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Continuance Interaction Intention in Retailing: Relations between Customer Values, Satisfaction, Loyalty, and Identification

Abstract
Purpose - Social media as a competitive marketing tool deliver online platforms for retailers to get closer to their consumers/visitors/shoppers through continued interaction. This study scrutinizes how customer values (functional, social, and experimental) enhance satisfaction, loyalty, identification and how such relationships, in turn, impact on user-continuance interaction intention.

Design/methodology/approach – A mixed method approach was designed to identify the consumers perception towards high-end retailers of worldwide brands. 12 interviews were conducted with experts in retailing and a survey with 390 respondents. Structural equation modeling/AMOS was employed to gain insight into the various relationships and influences.

Findings - To augment user-continuance interaction intention, results indicate that retail managers should focus more on customer-based values when they design marketing strategies for brand pages on social media. The findings also provide guidelines for retail marketing and social media managers to generate consumer value in the retail environment via information quality, product-related learning, and economic benefits (functional value), interaction, collaboration, and social presence (social value), and experiential value (intellectual and effective value).

Originality/value - The paper offers critical managerial contributions by presenting a comprehensive picture of the condition in which a favorable brand social media page could be constructed within a brand to satisfy consumers value and achieve satisfaction, loyalty, identification, and continuance interaction intention; all of which are critical objectives for every company. In other words, a clear knowledge of the dimensions of consumer value concepts can assist retail communication managers to improve consumers/visitors/shoppers intention to continue their interaction in a competitive market. The current study is one of the very few emerging research studies to have examined the relationships between consumers/visitors/shoppers functional, values, social values, and experimental values empirically, to have further explored the relationships between the research constructs.
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1. **Introduction**

Continuance interaction intention is essential to the future of social media services with rapid expansion and rigorous competitions between its suppliers. Social media help companies to broaden customer reach and interact with them more proficiently (Duffet, 2015; Whiting et al., 2013; Yin et al., 2015). Online Micro-blogging platforms such as Facebook and Twitter have increased in popularity since five years ago (Cuomo et al., 2017; Hajili et al., 2015). The primary goal of Micro-blogging platforms as an application or tool is to create content compelling enough for users to connect, communicate, share information, experience, and interact with others (Cuomo et al., 2016; 2017; Weinberg, 2009). Organisations have declared that customers are now more value conscious (Leroi-Werelds et al., 2014). Many organizations set up brand or company pages (also called brand communities or fan pages) on micro-blogging platform to connect with their consumers and get closer to them through continued interactions (Hutter et al., 2013). The micro-blogging platform is one of the highest outstanding digital tools to create consumer awareness and experience (Cuomo et al., 2016; 2017; Edison Research, 2012; Lipizzi et al., 2016; Parganas et al., 2015; SynForce, 2013). Consumers with a high level of continued interaction on the platform receive more marketing information regarding the brand which creates more profound satisfaction, loyalty, and identification towards the brand (Trainor, 2012). Satisfaction, loyalty, and identification signify a collective experience and feeling created by various interactions with the brand (Aggeva et al., 2018; Bhattacherjee, 2001; Foroudi, 2016; 2019; Gao and Bai, 2014; Melewar et al., 2017). However, there is a limited study examined the effect of satisfaction, loyalty, and identification on continuance interaction intention.
From the organizations' perspective, the use of brand social media can help company’s performance through the values created via customers’ continued interactions (Shi et al., 2016; Trainor, 2012; Yu et al., 2018). In a progressively competitive environment, retailers are moving towards being service-oriented than product-oriented. Retailers have to compete and provide new service innovation (Fain et al., 2018). It is hence important for retailers to distinguish the brand in the marketplace by investing in innovative technology. Social media service is a fast-improving technology proposing consumers a convenient way of shopping and improving their experiences and intention to use. This technological proliferation involves new consumer learning and understanding before acceptance and eventually practice (Moreau et al., 2001). It can create functional, social, and experiential benefits for users that in turn can improve consumer-computer interaction. Social media as a competitive marketing tool deliver online platforms for retailers to get closer to their consumers/visitors/shoppers through continued interaction, however there is a lack of study on this area which examine the key values influence on continuance interaction intention (Gan and Li, 2018; McCole et al., 2019; Shi et al., 2016). Based on social exchange theory and customer value theory, this study seeks to examine how customer values (functional, social, and experimental) enhance satisfaction, loyalty, and identification and how such relationships, in turn, impact users’ continuance interaction intention?. The results will deliver guidelines for communication, social media and marketing managers to generate consumer value in the retail setting and to make day-to-day operations easier for sellers.

To address the research aim and questions, the theoretical background and conceptual model on the key determinants through a systematic review of the literature is included in Section 2. The research method and the results of the study are set out in Sections 3 and 4. Finally, a
discussion of research findings, the limitations of the research and paths for future research are
detailed in Section 5 and 6.

2. Theoretical background

It is indisputable, as amply demonstrated in many scientific studies, the crucial role played by
innovation as a lever to determine the growth of enterprises in a highly competitive
environment (Ngo and O’Cass, 2013). In this regard, the world of retailing is perfectly aware
of the great opportunities that technological innovation can offer in improving the relationship
with markets (Foroudi et al., 2016). Since this phenomenon creates both challenges and
marketing chances for companies, the real change goes beyond merely introducing or making
use of technological innovation (Zou et al., 2019). However, nowadays retailers think digitally
thus activating a process of cultural evolution and upgrading of skills that involves the
corporation as a whole (Bessant et al., 2010).

