

Perceived authenticity of online-only brands (OOBs):

A quali-quantitative study with online consumers

Jason Sit, Giovanni Pino, Marco Pichierri

Abstract

Purpose – The present study examines the dimensions that are meaningful to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs (i.e. retail brands that trade exclusively online) from a consumer's perspective. Past frameworks of perceived authenticity exist in the branding literature but consistently focus on contexts beyond e-commerce settings like OOBs.

Design/methodology/approach – We employed a mixed-method research design, consisting of **quasi-**qualitative and quantitative studies with online customers, to establish the dimensions meaningful for the perceived authenticity of OOBs. Our work has theory testing and building components.

Findings – We identify five dimensions that are meaningful to define consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs. They are 'honesty', 'connection', 'continuity', 'craftsmanship' and 'accessibility'. Representing by multiple factors, 'craftsmanship' serves as the most meaningful dimension followed by 'accessibility'. Often being considered incompatible with perceived authenticity, we find accessibility particularly relevant to the context of OOBs. It describes the 'convenient' and 'affordable' aspects of OOBs, which typically serve as unique selling propositions.

Originality/value - Our work confirms the utility of established dimensions to define consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs. This highlights that consumers hold some consistent authenticity image between non-online and online brands. Our work also reveals the accessibility dimension being neglected by the branding literature, suggesting a more up-to-date perspective is needed when studying consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs.

Keywords Perceived authenticity; Online branding; E-commerce; Accessibility

Paper type Research paper

Perceived authenticity of online-only brands (OOBs): A quali-quantitative study with online consumers

1. Introduction

Authenticity represents a persistent fundamental quest for both consumers and brands (Beverland & Farrelly, 2010). For consumers, they seek authenticity to address the unauthentic aspects of their lives (Leigh et al., 2006) and differentiate fakery from genuinity in the commoditised context of consumption (Cohen, 1988). In the marketplace, consumers fulfil their desire for authenticity through the brands they engage and consume (Guèvremont, 2018; Holt, 2002). Brown, Kozinets and Sherry (2003, p. 21) indeed state that “the search for authenticity is one of the cornerstones of contemporary marketing”.

For brands, authenticity provides many competitive advantages. Authenticity is a perceptual concept that exists in the consumer mind and thus is challenging for competitors to imitate the perceived authenticity of a brand when established (Cohen, 1988). Brands can leverage perceived authenticity to trigger consumers’ feelings and behaviours favourable to them, such as *nostalgia* (Meng et al., 2019), *loyalty* (Girish & Chen, 2017), *engagement* (Chen et al., 2020), and *purchase decision* (Liang et al., 2018). Authenticity can also help certain brands to effectuate premium pricing, such as those operating in the luxury sector (Beverland, 2006).

Consumers’ perceived authenticity is widely researched in the branding literature and several past frameworks exist (cf. Alexander, 2009; Beverland, 2005b; Beverland & Farrelly, 2010; Holt, 2002; Morhart et al., 2015; Moulard et al., 2015; Napoli et al., 2014). Positively, the past frameworks illustrate that ‘one size does not fit all’ and perceived authenticity can be measured

in different ways. Negatively, they do not reach a consensus on the range and composition of dimensions that are essential to define the perceived authenticity of a brand regardless of its nature. The choice about the range and composition is inconsistent and seemingly dependent on the context under study. Because of these inconsistencies, there is more room for further research into perceived authenticity especially when a new context emerges.

The present study aims to investigate consumers' perceived authenticity of online-only brands (OOBs). The term refers to brands that operate exclusively in the e-commerce landscape and that are usually 'young' in terms of heritage and longevity (Halzack, 2016). The findings above provide some ideas on how to approach the definition of the perceived authenticity of OOBs, but the ideas warrant further investigation. At this stage, we are unclear of the dimensions meaningful to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs. Whilst these brands represent a key player in the e-commerce landscape, they also increasingly compete with brick-and-mortar brands that are expanding to the same landscape. These brands typically have established heritage, tradition and credibility, and enjoy the nostalgia that consumers bestow on them. In essence, they have the established authenticity (Grayson & Martinec, 2004), a competitive advantage that OOBs usually lack because of their 'youngness' (e.g., *Casper*, *Bonobos*) and lacking physical presence (Fassnacht et al., 2019).

Accordingly, many OOBs compete on convenience, customer service and value for money as unique selling points (Nazir, 2019). They aspire to emulate the success of brands as Amazon and Asos, who excel in providing easy access to products, knockoff prices and free shipping and returns (Palumbo, 2019). These attributes together signify accessibility, a dimension that is frequently affiliated with the *perceived image* (Stoltman et al., 1991), *perceived value*

(Holmes et al., 2014) and *perceived quality* (Hare et al., 2001). However, it has not been associated with perceived authenticity yet, likely because accessibility is reputed as irrelevant to (or even capable of downplaying) some essence of perceived authenticity like scarcity and desirability (cf. Kluge & Fassnacht, 2015).

The reasons mentioned earlier warrants the research aim of the present study. That is, to study the dimensions meaningful to define consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs. It seeks to address two related issues: *1) What dimensions of perceived authenticity have been established in the past frameworks and to what extent are they meaningful to OOBs? 2) Are there any dimensions meaningful to OOBs but neglected by the past frameworks of perceived authenticity?* By answering these questions, the present study makes three contributions to the branding literature. First, we seek to reconcile the inconsistent range and composition of dimensions proposed to define perceived authenticity by the past frameworks. Second, building on past research (Guèvremont, 2018), we develop the utility of theoretical clustering to resolve the inconsistency issue and present a more compact list of authenticity dimensions established in the literature. Third, we verify the dated thinking of accessibility being incompatible with perceived authenticity especially within the context of OOBs.

2. Literature review

2.1 Perceived authenticity

Perceived authenticity represents a construct negotiated and interpreted by consumers, where its meanings are generated through personal aspirations and experiences within the social context. It is theorised as a social construct rather than an objectively defined reality (Cohen, 1988; Turunen, 2018). Given its utility to diagnose the meanings (and relationships) that

consumers attach to brands (Bryla, 2018; Fritz et al., 2017), perceived authenticity is widely researched in the branding literature. Several past frameworks of perceived authenticity exist. They offer great insights into 1) the complex nature of the concept in question, and 2) that the definition is likely to involve multiple dimensions as opposed to a single dimension (Beverland & Farrelly, 2010; Morhart et al., 2015). However, there is little consensus on the dimensions, both range and composition, meaningful to define the perceived authenticity of a brand regardless of its nature. The multiplicity created by the past frameworks has made it challenging to discern the relationships between the existent authenticity dimensions. Table 1 provides an overview of the past frameworks of perceived authenticity available in the branding literature.

Insert Table 1 about here

The range of dimensions proposed by the past frameworks can involve as few as two (Kennick, 1985), three (Alexander, 2009; Fine, 2003) or five dimensions (Thompson & Arsel, 2004), or as many as eleven (Napoli et al., 2014) or fifteen dimensions (Beverland & Farrelly, 2010). In terms of composition, some past frameworks endorse the focus on multiple dimensions that broadly relate to a single category, such as genuine and truth that broadly associate with honesty (Kennick, 1985). Others champion the focus on multiple dimensions representing multiple broad categories, such as quality commitments and stylistic consistency signifying competency, and heritage, pedigree and tradition representing continuity (Beverland, 2005a).

