05$, ** means $p < 0.01$, *** means $p < 0.001$.

Table 3. Correlation matrix and AVE

| Variable | BI       | BIT      | BA       | BT       | EV       | FV       | SS       |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Brand image (BI) | 0.600     |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Brand identity (BIT) | 0.669**   | 0.584    |          |          |          |          |          |
| Brand attachment (BI) | 0.644**   | 0.672**  | 0.616    |          |          |          |          |
| Brand trust (BT) | 0.612**   | 0.555**  | 0.602**  | 0.710    |          |          |          |
| Emotional value (EV) | 0.633**   | 0.545**  | 0.522**  | 0.534**  | 0.508    |          |          |
| Functional value (FV) | 0.613**   | 0.603**  | 0.699**  | 0.513**  | 0.570**  | 0.511**  |          |
| Service satisfaction (SS) | 0.630**   | 0.470**  | 0.495**  | 0.631**  | 0.685**  | 0.530**  | 0.669    |

Note: The square root of AVE is shown in bold letters; * means $p < 0.05$, ** means $p < 0.01$, *** means $p < 0.001$.

Table 4. Analysis results of a structural model

| Hypothesis (path) | Standardized loadings | Standard error | t value (p) | Hypothesis adoption |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------|
| H1                | Brand image → Emotional value | 0.981          | 0.835       | 3.151***           | Supported                   |
| H2                | Brand image → Functional value | 1.469          | 1.416       | 3.690***           | Supported                   |
| H3                | Brand identity → Emotional value | 0.567          | 0.615       | 1.808*             | Supported                   |
| H4                | Brand identity → Functional value | 0.562          | 0.691       | 1.803*             | Supported                   |
| H5                | Brand attachment → Emotional value | 0.906          | 0.919       | 3.494***           | Supported                   |
| H6                | Brand attachment → Functional value | 0.172          | 0.197       | 0.802              | Rejected                    |
| H7                | Brand trust → Emotional value | 0.231          | 0.248       | 1.736**            | Supported                   |
| H8                | Brand trust → Functional value | 0.085          | 0.104       | 0.629              | Rejected                    |
| H9                | Emotional value → Service satisfaction | 0.447          | 0.457       | 1.415**            | Supported                   |
| H10               | Functional value → Service satisfaction | 0.246          | 0.253       | 1.148*             | Supported                   |

Note: * means $p < 0.05$, ** means $p < 0.01$, *** means $p < 0.001$; Structural model fit: $\chi^2(\text{p})$ 451.383(0.000), RMR 0.036, GFI 0.894, AGFI 0.860, NFI 0.882, TLI 0.919, CFI 0.933, RMSEA 0.060.
The brand image had a positive effect on emotional value (3.151, \( p < 0.01 \)) and functional value (3.690, \( p < 0.001 \)). Particularly, brand image had a bigger effect on functional value. Brand identity had a positive effect on emotional value (1.808, \( p < 0.05 \)), and functional value (1.803, \( p < 0.05 \)) was at a similar level. Brand attachment positively affected emotional value (3.494, \( p < 0.001 \)) and did not affect functional value. The brand trust positively affected emotional value (1.736, \( p < 0.01 \)), but the hypothesis on functional value was rejected. Lastly, emotional value (1.415, \( p < 0.01 \)) and functional value (1.148, \( p < 0.05 \)) affected customer service satisfaction, so both hypotheses 9 and 10 were adopted (see Table 4).

4. DISCUSSION

This study analyzed the relationship between brand factors, having effects on online shopping’s omnichannel-based pickup service, consumption value, and service satisfaction. Major implications drawn through the analysis are as follows.

First, brand image affected the emotional value and functional value the most; specifically, brand image affected functional value more. This shows that brand image may affect emotional value such as psychological stability or self-satisfaction, as well as a functional value such as convenience and user access in using omnichannel-based pick-up service upon online shopping. It was ascertained that brand image might exercise key influence in various aspects to maximize consumers’ recognized value and draw customer service satisfaction in omnichannel pickup service operation. Therefore, it is implied that strategic activities should be sought for the positive image construction of the exposed brand for the reinforcement of brand exposure through pick-up service of distribution companies aiming to expand the omnichannel-based pickup service.

Second, brand attachment and brand trust affected emotional value but did not affect the available brand. Brand attachment and brand trust are attitudes to brand, unlike brand image and brand identity, and they are the factors that may be formed in continuous interactions. Omnichannel-based pick-up service needs brand management focused on emotional value and strategy construction with consumers to draw brand attachment- and brand trust-based customer service satisfaction. Generally, studies from a technology acceptance aspect, based on IT and platform-focused technical convenience and efficiency in omnichannel-based services, are mainstream. In consideration of the market environment where omnichannel-based online shopping is generalized and pickup service use is reinforced beyond delivery, a marketing strategy that can improve emotional communion through attachment and trust within the service use and brand relation, in addition to brand image and brand identity improvement, needs to be considered according to the results of this study.

CONCLUSION

This study empirically indicates the correlations of such brand factors as brand image, brand identity, brand attachment, and brand trust, affecting customers’ consumption values and pickup service satisfaction on online shopping omnichannel platforms. The results show that brand image is the most important influencer on customer value and satisfaction of omnichannel-based pickup services. In addition, it was verified that the brand attachment and trust affected to emotional value on online shopping pickup service, not functional value.

Nonetheless, this study has some limitations. First, omnichannel-based pickup services may have diverse channels, including direct management shops and stronghold distributors. This study, however, performed research targeting the users of the pickup service through convenience stores. There is a need to study brand effect factors’ differences by pickup service type in more detail through a further study targeting diverse types of consumer pickup services. Second, this study targeted Korean online shopping mall omnichannel-based pickup service users, and thus there is
a limitation in the generalization of the study results. There needs to be a more generalized omnichannel pickup service-related research by expanding study scope, centered on major countries leading online shopping, including the U.S. and China.
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