The use of retailing innovative tools represents an extraordinary occasion that enables the
management of numerous features that enrich shopping experience value (Dennis et al., 2014).
Individual customer experience can be integrated with online and physical interactions through
multiple settings (e.g., touch points pick-up in-store, online visibility on stock available in store,
integrated customer care, reserved apps, RFID/QR code, smart mirrors, and so on) and to
access digital content are just some examples of assisted shopping services (Choi et al., 2015;
Huang and Liu, 2014).

For these reasons, connection with users must be constantly active through listening,
interaction and sharing of quality content that may excite, inform and educate their customers
(Gupta and Malhotra, 2013). Social networks can be useful to reach this aim, providing they
have been inserted in the marketing strategy (Adner and Kapoor, 2010; Berthon et al., 2012; Park and Kim, 2014; Kumar et al., 2016). Conversely, retailers have to invest in analytics and monitoring technological innovations tools; ultimately the adoption of these systems is critical to effectively connect up their customers (Beck and Rygl, 2015; Liu and Atuahene-Gima, 2018; Verhoef et al., 2015). Profiling and supervising their behavior both in physical and digital places, attending them before, during and after the purchasing process allows retailers to quickly intercept opportunities and accurately respond to customers’ expectations (Kuo and Feng, 2013). Hence, the stakeholders’ collective judgments about corporations linked to positive reputations (Ageeva et al., 2018; Chun, 2005; Foroudi, 2019) generate favorable perceptions and thus retain customer loyalty (Gupta and Malhotra, 2013), based on their evaluation of the firm’s capacity to be innovative (Foroudi et al., 2014).

Consumers/visitors/shoppers perceive a retailer as respectful and reliable because of their interaction with the retailer, its product and services, and brand reputation (Bhattacharya and Sen, 2003; Foroudi et al., 2014). These behaviors can influence customer identification, especially taking into consideration different demographic features and the retailer (Foroudi et al., 2016) and building an interaction-based virtuous circuit.

Based on social exchange theory (SET) (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Homans, 1961) and customer value theory (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Shi et al., 2016): (i) functional value, (ii) social value, and (iii) experiential value (Dennis et al., 2014; Shi et al., 2016), this study aims to identify the relationships between these customer-based values to influence customer satisfaction, loyalty, identification, and continuance interaction intention. The following section offers the theoretical rationale for the causal associations in the proposed model (Figure 1).
Attracting and maintaining customer interest, reinforcing the link with brands/products/services, boosting the conversion rate and reducing risks (Cuomo et al., 2014). These are only several of the results achievable using interaction-based customer value, both functional and social. Indeed, according to Puccinelli et al. (2009), this could be considered the new way utilizing which customers will shop in the future. The main contributions focus on shopping behavior (Hoyer and MacInnis, 2010), exploring the driving forces at the basis of the decisional process, in conjunction with different consumer’ orientation, behavioral, cognitive, and experiential views (Sachdeva and Goel, 2015).

Starting from this perspective, interactive shopping behavior examines the raised aptitude of interaction between retailers and consumers offered by the digital environment. Thus, a hybrid consumers/visitors/shoppers interaction takes place at three levels: channel convergence (strategy), process convergence, and technology convergence (systems) (Nuesch et al., 2015), where the latter has been considered crucial for the competitiveness of the retailing system as a whole (Darrick and McNaughton, 2002; Han et al., 1998).

Open trustworthy relationships, social media as new communication tools and 24/7 connections with innovative devices distinguish a different way of interaction between customers and retailers, in the light of re-considering the retailer as both a functional and a socially constructed space. In this direction, innovative devices allow consumers to try services and products on social media, and concerning the application to e-commerce, offer interesting opportunities (Groß, 2015). Also, optimizing the search, aggregation channels, suggesting buildings, and local referral marketing on social platforms are the main areas to connect brick-and-mortar shopping experience with the profits of digital channels (Heinemann and Gaiser,
2015). Based on the support of new technologies, customer experience touches points, atmospheric, technological, communicative while product interaction elements, facilitate employee-customer interactions and customer–customer interactions in a smarter retailing environment (Stein and Ramaseshan, 2016), increasing brand consideration (Baxendale et al., 2015), customer loyalty and customer-company identification (Foroudi et al., 2016; Wolter et al., 2018).

In other words, purchases take place in new spaces, pending between the digital and physical organization. Preferably, the integration of the retailing channels, both physical and digital, aims at realizing a single intuitive and integrated distribution system synthesized in the use of technological devices and solutions. In this way, interaction-based customer value enriches retail of extra-content – both informational and social – amplifies its significance toward consumers and inflects its commercial and emotional charm through new dimensions of continuance interaction intentions (Zhou et al., 2014).