Despite a multiplicity of dimensions exists, their relevance to study the perceived authenticity of OOBs remains unclear. Except for Guèvremont's work (2018), other past frameworks have

not focused on an online setting or an e-commerce practice (see Table 1). Guèvremont's framework (2018) was based on an online blog and comprised three dimensions of perceived authenticity. They are labelled 'transparency', 'virtuousness' and 'proximity'. Referring to Guèvremont's description (2018), these three dimensions are parallel to the dimensions of other frameworks. More specifically, *transparency* seems to resonate with honesty, sincerity, genuineness and truth. *Virtuousness* is comparable to values, virtue, moral, noble, commercial disinterest, downplaying commercial motives. *Proximity* links to relationship to place, connection, closeness, close and emotional. This has given us the inspiration to theoretically cluster the authenticity dimensions established by the past frameworks into broader categories and discern their connections, akin to template analysis (Huang & Soergel, 2013).

Using Guèvremont's work (2018) as the clustering template, we identify five macro-dimensions that can be relevant to our study. They are labelled as 'honesty', 'kindness', 'connection', 'continuity' and 'craftsmanship'. We relabelled Guèvremont's 'transparency', 'virtuousness' and 'proximity' as *honesty*, *kindness* and *connection* to better convey their meanings in layman's terms and added the dimensions of 'continuity' and 'craftsmanship'. Although Guèvremont (2018) does not explicitly present these two dimensions in her framework, she did thoroughly discuss them. *Continuity* describes the temporal and historical aspects of perceived authenticity and encompasses dimensions like heritage, pedigree, continuity and tradition. *Craftsmanship* represents the production, design and functional aspects of perceived authenticity and fittingly captures dimensions like stylistic consistency, quality commitment, original design, simplicity and high standards. Table 2 presents the outcomes of the theoretical clustering targeted at the past frameworks of perceived authenticity.

Insert Table 2 about here

The theoretical clustering yields several interesting outcomes. First, almost all of the dimensions from the identified frameworks can be grouped into the five broad categories, notably, ‘honesty’, ‘kindness’, ‘connection’, ‘continuity’ and ‘craftsmanship’. This suggests the possibility of developing a more parsimonious framework of perceived authenticity by synthesising the existent frameworks. Second, ‘continuity’, ‘craftsmanship’ and ‘honesty’ appear more popular than ‘kindness’ and ‘connection’ with a greater number of clustered dimensions. This reinforces the dominant focus on the temporal, production and truthfulness/realness aspects of perceived authenticity. Third, none of the clustered dimensions is associated with accessibility: for instance, can brands perceived as accessible be equally perceived as authentic? Accessibility represents a fundamental aspect in the e-commerce landscape and a core experience that OOBs must deliver to secure the patronage of their customers (Kumar & Kashyap Anil, 2018). The (lacking) relationship between accessibility and perceived authenticity within the context of OOBs is discussed in another section.

Given that OOBs operating in the e-commerce landscape, we have also reviewed the e-commerce literature to gauge the dimensionality of perceived authenticity. E-commerce studies have rarely approached perceived authenticity with a dimensionality approach. That is, none of them have attempted to discern the varied dimensions defining perceived authenticity. Instead, favouring an *antecedent approach*, they have consistently measured it as a driver of other theoretical factors, such as consumer attitude towards the product and the website (Algharabat et al., 2017) and behavioural intention (Baek et al., 2019). They have also typically treated perceived authenticity as a single-dimensional factor, revolving around *imagery*

(Algharabat et al., 2017), *product* (Baek et al., 2019), *advertisement* (van Esch et al., 2018) and *retail channels* (Xue et al., 2020). These dimensions consistently relate to the functional aspects of perceived authenticity and thus can be grouped into the macro-dimension of ‘*craftsmanship*’ discussed earlier. In essence, the e-commerce literature sheds very little light on the multi-dimensionality of perceived authenticity as previous studies have favoured a simple and antecedent approach to examine the concept.

2.2 Accessibility of OOBs

In some cases, accessibility is reputed to be counter-authenticity. The typical defining dimensions of perceived authenticity are about being niche and local (Holt, 2002; Thompson & Arsel, 2004), being discrete (Moulard et al., 2015), preserving one’s essence (Alexander, 2009) and being heritage and pedigree (Beverland, 2005a). For instance, Newman and Dhar (2014) found that a luxury product is perceived more authentic if it is made in the country of origin than in a different country. The mentioned dimensions consistently signify the essence of perceived authenticity is about being elite and exclusive, by limiting access to a select group of people (Kluge & Fassnacht, 2015). Accessibility, however, represents the opposite of the mentioned dimensions and thus is deemed incompatible with perceived authenticity (Kumar & Kashyap Anil, 2018).

Accessibility, in the e-commerce context, is a multifaceted concept and has direct and indirect meanings. Directly, it refers to the *usability or navigability* of a website (the extent to which the website is easy to use or navigate) and the *availability of information* (the extent to which all key information is available online) (Kablan et al., 2015). Indirectly, accessibility can also relate to *searchability* (the extent to which it is easy to search information online), *convenience*

(the extent to which the online experience is free from hassle and traffic), and *product availability* (the extent to which products are readily available, more varieties are identifiable and prices are clearly stated) (Kumar & Kashyap Anil, 2018).

Accessibility represents a fundamental quest to both OOBs and customers. To OOBs, they need accessibility to serve plural consumer segments located in plural locations and time zones and in turn establish their foothold in the e-marketplace (Palumbo, 2019). The unique properties of the e-commerce landscape facilitate this accessibility, freeing OOBs from geographical, physical-space and temporal constraints and provide them with greater control over the shopping experience (e.g., personalisation) (Xue et al., 2020). To online consumers, they expect accessibility to be in ‘good place’ to support their shopping endeavours (Kumar & Kashyap Anil, 2018). They expect the utilities to shop 24/7 for 365 days, to easily search and gather essential information online (e.g. product returns and customer support), to explore a variety of products that are readily available but unique from the high street, and to experience no hassle of placing and paying for an order, (Kumar & Kashyap Anil, 2018). Accordingly, when considering the perceived authenticity of OOBs, consumers expect accessibility as a key defining dimension (Jayawardhena & Tiu Wright, 2009). They deem accessibility as a fundamental ‘customer service’ to warrant their engagement with OOBs (Immonen et al., 2018).

2.3 Electronic word-of-mouth (eWoM) for OOBs

eWoM refers to any statement made by customers about a product or brand that is accessible by multiple people and/or institutions and that is disseminated via the Internet. The statements can be either positive or negative, and the customers can be potential, current or former

(Cheung & Thadani, 2012; Hennig-Thurau & Walsh, 2003). It has been a popular behavioural outcome amongst the studies of online contexts, like *e-shopping* (Jayawardhena & Tiu Wright, 2009), *product returns* (Minnema et al., 2016), *attitude towards websites* (Toufaily et al., 2013) and *webrooming* (Flavián et al., 2016).

eWoM and online contexts are intricately linked because: eWOM serves an unpaid, unfiltered and genuine commentary of an online brand (Cheung & Thadani, 2012); consumers frequently rely on this commentary to assess a purchase decision (Flavián et al., 2016); and it provides online brands with insights into consumers' likes and dislikes and thus ideas for product development or improvement (Zhang et al., 2021). The primary focus of the present study is to examine how consumers define the perceived authenticity of OOBs. However, we are also keen to explore how the authenticity dimensions defined by consumers subsequently affect their behaviours. To answer this question, eWoM represents a logical choice as a dependent variable. The logic lies in, like many other online contexts, OOBs also actively encourage customers to share feedback on their online platforms in order to increase their online visibility, provide content for search engines, and diagnose customer insights (Charlton, 2012).