In the light of this conceptual model and customer value theory, this study proposes that functional and social value are the two features that affect experiential customer value. In general, technological innovation provides new or developed products/services and favorably affect customer experiences (Oh and Teo, 2010; Tung et al., 2019). Instead, the functional value component can enhance information quality, product-related learning, and economic benefit through critical elements of design innovation, which focus on new product/service development and marketing segment creation (Foroudi et al., 2016). Thus, the conceptual research model may use interactions with customers to get high quality of information exchange, or for monitoring market trends and seeking market opportunities (Sherman et al., 2000), or analyzing the role of consumer confidence on the share of wallet formation in accordance with Hunneman et al. (2015).
Wang et al. (2004) posit that “functional value” refers to the utility derived from the perceived quality and expected performance of the product/service and is an antecedent of the experiential aspect of consumption (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). However, there is considerable consensus that such customer behaviors are also influenced by factors such as satisfaction and loyalty (Szymanski and Henard, 2001; Bolton, 1998; Mittal and Kamakura, 2001, Gentile et al., 2007), influencing them significantly. Moreover, Hur et al. (2013) in a survey based on 517 consumers in the USA, establish the importance of consumer value and satisfaction in facilitating the diffusion of green innovation, with resulting strong implications for marketing strategy.

\textit{H1: Functional value positively influences experiential value (H1a), satisfaction (H1b), and loyalty (H1c)}

\textbf{Social value, experiential value, satisfaction, and loyalty}

As for the social value component, new technological settings improve customer engagement by reinforcing the link with product/service and offer an exciting social shopping experience regarding interactivity, collaboration and social presence (Beck and Rygl, 2015; Berthon et al., 2012). Based on customer value theory, social values express core conceptions of the desire within every individual and society. SET translates social values to the individual consumer level of choice, thus enhancing the shopping experience. Through marketing practices, such values are linked to objects, transferred to semiotic value, and transformed into exchange value (Karababa et al., 2013). In details, several studies (Hwang and Kim, 2007; Park and Park, 2007; Rhee and Ryu, 2010) show that consumers appreciate the social value of the enterprise products and that social value affects satisfaction and repurchase intention regarding customer loyalty.

\textit{H2: Social value positively influences experiential value (H2a), satisfaction (H2b), and loyalty (H2c)}
**Functional value and social value**

Many commentators consider customer value as the key to long-term success, particularly Albrecht (1997) who argues that it “is the only thing that matters in the new world of quality” (p. 7). Consequently, several kinds of research have addressed the value construct itself although there is no well-accepted value measurement, even in the retail environment in which customers evaluate products before purchase (Sweeney and Soutar, 2001). Following the study of Mazumdar and Jun (1993), customers are becoming more value-oriented and are not simply used by high quality or lower price. Instead, they tend to make a reasonable trade-off between the perceived benefits and perceived sacrifices in the process of obtaining and consuming products or services. However, not all the customers value the same potential benefits and care for the same sacrifices at any given time. Based on customer value theory, these arguments are the basis of the formulation of the following research hypothesis.

\[ H3: \text{Functional value positively influences social value} \]

**Experiential value, satisfaction, and loyalty**

Experiential value can be defined as: i) intellectual experience and ii) affective experience (Fourodi et al, 2016). Many types of research demonstrate that a high level of customer experience might be a source of customer satisfaction and loyalty (Martin et al., 2015; Khodadadi et al., 2016). However, strong experiential values also have positive implications for factors such as satisfaction and brand loyalty (Bolton, 1998; Mittal and Kamakura, 2001; Szymanski and Henard, 2001). Such impact depends upon the nature of the different customer experience components in terms of sensorial element, emotional component, cognitive
component (Schmitt, 1999), pragmatic component, lifestyle component and relational component (Battarbee and Koshinen, 2005) that can be reinterpreted in the light of the previous distinction between intellectual and affective experience described by Foroudi et al. (2016). Undoubtedly, high levels of satisfaction and loyalty arise from experiential values accrued by customers in contact with retailers. For these reasons, it becomes imperative to implement customer value-based strategies able to improve the competitiveness of enterprises.

H4: Experiential value positively influences satisfaction (H4a), and loyalty (H4b)

Satisfaction and loyalty

Studies that deal with the links between satisfaction and loyalty are not new in marketing management literature. They are classified into two main strands of research: 1) management-based service, and 2) marketing-based. The first proposes that satisfaction influences loyalty, which in turn impacts on economic performance (Anderson et al., 1994; Heskett et al., 1990; Reicheld and Sasser, 1990; Rust et al., 1995; Schneider and Bowen, 1995; Storbacka et al., 1994; Zeithaml et al., 1990). According to this perspective and theory of customer value, satisfaction is the result of a customer's perception of the value received about the value expected (Zeithaml et al., 1990). In this way, loyalty result from customers' beliefs that the quantity of value received is higher than that obtainable from other vendors. Loyalty, hence, creates increased profit through enhanced revenues, reduced costs to acquire customers, lower customer-price sensitivity, and decreased costs (Reicheld and Sasser, 1990).

The second strand of research regards the marketing domain and discusses the impact of customer satisfaction on customer loyalty. In this perspective, loyalty is defined as attitude and behavior (Jacoby and Kyner, 1973). In general, the primary studies about loyalty have
demonstrated that attitudinal loyalty (such as intent to repurchase) is linked to customer satisfaction (Fornier, 1994), while behavioral loyalty is linked to firm performance (Yi, 1990). Despite the importance of satisfaction, the customer-based approach appears unquestionable as the main aim for enterprise success, the role of the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty does not seem so evident (Chaudhuri, Holbrook, 2001; Verhoef, 2003). This is particularly true about the efficacy of the satisfaction-loyalty link (Kamakura et al., 2002; Rust et al., 1995). Specifically, Szymanski and Herard (2001) in their meta-analysis, find that satisfaction explains less than 25% of the variance in a repeat purchase. Thus the association between customer and loyalty is highly variable depending on the industry (Anderson and Mittal, 2000; Mittal and Kamakura, 2001; Ngobo, 1999), customer segment studied (Homburg and Giering, 2001), the nature of the dependent and independent variables (Agustin and Singh, 2005; Gupta and Zeithaml, 2006), and the presence of numerous factors that serve as mediators (Picon et al., 2014), moderators or both to the relationship (Garbarino and Johnson, 1999; Luo and Homburg, 2007; Mittal and Frennea, 2010). In the lights of these statements, the next hypothesis is developed.

\[ H5: \text{Satisfaction positively influences loyalty} \]

**Loyalty, identification, and continuance interaction intention**

As widely discussed up to this point, the actual challenges of the market impose companies to pay attention to establish and/or maintain customer loyalty which involves, on the one hand, a positive attitude toward a brand-company. Also, they repeat buying-behavior, and on the other, employee satisfaction which pertains both to a perceived connection with and a sense of belonging to and a more behavioral element regarding the permanence of employment with the organization (Foroudi et al., 2016). Hence, the conceptual model proposes the explication of
the relationship between loyalty and identification, reiterating that loyalty may reinforce consumer-company identification (Netemeyer et al., 2012).

The managerial literature recognizes the existence of the linkage between loyalty and identification but is not as clear as to its direction. A very recent study shows that program loyalty and customer–company identification enhance customer loyalty toward the company. The development of customer-company identification can transform program loyalty into company loyalty, reducing the company's potential financial risk. While Alvesson (2000) treats the significance of organization-based social identity for loyalty versus exit reactions, thus discussing different modes of accomplishing loyalty and addresses post-exit management regarding how companies may deal with employees that have left the company. The centrality of network relations and close contact with clients in combination with the knowledge workers defecting in many knowledge-intensive companies make social identification and loyalty fundamental issues for management (Alvesson, 2000).

Conversely, Kuenzel and Halliday (2010) propose and evaluate a theoretical model where brand personality congruence and reputation affect brand identification, which in turn impacts on brand loyalty. Furthermore, it shows that brand identification only partially mediates the influences of brand personality congruity and reputation as these variables also affect brand loyalty directly, so providing important managerial and theoretical implications. At least, some scholars (He et al., 2012) propose a social identity and social exchange perspectives of customer–brand relationship and integrate brand identity and identification with value, trust, and satisfaction in predicting brand loyalty.

The conceptual framework terminates showing that interaction-based customer value enriches retail offer of extra-content – both functional and social – amplifying its commercial and emotional allure via the new dimensions of continuance interaction intentions (Zhou et al.,
able to create a virtuous cycle. As described above, scholars recognize that company-consumer identification process has a significant impact on the maintenance of interaction intentions (Del Rio et al., 2001; Kuenzel and Halliday, 2010) mainly thanks to the generation of positive word of mouth (Tuskej et al., 2013).

\[ H6: \text{Loyalty positively influences identification} \]

\[ H7: \text{Identification positively influences continuance interaction intention} \]

3. Methodology

3.1. Sample and procedure

To scrutinize our research framework and hypotheses, the study has 12 interviews with experts such as communication manager, academics, brand manager and design consultant, e-marketing and social media specialists. Also, we conducted an online consumer-based survey among high-end retailers of worldwide brands, with a favorable reputation due to the retailers’ brand names (Dennis et al., 2014; Foroudi et al., 2016; Silva and Alwi, 2006). Data were collected in London by consumers/visitors/shoppers using the retailers’ brand page, Facebook and Twitter frequently between September 2016 and November 2016. The initial version of the questionnaire was tested by 54 responses for the format of the instrument, clarity and suitability of the wording of the measurement scales face and content validly. Valid questionnaires collected numbered 390. Of the participants, 50.8% were female and 49.2% male. A majority (46.9%) were aged 25-34. 26.4% 35-44; about 34.6% held a Degree and 34.1% a Master’s Degree (Table 1). Besides, 27.4% of the respondents were senior management or CEOs of a company (23.6%)
3.2. Measures

All the research constructs were measured with multiple item-scales and developed employing validated items from previous studies as a means of evaluating the theoretical constructs (Table 1). The functional value as a second order construct was measured by three constructs: information quality, product-related learning, and economic values. Information quality was developed from the study of Lee et al. (2014) and Shi et al. (2016). Product-related learning and economic benefit measurement were adapted from Shi et al. (2016). The construct of social value a second order construct was measured via three constructs: interaction, collaboration, and social presence. Interaction and social presence items came from studies by Lee et al. (2014) and Shi et al. The items of collaboration were constructed from the measurement given by Shi et al. (2016). Experiential value refers to intellectual and affective values (second order construct). The measurements of both were developed through the appropriate adaptation of the scales suggested by Dennis et al. (2014) and Foroudi et al. (2016). The measurement of satisfaction was adapted from previous studies (Alam et al., 2012; Foroudi et al., 2016; Melewar et al., 2016; Stathopoulou and Balabanis, 2016; Yeh, 2015). Identification was measured via a scale modified from Bhattacharya and Elsbach (2002), Dukerich et al. (2002), and Keh and Xie (2009). Continuance interaction intention was operationalized via a scale developed by Kim et al. (2008) and Shi et al. (2016). All items in the final questionnaire were modified to suit the context of the research and measured on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree).
4. Data analysis