2.4 Literature gap and research propositions

The review of the branding literature has revealed several gaps in our knowledge of perceived authenticity. First, whilst there are many past frameworks of perceived authenticity, they are yet to reach a consensus on the range and composition of dimensions meaningful to define the concept in question. Second, except for Guèvremont's framework (2018), hardly any of the past frameworks has studied online settings. Hence, the extent to which any of the established dimensions are relevant to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs remains unclear. Third,

Guèvremont's framework (2018) has focused on an online setting – i.e., a blog – which is related to but different from OOBs. That is, the blog is principally informative; whereas, OOBs are both informative and transactional (i.e. selling and buying) (Jaiswal et al., 2018). Fourth, past frameworks have not considered accessibility as a meaningful dimension of perceived authenticity. These gaps highlight a paucity of research on the perceived authenticity of OOBs and thus warrant the need for the present study.

Using Guèvremont's framework (2018) as the clustering template, we identify five established dimensions that are potentially meaningful to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs. They are labelled as 'honesty'; 'kindness'; 'connection'; 'continuity' and 'craftsmanship'. Coupling these established dimensions with the neglected dimension of accessibility, we present:

Proposition 1: The perceived authenticity of OOBs can be defined by six dimensions.

They are honesty, kindness, connection, continuity, craftsmanship and accessibility.

We are also keen to explore the relationship between the perceived authenticity of OOBs and consumers' eWoM, to better discern the utility of the established and neglected dimensions to explain consumer behaviour. eWoM is chosen because of its strategic roles in the e-commerce landscape and inherent relevance to OOBs. Accordingly, we present:

Proposition 2: The perceived authenticity of OOBs will have a positive effect on consumers' eWoM, but the effect will vary across the six dimensions.

3. Methodology

Following an established approach (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003; Guiot & Roux, 2010), the present research employed a mixed quali-quantitative research design to investigate the perceived authenticity dimensions of OOBs. This mixed methodological design is widely used to explore unknown constructs (via qualitative method) and obtain objective support for the research conclusions (via quantitative method) (DeVellis, 2003)

3.1 *Quasi-qualitative study*

We designed this qualitative research phase to gauge customers' understanding of the perceived authenticity of OOBs in a fluid, rich, in-depth and naturalistic manner. That is, customers were invited to share their understanding based on personal experiences, using expression that was natural to them and free from the influence of pre-coded responses (Richards, 2009). However, because the data collection was administered via an online survey rather than an interviewing approach, we characterised the research phase as 'quasi-qualitative study'. More specifically, we administered the online survey to 39 customers of OOBs and recruited them from an online access panel (i.e. an online pool of individuals who have agreed to be available for surveys) (Malhotra et al., 2017). This study procedure reflects a popular practice used by other studies seek to investigate a phenomenon occurring in the online world (Al-Essa & Yahia, 2019). Our sample size was highly acceptable as it exceeded the threshold recommended by Kuzel (1999, cited in Sim et al., 2018), that is, between 12 and 20 participants for qualitative research that looks for disconfirming evidence or to achieve maximum variation sampling.

Following the unique properties of qualitative research (i.e. being fluid, in-depth and naturalistic) (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008; Richards, 2009), the online survey asked the OOB customers to list: 1) three to five keywords defining brand authenticity; and 2) two or more

advantages of buying OOBs in open-ended questions. We did not limit the number of characters and words required for both questions, allowing customers to share their answers freely and naturally. We cross-checked the questions to gauge the face validity of the listed keywords. We counted the frequency of the keywords and advantages using Microsoft Excel and the COUNTIF function. Word count represents an effective qualitative data analysis technique (see Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). Drawing on the literature review findings, we assigned each keyword with a relevant authenticity dimension manually (see Table 3).

Insert Table 3 about here

Most of the customers surveyed in the quasi-qualitative phase were females (71.8%) and aged between 26 and 35 years old (53.8%). They claimed to be experienced online shoppers and have bought from OOBs fairly frequently, notably, 40% less than once a week and 20% between three to six times per week. Following the guidelines of template analysis, a popular content analysis (Huang & Soergel, 2013; see also Kassirjian, 1977; Spiggle et al., 2012), the researchers analysed customers' answers using a priori coding procedure. Each researcher repeatedly read the keywords that respondents used to describe the notion of authenticity and grouped them into meaningful dimensions identified from the literature review. After completing this first level of analysis, the researchers compared their dimensions with the related lists of keywords, discussed discrepancies in their interpretations, and merged those with similar meanings. This process yielded an initial coding scheme whose structure was subsequently discussed and revised until the researchers reached a complete agreement.

3.2 Quantitative study

To delve into the dimensionality of OOBs' authenticity, we designed a quantitative study that, following an approach that is commonly used in studies aimed to develop multi-dimensional measurement tool useful to assess new or under-investigated constructs (Arnold & Reynolds, 2003; Guiot & Roux, 2010; Kim et al., 2012) built on the past literature on perceived authenticity and the results of our qualitative study. This phase involved an online survey being administered on another online access panel, which was different from the one used in the qualitative study to avoid repeat participation and reduce bias. The 201 customers of OOBs self-selected themselves for participation, a popular non-probabilistic sampling technique for panel survey (see Lehdonvirta et al., 2020). In return, they gained the minimum hourly reward requested by the panel (i.e., £5.00 per hour). The online survey comprised a series of closed-ended questions designed to gauge OOB customers' agreement or disagreement with a list of attributes measuring perceived authenticity. Specifically, the questionnaire included six dimensions identified from the literature: *continuity* (4 items), *craftsmanship* (14 items), *honesty* (3 items), *kindness* (4 items), *connection* (4 items) and *accessibility* (12 items). Hence, the researchers ultimately created a questionnaire with 41 closed-ended questions measured on 7-point Likert scales. The online survey also included demographic and behavioural questions to explore their distributions across OOBs customers.

We recruited 201 participants for the quantitative study. The majority was females (60.7%), aged between 26 and 45 years old (72.1%), clothing and accessories were the most frequently bought item, and their average online spending was between £25 and £50 (45.8%). We screened all collected responses and identified no incomplete questionnaires. Table 4 presents the profile of the participants of the quantitative study.

Insert Table 4 about here

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 *Quasi-qualitative study*

The final coding scheme consisted of eight authenticity dimensions, namely ‘*quality*’, ‘*honesty*’, ‘*different*’, ‘*service/convenient*’, ‘*established/trustworthy*’, ‘*connected*’, ‘*rare/choice*’ and ‘*affordable*’. In terms of popularity, ‘*quality*’ and ‘*different*’ emerged as the most popular dimension with 22 and 19 keywords respectively. The next popular dimensions were ‘*honesty*’, ‘*established/trustworthy*’ and ‘*service/convenient*’, consisting of more than 10 keywords. Other less popular dimensions like ‘*connected*’, ‘*rare/choice*’ and ‘*affordable*’ had between 4 and 7 keywords.