Descriptive statistics for the entire research sample was examined using SPSS (statistical package for social science). EFA (exploratory factor analysis) as an essential method and coefficient alpha was carried out in the initial stages of the current study for scale validity based on the recommendations of Aaker (1997) and Churchill (1979) and to reduce the numbers of observed study indicators (Hair et al., 2006). To examine the causal association between the research constructs and to determine the quality of the measurement model, SEM (structural equation modeling) using AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structures) was performed. Also, SEM is a reliable tool and technique for modeling and is the most critical method for theory examining in marketing (Fornell and Larcker, 1981; Steenkamp and Baumgartner, 2000). The descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for the items are illustrated in Table 2.

<<Please Insert Table 2 Here>>

4.1. Measurement model validation

Before running SEM to examine the research hypotheses, EFA was used to test the research variables and to define such research variables regarding their common underlying factors (Hair et al., 2006). All items loaded meaningfully on their respective latent factors except nine items. FIQ2, SIN1, SAT1, IDN2, EE5, SS2, LOY3, LOY9, and SS8 items with cross-loaded were excluded from the data (Table 3). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was tested for appropriateness and accuracy of the data collected. The sampling adequacy was .843, and Bartlett's test of sphericity (BTS) was substantial (BTS=.000<.001) and fulfilled the necessary criteria (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). 12 scales explained a total variance of 80.7%, which is higher than the suggestions (Hair et al., 2006; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Cronbach’s alpha (between .900 and .954) for each factor established that the
measurement items in each factor were internally reliable (Nunnally, 1978). AVE (average variance extracted) and CR (composite reliability) were examined to test reliability and convergent validity (Table 4).

AVE for each construct ranged from .755 to .883 > .5 which indicates adequate convergent validity. Convergent validity which refers to the homogeneity of the constructs ranged from .719 to .782, exceeding the threshold of .7 (Nunnally, 1978) (Table 3). To examine discriminant validity, we designed a CFA model with 8 constructs and 41 measures. After sixteen items were excluded for overlap in their residual variance (Byrne, 2001), the confirmatory factor analysis results illustrated a good fit model, root means square error of approximation residual (RMSEA) = .038, goodness-of-fit index (GFI) = .884, adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) = .860, Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) = .972, comparative fit index (CFI) = .976, normed fit index (NFI) = .936, incremental fit index (IFI) = .976, and relative fit index (RFI) = .926 (Hair et al., 2006).

<<Please Insert Table 3 and 4 Here>>

<<Please Insert Table 4 Here>>

4.2. Structural model evaluation

The results of the path model are illustrated in Figure 1 and Table 5. The results of the proposed operational model reveal an RMSEA of .04, GFI of .867, AGFI of .848, TLI (.966), CFI (.968), NFI of .927, IFI (.968), and RFI score of .921, additional confirms that the hypothesized model provides an adequate fit for the research data. To examine the research hypotheses, we used hierarchical linear regression analysis. Based on the standardized parameter estimates, the result provides support for H1a (functional value -> experiential value) and H1b (functional value -> satisfaction) (β = .551, t = 7.265; β = .382, t = 2.57 respectively). Regarding H1c
(functional value -> loyalty) there was no association between these relationships from the respondents ($\beta=-.233$, $t=-1.458$, p.145). The hypothesized model from the analysis shows that there is no effect of social value on experiential value (H2a: $\beta=.202$, $t=1.187$, p.235) and the hypothesis is not supported. However, the results show the direct impact of social value on satisfaction (H2b: $\beta=.602$, $t=2.477$) and loyalty (H2c: $\beta=1.322$, $t=3.324$).

Hypothesis 3 illustrated that there are no effects of functional value on social value ($\beta=.055$, $t=.984$, p.325). Regarding H4a (experiential value -> satisfaction) and H4b (experiential value -> loyalty), the results shows the no impacts between the constructs (H8: $\beta=.371$, $t=1.716$, p.086; H9: $\beta=.054$, $t=.238$, p.812 respectively). There was no association between satisfaction and loyalty (H4b: $\beta=.172$, $t=1.946$, p.052) and is significantly different from 0 at the .05 significance level and that it may not be predominantly effective regarding a participants’ perception. The hypothesized model shows that the effect of loyalty on identification (H6: $\beta=.374$, $t=7.216$) and identification and continuance interaction intention (H7: $\beta=.416$, $t=8.163$) were statistically significant.

<<Please Insert Table 5 Here>>

<<Please Insert Figure 2 Here>>

5. Discussion of the research findings

This study examines how customer values (functional, social, and experimental) enhance satisfaction, loyalty, and identification and how such relationships, in turn, impact users’ continuance interaction intention. Social exchange theory (SET) (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005; Homans, 1961) and customer value theory (Chen and Dubinsky, 2003; Shi et al., 2016) classifies consumers’ value of companies into three categories: (i) functional value, (ii) social value, and (iii) experiential value (Dennis et al., 2014; Shi et al., 2016). According to Dennis et al. (2014) and Shi et al. (2016), although the literature pays much attention to
consumer value, it has received little attention to date. To fill this gap and to use the theory of social exchange and customer value, our research pushes beyond the current boundaries to relationship consumer value, satisfaction, loyalty, identification, and continuance interaction intention concepts.