Being a consumer-centric study interested in understanding how online consumers shop, we also asked customers to report the main advantages of shopping with OOBs. Surprisingly, the mentioned advantages were hardly associated with ‘*connected*’, ‘*honesty*’ and ‘*established/trustworthy*’. They generally represent the established dimensions of perceived authenticity (Beverland, 2005a; Napoli et al., 2014). This result presents an interesting notion for consideration. That is the dimensions that participants perceived to be the most meaningful to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs were not necessarily the most meaningful drivers of their shopping behaviour. On the contrary, the key attributes motivating them to shop with OOBs revolved on ‘*affordable*’, ‘*service/convenient*’ and ‘*rare/choice*’. They represent the less popular dimensions asked in another question. The following example comments illustrate the effects of ‘*affordable*’, ‘*service/convenient*’ and ‘*rare/choice*’ on participants’ shopping behaviours:

“Better prices and customized services” (Participant 5, male, 18-25 years old)

“More choice, usually cheaper, delivered to your door” (Participant 26, female, 26-35 years old)

“Save time shopping online, can browse many options easily, convenience” (Participant 2, male, 26-35 years old)

“No need to go out to a store. The item is shipped directly to your home” (Participant 13, female, 46-55 years old)

4.2 Quantitative study

We performed a series of exploratory factor analysis (EFA), involving the Maximum Likelihood extraction method and direct oblimin rotation, to establish the dimensionality of the brand authenticity of OOBs. We identified eight factors with satisfactory total variance explained (68%). One accessibility item (online-only brands are not available in traditional stores) failed to reach satisfactory factor loading ($> .50$) and was therefore dropped from the analysis. One craftsmanship item (“Online-only brands are rare”), together with one accessibility item (“Online-only brands are convenient”) and two items of the kindness dimension (e.g. “Online-only brands are true to a set of moral values”; “Online only brand are brands with moral principles”) exhibited high loading between two or more factors ($\geq .50$). These items were deemed problematic and thus excluded from further analyses. Hence, we repeated the EFA with the same extraction and rotation procedures. In this case, two craftsmanship items (“Online only brands come in many different versions”, “...are practical”) loaded poorly (with loadings $< .50$) and another craftsmanship item (“Online-only brands are comfortable”) with borderline acceptable loading (equal to 0.54). These three items were therefore dropped from the analysis. Additionally, one item of the connection dimension

(online only brands give back to their customers) exhibited a poor loading ($< .50$) and was therefore dropped from the analysis. We identified eight factors with also satisfactory total variance explained (71%) and retained thirty-two items.

We then submitted the retained factors and their operational items to confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). It confirmed the goodness of fit of the eight factors and their loaded items, with satisfactory fit indices ($\chi^2/df = 1.54, p < .00$; SRMR = .63; CFI: .95; RMSEA = 0.05). All items exceeded the recommended loading score of 0.50, indicating strong convergent validity (Kline, 2016). The composite reliability (CR) index of the eight factors exceeded the recommended level of 0.80 and the average variance indicators (AVEs) were higher than 0.50, both indicating the existence of strong reliability (Table 5). The AVE indicators were higher than the squared inter-constructs correlations between the eight factors, strongly supporting their discriminant validity. The dimensions were labelled as *honesty* ($M = 6.08, CR = 0.88, r^2 = 0.55$), *convenience* ($M = 5.90, CR = 0.91, r^2 = 0.72$), *quality* ($M = 5.34, CR = 0.95, r^2 = 0.83$), *different* ($M = 5.30, CR = 0.89, r^2 = 0.66$), *connect* ($M = 4.69, CR = 0.92, r^2 = 0.74$), *timelessness* ($M = 4.76, CR = 0.83, r^2 = 0.56$), *affordable* ($M = 4.82, CR = 0.93, r^2 = 0.69$) and *rare* ($M = 3.10, CR = 0.81, r^2 = 0.68$).

Insert Table 5 about here

Based on the suggestion of past literature (cf. Byrne, 2016), we assessed the predictive validity (i.e., its ability to correlate in theoretically predictable ways with a related construct; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) of our ‘hybrid’ scale by examining a possible impact of the eight dimensions on an alleged consequence of authenticity perception. To this end, we considered

past studies according to which authenticity exerts a positive influence on consumers' intention to spread eWoM (Morhart et al., 2015; Spiggle et al., 2012). Accordingly, we performed a linear regression analysis where the identified factors served as the independent variables and customers' eWoM related to OOBs as the dependent variable. To our surprise, only four factors yielded significant predictive effects on eWoM (see Table 6). They were *timeliness* ($\beta = .25$, $t\text{-value} = 3.09$, $p = .00$), *quality* ($\beta = .23$, $t\text{-value} = 2.85$, $p = .01$), *rare* ($\beta = -.17$, $t\text{-value} = -2.41$, $p = .02$) and *convenience* ($\beta = .22$, $t\text{-value} = 2.82$, $p = .01$). It is unclear why other factors, like connected and different, had no significant effects on eWoM and can serve as a fruitful direction for future research.

Insert Table 6 about here

4.3 Discussion

The present study examines the dimensions meaningful to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs from a consumer's perspective. More specifically, it investigates two related issues: 1) *What dimensions of perceived authenticity have been established in the past frameworks and to what extent are they meaningful to OOBs?* 2) *Are there any dimensions meaningful to OOBs but neglected by the past frameworks of perceived authenticity?*

Regarding the first research issue, we identify five dimensions from the past frameworks to be meaningful to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs. They are 'honesty', 'kindness', 'connection', 'continuity' and 'craftsmanship'. Regarding the second research issue, we identify accessibility as a neglected dimension to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs. Past frameworks have consistently theorised accessibility as an anti-dimension of perceived

authenticity. In an ecommerce setting like OOBs, however, accessibility represents an essential ‘customer service’ to attract customers’ engagement and conducting transactions with OOBs (Ramanathan, 2010). Hence, we propose accessibility as another integral dimension—along the five dimensions identified from the past frameworks—of the perceived authenticity of OOBs.

Our **quasi-qualitative** study supported the meaningfulness of ‘accessibility’ to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs, particularly via the facets of ‘service/convenient’ and ‘affordable’. Except for ‘kindness’, our qualitative study also supported the meaningfulness of the other established dimensions to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs. In the order of popularity, they are ‘craftsmanship’ (3 facets), ‘continuity’ (1 facet), ‘honesty’ (1 facet) and ‘connection’ (1 facet).

Our quantitative study supports the meaningfulness of eight factors to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs. They are labelled as ‘convenient’, ‘connected’, ‘rare’, ‘quality’, ‘different’, ‘affordable’, ‘timeless’ and ‘honest’. **Drawing on the literature review**, they relate to **the proposed dimensions** of ‘honesty’, ‘connection’, ‘continuity’, ‘craftsmanship’ and ‘accessibility’ but not ‘kindness’. **Figure 1 presents a diagram summary of the results.**

Insert Figure 1 about here

‘*Honesty*’ is about the extent to which OOBs are perceived to be honest, deliver their promises, care about their customers and not betray their trust (Morhart et al., 2015). ‘*Connection*’ refers to the degree to which consumers perceive OOBs connect with their lives and with real selves

and reflect the important values that they care for (Napoli et al., 2014). ‘*Continuity*’ represents the degree to which OOBs survive time and trends to sustain their existence for a long period (Alexander, 2009). ‘*Craftsmanship*’ relates to the excellent standards, uniqueness and, to some extent, rareness of OOBs (Beverland, 2005a; Moulard et al., 2015). ‘*Accessibility*’ denotes the degree to which OOBs are convenient and affordable to consumers (Jayawardhena & Tiu Wright, 2009; Kumar & Kashyap Anil, 2018).

In terms of ‘kindness’, it is unclear why this dimension has not been evident in both the quasi-qualitative and quantitative studies despite the past frameworks state otherwise. In the quantitative study, three out of the four items measuring ‘kindness’ were found to have poor construct validity and thus excluded from further analysis. The remaining item, ‘OOBs care about their customers’, merged with other items of ‘honesty and formed the factor labelled ‘honest’. This finding is novel, suggesting the possible intricate nature of ‘kindness’ and ‘honesty’ and thus warrants further investigation.

In essence, the present study supports the meaningfulness of five dimensions to define consumers’ perceived authenticity of OOBs. They are ‘honesty’, ‘connection’, ‘continuity’, ‘craftsmanship’ and ‘accessibility’. Not only does ‘craftsmanship’ serve as the most meaningful dimension of consumers’ perceived authenticity of OOBs, but it also serves as the most effective dimension to drive consumers’ eWoM related to OOBs. Besides ‘craftsmanship’, the dimensions of ‘continuity’ and ‘accessibility’ serve the other drivers of consumers’ eWoM linked to OOBs. We find no significant effects from ‘honesty’ and ‘connection’.

5. Implications

The present study offers theoretical and managerial implications to both retail academics and practitioners. Theoretically, we propose a perceived authenticity framework, which consists of five defining dimensions, meaningful to OOBs. No past frameworks of perceived authenticity have considered OOBs or any other ecommerce settings. We present five authenticity dimensions unique to OOBs, notably, ‘honesty’, ‘connection’, ‘continuity’, ‘craftsmanship’ and ‘accessibility’. The last dimension ‘accessibility’ has been consistently neglected by the past frameworks of perceived authenticity for several possible reasons, where accessibility: 1) is deemed to disagree with the typical definitions of perceived authenticity (e.g. being niche, local and discrete) (Holt, 2002; Moulard et al., 2015; Thompson & Arsel, 2004); and 2) is typically linked to ecommerce practices like web design and navigation (Kablan et al., 2015; Kumar & Kashyap Anil, 2018) and past frameworks of perceived authenticity are more branding and less ecommerce focused.

Before the present study, there is indeed little knowledge about the authenticity dimensions meaningful for brands that operate exclusively online, that are ‘young’ in terms of heritage and longevity and that emphasise convenient access for (almost) all people via a wide range of products with affordable prices. On the contrary, many past frameworks of perceived authenticity are devoted to brands that possess the opposite qualities, such as strong history, pedigree and tradition (Beverland, 2005a) and strong niche and local presence (Thompson & Arsel, 2004). The present study represents the first study focusing on the perceived authenticity of OOBs.

In terms of accessibility, not only has the present study established its meaningful role to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs, it has also identified its plural meanings. This finding

suggests accessibility can have varied inter-related sub-roles, as opposed to one single role, in shaping consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs. In the present study, we learn that the accessibility of OOBs signifies both *convenience* and *affordability*, where the former involves accessing customer service and the latter is about accessing good deals and knock-off prices. This finding echoes Kluge and Fassnacht's (2015) notion that online accessibility does not dilute consumers' perceived desirability of brands.

Whilst the literature review has noted 'kindness' (virtuousness) as an established dimension of perceived authenticity, the present study provides no support for this notion. We are unable to establish the utility of 'kindness' to define the perceived authenticity of OOBs in both qualitative and quantitative studies. This finding serves as another theoretical contribution of the present study where it yields two interesting ideas for future investigation: *either* consumers give less emphasis to kindness in comparison to other dimensions, *or* both kindness and honesty are intricately related and consumers perceive them as a singular rather than plural dimensions.

Methodologically, we **propose** the theoretical clustering technique and **demonstrate** its utility to sort the multiplicity of theoretical frameworks and dimensions **available for a concept under study**. Inspired by the practices of template analysis (Huang & Soergel, 2013), theoretical clustering encourages researchers **to apply a priori framework to systematically organise the vast of information (e.g. the multiple dimensions of a concept) into concise categories and then discern their interrelations or common threads**. In the present study, the technique has helped us to identify established and neglected dimensions pertaining to the perceived authenticity of OOBs and guide the subsequent data collection.

Managerially, the present study discloses several opportunities that OOBs can consider to establish their perceived authenticity in the consumer mind-set without relying on the typical attributes of heritage, pedigree and tradition (Beverland, 2005a; Napoli, *et al.*, 2014). As OOBs cannot yet deliver an image of heritage and traditions, they should seek to cultivate their unique image and strive to be timeless brands that transcend trends and fads to be easily identified by target customers. Our empirical work suggests that consumers are inclined to spread positive eWOM when they perceive OOBs to be timeless in nature and offer quality products and convenient services. Accordingly, to nurture consumers' eWoM behaviour, OOBs should invest in storytelling, quality development and service excellence, like speedy delivery and hassle-free returns to target customers (Watkinson, 2013). There is however a caveat to this suggestion.

Whilst consumers desire timeliness, quality and convenience from OOBs, they also prefer to keep their favourite OOBs away from the public. We deduce this notion from the negative relationship between the 'rare' factor and consumers' eWoM. Consumers seem to prefer their favourite OOBs not becoming (too) mainstream and jeopardising their 'hidden gem' authenticity. This notion resonates with the scenario where some luxury brands (e.g. Burberry) in the past have become too mainstream, suffered the 'chav' image and thus resulted in consumer abandonment (Brennan, 2018). To balance both accessibility and rarity and, at the same time, nurture consumers' eWOM, a managerial recommendation for OOBs is to consider a membership-only model (e.g. veepee.fr and brandalley.co.uk). Finally, considering that establishing perceived authenticity may require economic and non-economic efforts (e.g. in terms of time, money and manpower), younger OOBs with limited resources could prioritise

achieving the five authenticity dimensions suggested in the present study according to their short and long-term plans.

Instead of striving for the heritage and traditional image, OOBs can aim to be timeless brands that transcend trends and fads, that stay relevant in varied consumption situations, and that care about their customers. Based on the results of our regression analysis, OOBs could stress their convenience, rarity, and quality in their communication as these aspects appear to significantly drive consumers' intention to spread eWOM. To achieve perceived authenticity, OOBs can also aim to design and produce their own labels, make them mainly accessible to registered via, for instance, member privilege, offer affordable prices and provide excellent customer services like speedy delivery and hassle-free returns (Watkinson, 2013). Finally, establishing perceived authenticity will consume plenty of resources (e.g. time, money and manpower), younger OOBs with limited resources could prioritise achieving the five authenticity dimensions suggested in the present study according to their short and long-term plans.

6. Limitations and future research

The present study offers new insights into the perceived authenticity of OOBs, but they should be interpreted with several limitations in mind. First, the use of an online access panel may have limited the generalisability of the findings. While researchers (Paolacci et al., 2010) advocate the representativeness of this sampling strategy, future studies can add value to the present study by surveying OOBs' customers from a more nationally representative pool. This is to improve the generalizability of the results of the present study. Towards this end, future studies can also test the identified dimensions of perceived authenticity with OOBs trading in different sectors (e.g., goods versus services).