“Functional value describes a large portion of social media service user experiential value and satisfaction within three dimensions (information quality, product-related learning, and economic benefit). Our interviewees, confirm the relationships When we discuss about our functional value, I assume you mean the type of values, offers, services which we provide to our customers. As a brand manager, our main focus is to give a right services and products to our clients, we help them to promote their company or brand well to market, and it is quite challengeable these days and we should compete with our competitors. Social media is the cheapest tool to introduce their product, interact with the right target market, and increase sales and performance” (Brand Manager 39 years old).

“We all use social media daily, or even every hour, or every minutes of our lives are related to our online community, we are in a digital era, we share information, interact with all my friends, colleagues, customers around the world. Interestingly, we receive fast reply, is not it amazing?” (Communication Consultant 27 years old).

The results show that functional value has no significant link to loyalty. Also, one of interview mentioned that “even we have a great relationships with our customers, but sometimes, they visit different retailers... based on their purchases, we send promotions and offers to them but I don’t really believe the word of loyalty these days... I think social media make lives tough... we always analysis other retailers and we have to be updated (Retail Manager 34 years old).

Similar to earlier studies conducted on website interactivity, our findings also presented that the social value of social media services with three dimensions (interaction, collaboration, and social presence) will increase user satisfaction and loyalty.

However, we found that there is no relationship to consumer experiential value. The qualitative study also confirmed the insignificant relationships. A Marketing Professor stated that “it is absolutely right that social media help us to share information, idea, search for the information easier, be in touch with friends and never being lonely, but most of the time, I could not see real feelings and real emotion, maybe because of my age and I am old fashion... in my generation, we prefer to visit the places to shop, touch the product, feel it, then buy it. I do online shopping but when something goes wrong, there is no guarantee to get money back
quickly. But in shop, everything is easier, much easier… Don’t get me wrong, I have over 400 friends in Facebook but still if I really want to enjoy my time, meet them for dinner or drink”.

The critical contribution for retail managers is the necessity to be more concerned about providing information quality, product-related learning, and economic benefit (functional value) of the brand in social media to influence consumer social value. Surprisingly, the relationships between functional value and social value was rejected. It could be related to the perception of high-end retail store customers towards the retailer’s social media.

Consumer experiential value through two main dimensions (intellectual and affective) was found to have a marginal effect on visitors/shoppers satisfaction and loyalty towards a brand’s social media services. Although the finding was unexpected, it confirms the results that consumers’ experiential value is an outcome of consumer functional value but does not mediate between functional value, satisfaction, and loyalty. This result is inconsistent with previous studies by Dennis et al. (2014) and Foroudi et al. (2016). This might be due to the inexperience of users. Connectedness, which reflects consumer value, retail and communication managers should more focus on the needs of users to generate more satisfaction and loyalty between the brand and consumers via brand pages on social media. Three interviewees were in agreement that physical shopping experience is different to online shopping experiences. Even they could find what they are looking for in online store but the satisfaction of their purchase might not give them the fulfilment till they receive the product. Due to variety of products online, the level of loyalty and satisfaction is quite low.

The significant relationship between user satisfaction and loyalty reveals that if users perceive proper overall evaluation of the brand and their expectations are met, they are more satisfied with the brand, which impacts on their future purchase and they are more likely to favor the
brand and its services and continue to use the service. User loyalty was found to have positive effects on user identification towards brands. The finding defends that the ability of a brand offering social media to generate a strong position in a highly probable marketplace depends upon the level to which the retailer can impact on the satisfaction and loyalty of its consumers. As expected, users’ continuance interaction intention is positively impacted by identification towards social media services. It confirms the significance of identification in continuing use of information technology.

6. Implications, limitations, and future research

The current study is one of very few emerging research studies to have examined the relationships between consumers/visitors/shoppers functional, values, social values, and experimental values, to have further explored the relationships between consumers/visitors/shoppers’ value on satisfaction, loyalty, and identification and how such relationships, in turn, impacts their continuance interaction intention on brand pages in social media. The sample, consisting of 390 valid responses, was carried out on consumers of high-end retailers of worldwide brands. Data were analyzed employing structural equation modeling.

6.1. Implication for theory

From a theoretical perspective, this study integrates social media into marketing strategies. Also, it responds to the call for more in-depth understanding of continuance interaction intention (Shi et al., 2016). Our study found that continuance interaction intention depends mostly on user satisfaction, loyalty, and identification which are driven by functional and social values. This paper pushes the existing boundaries of continuance interaction intention, and marketing research, innovation management, integrating, consolidating, and previous research. Based on a comprehensive reviewing of the literature, our research contributes to the studies
by recognizing the main drivers of each measurement of customers’ continuance interaction intention, providing a structured theoretical model which yields new insights. Furthermore, this study determines how strategic marketing impacts organizations' performance, examining the indirect and direct associations between the research constructs unexplored previously in the literature. More prominently, our study contributes to customer value theory and social exchange theory by enlightening its predictive ability via the investigation of the content of each measurement of customer value and their relation to satisfaction, loyalty, identification, and continuance interaction intention. Thus, our study adds valuable knowledge to the understanding of how customer values (functional, social, and experimental) enhance satisfaction, loyalty, and identification and how such relationships, in turn, impacts users’ continuance interaction intention.