Second, we do not consider the utility of online reviews to define consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs. We have designed our research within the scope that consumers' perceived authenticity is based on from their personal experiences with OOBs. Other literature has however shown that the experiences of others, such as those being shared via online platforms, can influence consumers' perceived image of brands (Gruen et al., 2006). Stated differently, the extent to which social proof (Amblee & Bui, 2011) is constructive (or destructive) to consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs remains unclear and thus serves as a fruitful direction for future research. Fourth, despite being identified as the meaningful factors of perceived authenticity in qualitative and quantitative studies, we have found no significant predictive effect of 'connected', 'different', 'honest' and 'affordable' on consumers' eWoM. Future research can investigate this finding and establish the extent to which the eWoM efficacy of those authenticity factors hinges upon other factors (e.g. types of OOBs and consumers). Finally, future research can strengthen our work by examining consumers' perceived authenticity of OOBs together with other psychological and behavioural factors such as *brand trust* (Schallehn et al., 2014), *brand attachment* (Morhart et al., 2015) and *willingness to pay* (Vock et al., 2013).

References

- Akbar, M. M., & Wymer, W. (2017, January 01). Refining the conceptualization of Brand Authenticity. *Journal of Brand Management*, 24(1), 14-32. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41262-016-0023-3>
- Al-Essa, M., & Yahia, I. B. (2019). Success and failure factors of social media integration - insights from business experience. *International Journal of Electronic Marketing and Retailing*, 10(2), 118-129. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijemr.2019.098749>
- Alexander, N. (2009). Brand authentication: creating and maintaining brand auras. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(3-4), 551-562. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560910935578>
- Algharabat, R., Abdallah Alalwan, A., Rana, N. P., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2017, 2017/05/01/). Three dimensional product presentation quality antecedents and their consequences for online retailers: The moderating role of virtual product experience. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 36, 203-217. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.02.007>
- Amblee, N., & Bui, T. (2011, Win). Harnessing the influence of social proof in online shopping: The effect of electronic word of mouth on sales of digital microproducts. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 16(2), 91-113. <https://doi.org/10.2753/jec1086-4415160205>
- Arnold, M. J., & Reynolds, K. E. (2003). Hedonic shopping motivations. *Journal of Retailing*, 79, 77-95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(03\)00007-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(03)00007-1)
- Baek, E., Lee, H. K., & Choo, H. J. (2019, Oct). Cross-border online shopping experiences of Chinese shoppers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 32(2), 366-385. <https://doi.org/10.1108/apjml-03-2018-0117>
- Beverland, M. (2005a). Brand management and the challenge of authenticity. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 14(7), 460-461. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10610420510633413>
- Beverland, M. (2005b, Jul). Crafting brand authenticity: The case of luxury wines. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5), 1003-1029. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00530.x>
- Beverland, M. (2006, 2006/02/01/). The 'real thing': Branding authenticity in the luxury wine trade. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(2), 251-258. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.04.007>

- Beverland, M. B., & Farrelly, F. J. (2010). The quest for authenticity in consumption: consumers' purposive choice of authentic cues to shape experienced outcomes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(5), 838-856. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip.shib&db=bth&AN=47717809&site=ehost-live&custid=s4121186>
- Brennan, S. (2018, 18 August). Burberry finally shakes off its 'chav check' reputation as millennials re-embrace the iconic print (and even Gigi Hadid is a fan). *Mail Online*. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article-6071585/Burberry-finally-shakes-chav-check-reputation.html>
- Brown, S., Kozinets, R. V., & Sherry, J. F. (2003, Jul). Teaching old brands new tricks: Retro branding and the revival of brand meaning. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(3), 19-33. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.3.19.18657>
- Bryla, P. (2018). Organic food online shopping in Poland. *British Food Journal*, 120(5), 1015-1027. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bfj-09-2017-0517>
- Byrne, B. M. (2016). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS : basic concepts, applications, and programming* (Third edition. ed.). Routledge. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/portsmouth-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4556523>
- Charlton, G. (2012). Ecommerce consumer reviews: why you need them and how to use them. *Econsultancy*. Retrieved 10 February 2021, from <https://econsultancy.com/ecommerce-consumer-reviews-why-you-need-them-and-how-to-use-them/>
- Chen, R. X., Zhou, Z. M., Zhan, G., & Zhou, N. (2020, Mar). The impact of destination brand authenticity and destination brand self-congruence on tourist loyalty: The mediating role of destination brand engagement. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 15, 11, Article 100402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100402>
- Cheung, C. M. K., & Thadani, D. R. (2012, 2012/12/01/). The impact of electronic word-of-mouth communication: A literature analysis and integrative model. *Decision Support Systems*, 54(1), 461-470. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2012.06.008>
- Cohen, E. (1988, 1988/01/01/). Authenticity and commoditization in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(3), 371-386. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(88\)90028-X](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X)

- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development : theory and applications* (2nd ed. ed.). SAGE.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01619a&AN=up.609124&site=eds-live>
- Easterby-Smith, M., Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. (2008). Working with pluralism-determining quality in qualitative research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(3), 419-429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108315858>
- Eggers, F., O'Dwyer, M., Kraus, S., Vallaster, C., & Guldenberg, S. (2013, 2013/07/01/). The impact of brand authenticity on brand trust and SME growth: A CEO perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 48(3), 340-348.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.07.018>
- Fassnacht, M., Beatty, S. E., & Szajna, M. (2019, Sep). Combating the negative effects of showrooming: Successful salesperson tactics for converting showroomers into buyers. *Journal of Business Research*, 102, 131-139.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.05.020>
- Fine, G. A. (2003, Apr). Crafting authenticity: The validation of identity in self-taught art. *Theory and Society*, 32(2), 153-180. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1023943503531>
- Flavián, C., Gurrea, R., & Orús, C. (2016). Choice confidence in the webrooming purchase process: The impact of online positive reviews and the motivation to touch. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 15(5), 459-476. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1585>
- Fritz, K., Schoenmueller, V., & Bruhn, M. (2017). Authenticity in branding – exploring antecedents and consequences of brand authenticity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(2), 324-348. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejm-10-2014-0633>
- Girish, V. G., & Chen, C. F. (2017). Authenticity, experience, and loyalty in the festival context: Evidence from the San Fermin festival, Spain. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(15), 1551-1556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1296821>
- Grayson, K., & Martinec, R. (2004). Consumer perceptions of iconicity and indexicality and their influence on assessments of authentic market offerings. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(2), 296-312. <https://doi.org/10.1086/422109>
- Gruen, T. W., Osmonbekov, T., & Czaplewski, A. J. (2006). eWOM: The impact of customer-to-customer online know-how exchange on customer value and loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(4), 449-456.
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6V7S-4J0XS2M-1/2/f9730726230235898957dc57393957a4>

- Guèvremont, A. (2018). Creating and interpreting brand authenticity: The case of a young brand. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 17(6), 505-518.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1735>
- Guiot, D., & Roux, D. (2010). A second-hand shoppers' motivation scale: Antecedents, consequences, and implications for retailers. *Journal of Retailing*, 86(4), 355-371.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2010.08.002>
- Halzack, S. (2016). Amazon physical grocery won't require checkout. *The Washington Post*.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsnbk&AN=1611C791B031C4C0&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Hare, C., Kirk, D., & Lang, T. (2001). The food shopping experience of older consumers in Scotland: critical incidents. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 29(1), 25-40.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., & Walsh, G. (2003, Win). Electronic word-of-mouth: Motives for and consequences of reading customer articulations on the Internet. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 8(2), 51-74.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2003.11044293>
- Holmes, A., Byrne, A., & Rowley, J. (2014). Mobile shopping behaviour: insights into attitudes, shopping process involvement and location. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 42(1), 25-39. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-10-2012-0096>
- Holt, D. B. (2002, Jun). Why do brands cause trouble? A dialectical theory of consumer culture and branding. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(1), 70-90.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/339922>
- Huang, X. L., & Soergel, D. (2013). Functional relevance and inductive development of an e-retailing product information typology. *Information Research-an International Electronic Journal*, 18(2), 16, Article 574. [Go to ISI://WOS:000328696400002](https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2003.11044293)
- Immonen, M., Sintonen, S., & Koivuniemi, J. (2018, 2018/01/01/). The value of human interaction in service channels. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 78, 316-325.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.10.005>
- Jaiswal, A. K., Niraj, R., Park, C. H., & Agarwal, M. K. (2018, 2018/11/01/). The effect of relationship and transactional characteristics on customer retention in emerging online

markets. *Journal of Business Research*, 92, 25-35.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.007>

Jayawardhena, C., & Tiu Wright, L. (2009). An empirical investigation into e-shopping excitement: antecedents and effects. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(9/10), 1171-1187. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1108/03090560910976429>

Kablan, S., Oulaï, A., & Elliott, E. (2015, 2015/09/01). Legal aspects of accessibility and usability of online public services in Quebec and Canada. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 15(3), 387-406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-015-9186-3>

Kassarjian, H. H. (1977). Content Analysis in Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4(1), 8-18. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208674>

Kennick, W. E. (1985). Art and inauthenticity. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 44(1), 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.2307/430535>

Kim, J.-H., Ritchie, J. R. B., & McCormick, B. (2012, 01//). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 12. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=69812685&site=eds-live>

Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (Fourth edition. ed.). The Guilford Press.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01619a&AN=up.1350615&site=eds-live>

Kluge, P., Nikolaus, & Fassnacht, M. (2015). Selling luxury goods online: effects of online accessibility and price display. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 43(10/11), 1065-1082. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-07-2014-0097>

Kumar, A., & Kashyap Anil, K. (2018). Leveraging utilitarian perspective of online shopping to motivate online shoppers. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 46(3), 247-263. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-08-2017-0161>

Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007, Dec). An array of qualitative data analysis tools: A call for data analysis triangulation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 22(4), 557-584. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1045-3830.22.4.557>

- Lehdonvirta, V., Oksanen, A., Räsänen, P., & Blank, G. (2020). Social media, web, and panel surveys: Using non-probability samples in social and policy research. *Policy & Internet*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.238>
- Leigh, T. W., Peters, C., & Shelton, J. (2006). The consumer quest for authenticity: The multiplicity of meanings within the MG subculture of consumption. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(4), 481-493. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070306288403>
- Liang, L. J., Choi, H. S. C., & Joppe, M. (2018). Understanding repurchase intention of Airbnb consumers: perceived authenticity, electronic word-of-mouth, and price sensitivity. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(1), 73-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2016.1224750>
- Malhotra, N. K., Nunan, D., & Birks, D. F. (2017). *Marketing research : an applied approach* (Fifth Edition. ed.). Pearson. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat01619a&AN=up.1276298&site=eds-live>
- Meng, Z., Cai, L. A., Day, J., Tang, C.-H., Lu, Y., & Zhang, H. (2019). Authenticity and nostalgia – subjective well-being of Chinese rural-urban migrants. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 14(5-6), 506-524. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eoah&AN=51020044&site=ehost-live>
- Minnema, A., Bijmolt, T. H. A., Gensler, S., & Wiesel, T. (2016, 2016/09/01/). To Keep or Not to Keep: Effects of Online Customer Reviews on Product Returns. *Journal of Retailing*, 92(3), 253-267. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2016.03.001>
- Morhart, F., Malar, L., Guevremont, A., Girardin, F., & Grohmann, B. (2015, Apr). Brand authenticity: An integrative framework and measurement scale. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(2), 200-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.11.006>
- Moulard, J. G., Garrity, C. P., & Rice, D. H. (2015, Feb). What makes a human brand authentic? Identifying the antecedents of celebrity authenticity. *Psychology & Marketing*, 32(2), 173-186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20771>
- Napoli, J., Dickinson, S. J., Beverland, M., & Farrelly, F. (2014, 2014/06/01/). Measuring consumer-based brand authenticity. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1090-1098. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.06.001>

- Nazir, S. (2019). Is the copycat economy damaging mid-market retail? *Retail Gazette*. Retrieved 7 October 2020, from <https://www.retailgazette.co.uk/blog/2019/07/is-the-copycat-economy-damaging-mid-market-retail/>
- Newman, G. E., & Dhar, R. (2014, Jun). Authenticity is contagious: Brand essence and the original source of production. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 51(3), 371-386. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.11.0022>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill.
- Palumbo, D. (2019). Amazon at 25: The story of a giant. *BBC News Business*. Retrieved 14 February 2021, from <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-48884596>
- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010, Aug). Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5(5), 411-419. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000281821900008
- Ramanathan, R. (2010, Jun). E-commerce success criteria: determining which criteria count most. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 10(2), 191-208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-010-9051-3>
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling Qualitative Data: A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Schallehn, M., Burmann, C., & Riley, N. (2014). Brand authenticity: model development and empirical testing. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(3), 192-199. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jpbm-06-2013-0339>
- Sim, J., Saunders, B., Waterfield, J., & Kingstone, T. (2018). Can sample size in qualitative research be determined a priori? *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 21(5), 619-634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2018.1454643>
- Spiggle, S., Nguyen, H. T., & Caravella, M. (2012). More than fit: Brand extension authenticity. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, 49(6), 967-983. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.11.0015>
- Stoltman, J., Gentry, J., & Anglin, K. (1991). Shopping choices: the case of mall choice. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18, 434-440.