6.2. Implications for practice

Based on its theoretical contribution, this investigation suggests managerial contributions for decision-makers, concerning retail communication and marketing in order to appreciate the effective association between consumers/visitors/shoppers’ value and their intention to continue interaction with the retailers’ brand page, Facebook, and Twitter. The paper offers important managerial contributions by presenting a comprehensive picture of the condition in which a favorable brand social media page could be constructed within a brand to satisfy consumers value and achieve satisfaction, loyalty, identification, and continuance interaction intention; all of which are critical objectives for every company. In other words, a clear knowledge of the dimensions of consumer value concepts can assist retail communication managers to improve consumers/visitors/shoppers intention to continue their interaction in a competitive market. By demonstrating the critical constituents of information quality, product-related learning, and economic benefit (functional value), and their relationships on brand
social media and how they can enhance customers’ continuance interaction intention, this research will assist communication and social media manager to understand the significant relationships.

The effect of social value on experiential value was not found to be significant in our study. Though experiential value is the most basic determination of brand social media, communication managers should put greater emphasis on users’ intellectual and affective experiences. 46.9% of the respondents in our study were aged between 25 -34, and as they have different needs towards experiential benefits, we consider this another limitation given that users’ needs towards the technology differ over time. It is suggested that this study also is applied in different contexts. This result might only be specific to the context of a high-end retail setting due to the source of data.

Also, this study helps the communication manager to advance social media strategic plans to improve customers’ continued interaction intention towards the brand social media. The results of this study help the retail marketing and communication managers to design and maintain their brand pages when targeting different types of shoppers with different values. Furthermore, communication and brand managers can also use these research results to recognize the weaknesses and strengths of their existing social media. By interpreting and understanding consumer value, as well as the retailer’s weaknesses and strength, managers will be able to make accurate choices in controlling the brand’s social media for targeting and responding to consumers’ needs.

6.3. Limitation and future research
The current study has some limitations. It may restrict the generalizability of its results, which can be addressed in forthcoming studies. The context dependent viewpoint on understanding the consumers' perception towards the research constructs, may offer directions for future studies in this area. Although high-end retail setting services have a relatively large consumers/visitors/shoppers base in the UK, we trust that originating more generalized findings will most likely necessitate applying the framework in other nations. Although the data derived are from high-end retailers in a developed marketplace, the emphasis of global brands nowadays is on developing marketplaces. As the concept of social value by its very nature is very complex, this study recommend future researchers using the retailers brand page Facebook and Twitter frequently to capture such complexity. This study recommends future researchers to collect the same research on developing markets. Nevertheless, the results may be dissimilar. In this case, innovative constructs to the model are advised. Furthermore, replicating this research model in different context and settings would improve the generalizability of the results.

**Conclusion**

The results of the current research illustrates that continuance interaction intention depends mostly on user satisfaction, loyalty, and identification which are driven by functional and social values. The present study offers theoretical and managerial contributions to marketing and innovation management for high-end retail setting by concentrating on social media on consumer-computer interaction. The analytical findings indicate that functional value has the positive influence on user's experiential value in turn leading to satisfaction compared to rival brands. Previous research studies those links between consumer values and continuance interaction intention but has ignored the main constructs, which are involved in their relationships. Unexpectedly, based on the respondents’ perception towards a brand’s social
media, there was no impact from functional benefits to their loyalty. Individually, regarding social value, factors such as interaction, collaboration, and social presence exert the most substantial influence on satisfaction followed by loyalty. In addition, our results reveal that identification positively influences continuance interaction intention. In sum, our findings indicate that overall, consumers/visitors/shoppers continued interaction intention is meaningfully driven by social and functional values.
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### Table 1: Demographic profile respondents (N= 390)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>A-level and below</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D. degree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Senior Management</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 less than 34</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 less than 44</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>Junior Management</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 less than 54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 less than 64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-enterprise</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (between 10-49)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (between 50-259 employees)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (250 and more employees)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for the items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIQ</th>
<th>FPL</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>SIN</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>LOY</th>
<th>IDN</th>
<th>CIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information quality (FIQ)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product-related learning (FPL)</strong></td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic benefit (FEB)</strong></td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction (SIN)</strong></td>
<td>.087*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration (SC)</strong></td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.118**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social presence (SS)</strong></td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.126**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual (EI)</strong></td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.120**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective (EE)</strong></td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction (SAT)</strong></td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loyalty (LOY)</strong></td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.213**</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.105*</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification (IDN)</strong></td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.412**</td>
<td>.095*</td>
<td>.155**</td>
<td>.106*</td>
<td>.092*</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.333**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance interaction intention (CIN)</strong></td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.106*</td>
<td>.086*</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.091*</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.384**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (Pearson's correlation sig. (2-tailed)).
Table 3: Study constructs, scale items, descriptive statistics, factor loadings, and reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct, Sub-Constructs, Item, and References</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>CFA Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information quality @ .945</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIQ2 – removed in EFA</td>
<td>FIQ1</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accumulate knowledge through the brand’s social media shared information</td>
<td>FIQ2</td>
<td>– removed in EFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get interesting information via the brand's social media</td>
<td>FIQ3</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find the information on the brand’s social media to be valuable</td>
<td>FIQ5</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this the brand’s social media is a valuable source of information.</td>
<td>FIQ6</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product-related learning @ .954</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the brand’s social media enhances my knowledge of the product and its usage.</td>
<td>FPL1</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the brand’s social media helps me to obtain solutions to specific product-related problems.</td>
<td>FPL2</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the brand’s social media enhances my knowledge about advances in the product, related products, and technology.</td>
<td>FPL3</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic benefit @ .947</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the brand’s social media helps me to get bonuses.</td>
<td>FEB1</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the brand’s social media helps me to participate in different activities.</td>
<td>FEB2</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the brand’s social media helps me to get better services.</td>
<td>FEB3</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the brand’s social media helps me to get fast responses.</td>
<td>FEB4</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN1– removed in EFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction @ .953</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the brand’s social media enables me to meet more people.</td>
<td>SIN2</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared with other brand social network sites, the brand’s social media friends are closer.</td>
<td>SIN4</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members are very responsive to my posts on the brand’s social media.</td>
<td>SIN5</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration @ .930</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the brand’s social media, I can get help from other users.</td>
<td>SC2</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the brand’s social media, I can provide information to other users.</td>
<td>SC3</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the brand’s social media, I can share my ideas with other users.</td>
<td>SC4</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social presence @ .900</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information would improve my image.</td>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing useful information would increase self-esteem.</td>
<td>SS5</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a sense of human contact on the brand’s social media.</td>
<td>SS6</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiential value @ .956</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>EI5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helpful in buying a product</strong></td>
<td>Find what looking for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helpful in buying a product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EI5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective @.925</strong></td>
<td>Emotional (and Emotional with Cognitive)</td>
<td>EI1</td>
<td></td>
<td>EI2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings and sentiments</td>
<td>EI2</td>
<td></td>
<td>EI5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>EI5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction @.946</strong></td>
<td>My overall evaluation of this brand is good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The advantages I receive, being a member of this brand, meet my expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am satisfied with my overall experience with the brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loyalty @.924</strong></td>
<td>Going to purchase from this retailer in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOY1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility (Alam et al., 2012; Kim et al., 2008; Melewar et al., 2016; Sweeney and Swait, 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOY2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative (Melewar et al., 2016; Stock and Zacharias, 2013; Yeh, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOY4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always buy from the same store because I like this retailer (Melewar et al., 2016; Stock and Zacharias, 2013; Yeh, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOY7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification @.946</strong></td>
<td>When I talk about the brand, I usually say ‘we’ rather than ‘they’ (Bergami and Bagozzi, 2000; Bhattacharya and Elsbach, 2002; Dukerich et al., 2002; Keh and Xie, 2009; Mael and Ashforth, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDN1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When someone praises the brand, it feels like a compliment of me (Bergami and Bagozzi, 2000; Bhattacharya and Elsbach, 2002; Bhattacharya et al., 1995; Dukerich et al., 2002; Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001; Keh and Xie, 2009; Mael and Ashforth, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDN3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When someone criticises the brand, it feels like a personal insult (Bergami and Bagozzi, 2000; Bhattacharya and Elsbach, 2002; Bhattacharya et al., 1995; Dukerich et al., 2002; Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001; Mael and Ashforth, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDN4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The brand’s success is my successes (Bergami and Bagozzi, 2000; Bhattacharya and Elsbach, 2002; Bhattacharya et al., 1995; Dukerich et al., 2002; Elsbach and Bhattacharya, 2001; Keh and Xie, 2009; Mael and Ashforth, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IDN6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance interaction intention @.947</strong></td>
<td>I would like to keep suggesting new ideas for product and/or service marketing plans on the brand’s social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to keep posting my opinions on product development on the brand’s social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to keep actively participating in discussions on the brand’s social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to keep providing my opinion on product-related problems and improvements in the brand's social media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Descriment validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>ASV</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Intellectual</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Results of hypothesis examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional value</td>
<td>→ Experiential value</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>7.265</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Loyalty</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-1.458</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>→ Experiential value</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>2.477</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Loyalty</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional value</td>
<td>→ Social value</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential value</td>
<td>→ Satisfaction</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ Loyalty</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>→ Loyalty</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>→ Identification</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>7.216</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>→ Continuance interaction intention</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>8.163</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Research Model
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Figure 2: SEM Model Outcomes
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**Hypotheses**
- H1a: 0.233 (1.458, p. 0.145)
- H1b: 0.382 (2.57)
- H1c: 0.551 (7.265)
- H2a: 0.202 (1.187, p. 0.233)
- H2b: 0.402 (2.477)
- H2c: 1.322 (3.324)
- H3: 0.055 (0.984, p. 0.325)
- H4a: 0.371 (1.716, p. 0.086)
- H4b: 0.054 (0.238, p. 0.812)
- H5: 0.172 (1.946, p. 0.052)
- H6: 0.374 (7.216)
- H7: 0.416 (8.163)