- Thompson, C. J., & Arsel, Z. (2004, Dec). The Starbucks brandscape and consumers' (anticorporate) experiences of glocalization. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(3), 631-642. <https://doi.org/10.1086/425098>
- Toufaily, E., Souiden, N., & Ladhari, R. (2013). Consumer trust toward retail websites: Comparison between pure click and click-and-brick retailers. *Journal of Retailing & Consumer Services*, 20(6), 538-548. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2013.05.001>
- Turunen, L. L. M. (2018). Perceived Authenticity. In *Interpretations of Luxury: Exploring the Consumer Perspective* (pp. 121-135). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60870-9_7
- van Esch, P., Arli, D., Castner, J., Talukdar, N., & Northey, G. (2018). Consumer attitudes towards bloggers and paid blog advertisements: what's new? *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 36(7), 778-793. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-01-2018-0027>
- Vock, M., Dolen, W. v., & Ruyter, K. d. (2013). Understanding willingness to pay for social network sites. *Journal of Service Research*, 16(3), 311-325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670512472729>
- Watkinson, M. (2013). *The ten principles behind great customer experiences*. New York : Pearson Financial Times.
- Xue, L., Parker, C. J., & Hart, C. (2020). How to design fashion retail's virtual reality platforms. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 48(10), 1057-1076. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-11-2019-0382>
- Zhang, M., Fan, B., Zhang, N., Wang, W. J., & Fan, W. G. (2021, Jan). Mining product innovation ideas from online reviews. *Information Processing & Management*, 58(1), 12, Article 102389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2020.102389>

Table 1: Past frameworks of perceived authenticity and defining dimensions

Author/s & year	Defining dimensions	Context	Key findings
Akbar and Wymer (2017)	Genuineness and originality	Brands (general) (Data of the main study were collected using a non-profit brand)	Authenticity as a two-dimensional (i.e., originality and genuineness), second-order reflective–formative construct
Alexander (2009)	Preservation of essence, continuity, and heritage	Companies operating in a mass-market context	Evaluation of the validity of Beverland’s (2006) six dimensions of authenticity to a mass-market beer brand within the context of a co-branding relationship with a sponsored sports team. Three of the factors are more significant than others in the creation of brand auras: stylistic consistency, relationship to place and downplaying commercial motives.
Beverland (2006)	Heritage and pedigree, stylistic consistency, quality commitments, relationship to place, method of production, and downplaying commercial motives	Luxury wines	Qualitatively established six dimensions of authenticity relevant for luxury products.
Beverland and Farrelly (2010)	Purity of motive, reflection of one's identity, values, connection, closeness, proximity, control, efficacy, nostalgia, group, commercial disinterest, instinct, noble, pure, and caring	General	Consumer perception of authenticity comprises multiple dimensions, which in turn influence their decision-making process (i.e., control, connection, virtue)
Eggers et al. (2013)	Consistency, customer orientation, and congruency	Data from 285 German small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)	Authenticity is represented by three factors (i.e., brand consistency, brand customer orientation, and brand congruency). Brand congruency and brand consistency had a positive

			impact on brand trust in SMEs
Fine (2003)	Sincerity, innocence, and originality	Self-taught art	Examination of authenticity from a self-identity perspective, establishing it as a multidimensional concept.
Holt (2002)	Commercial disinterest, local, and artistic	Brands (general)	Interpretation of authenticity from a consumer culture theoretical perspective. Authenticity is a multi-dimensional concept.
Morhart et al. (2015)	Longevity, symbolism, virtue, sincerity, credibility, reliability, consistency, and honesty	Brands (general)	Identified four higher-order dimensions of authenticity (continuity, integrity, credibility and & symbolism). They all turn increase emotional brand attachment and word-of-mouth.
Moulard et al. (2015)	Instinctive, honest, different, original, candid, moral, discrete, and emotional	Celebrity brands	Identified two higher-order dimensions of celebrity (human) authenticity: rarity and stability. Each higher-order dimension consists of sub-dimensions.
Napoli et al. (2014)	Heritage, sincerity, quality commitment, tradition, time, essence, values, longevity, continuity, high standards	Brands (general)	Identified three higher-order dimensions of authenticity (i.e., quality commitment, sincerity and heritage). Each dimension consists of sub-dimensions;
Kennick (1985)	Genuine, truth.	Art	Conceptual discussion on authenticity from an aesthetic perspective.
Thompson and Arsel (2004)	Niche, local, close, unstandardized, spontaneous	Local coffee shops	Examination of authenticity from a servicescape perspective, a prominent study about place authenticity, whereas other studies focus on brand- or goods-related authenticity.
Guèvremont (2018)	Transparency, virtuousness, proximity	A cooking blog	Examination of authenticity related to an online channel, emphasising the multidimensionality of the concept, and the importance of transparency transparency

			over the other dimensions in the early stage of brand authentication.
--	--	--	---

Table 2: Theoretical clustering of established authenticity dimensions

Authenticity dimensions from Guèvremont's work (2018)	Authenticity dimensions from past frameworks
<i>Honesty (transparency)</i> - the quality of being honest and transparent	Purity of motives, pure (Beverland & Farrell, 2010) Honesty, purity (Moulard <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Integrity (Morhart <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Sincerity (Fine, 2003; Morhart <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Credibility (Morhart <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Innocence (Fine, 2003) Candid, moral (Moulard <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Values (Beverland & Farrell, 2010; Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Genuine, truth (Kennick, 1985) Virtue (Morhart <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Spontaneous (Thompson & Arsel, 2004)
<i>Kindness (virtuousness)</i> - the quality of being well meaning, caring and helping others and seeking to have positive impacts on people and society	Downplaying commercial motives (Beverland, 2005a) Commercial disinterest (Beverland & Farrell, 2010 Holt, 2002) Nobility (Beverland & Farrell, 2010) Symbolism (Morhart <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Emotional (Moulard <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Discrete (Moulard <i>et al.</i> , 2015)
<i>Connection (proximity)</i> - the quality of being close to consumers, creating familiarity and closeness within the community	Relation to place (Beverland, 2005a) Reflection of one's identity, connection, closeness, Proximity, caring (Beverland & Farrell, 2010) Customer orientation (Eggers <i>et al.</i> 2013) Local (Holt, 2002; Thompson & Arsel, 2004) Closeness (Thompson & Arsel, 2004) Nostalgia (Beverland & Farrelly, 2010)
<i>Continuity (time)</i> - the quality of remaining in existence or operation over time	Preservation of the original essence (Alexander, 2009; Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Continuity (Alexander, 2009; Morhart <i>et al.</i> 2015) Heritage (Alexander, 2009, Beverland, 2005a; Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Pedigree (Beverland, 2005a) Tradition (Beverland, 2005a; Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Traditional method of production (Beverland, 2005) Consistency (Beverland, 2005; Eggers <i>et al.</i> 2013; Morhart <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Longevity (Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Timelessness (Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
<i>Craftsmanship</i> - the quality of being skilful and knowledgeable with production and/or product design	Artisanal, stylistic (Beverland, 2005a) Quality commitments (Beverland, 2005a; Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Artistic (Holt, 2002) Control, efficacy, instinct (Beverland & Farrell, 2010) Instinctive, different (Moulard <i>et al.</i> , 2015) Original/original design (Beverland, 2005; Moulard <i>et al.</i> , 2015) High standards (Napoli <i>et al.</i> , 2014) Niche (Thompson & Arsel, 2004) Unstandardised (Thompson & Arsel, 2004) Originality (Fine, 2003)

Table 3: Findings from quasi-qualitative study

Quality	Freq.	Service/convenient	Freq.	Rare/choice	Freq.
Good quality	6	Customer service	3	Unavailable in (physical) stores	1
Established quality	5	Social media	3	Less access to people	1
Durable	1	Efficient	1	Limited	1
Reliable	4	Responsive to	1	Choice	2
Practical	1	Responsive to	1	Variety	1
Focused	1	Digital (modern)	1	Total	6
Safe	2	Convenient	1		
Dedicated	1	Seeing before buying	2		
Dependable	1	Total	13		
Total	22				
Honesty		Established/trustworthy		Affordable	
Genuine	6	Well known	3	Budget	1
Accurate	1	Reputation	2	Affordable	1
Licence	1	Popular	2	Value for money	1
Legitimate	1	Global	1	Discounted	1
True to its customers	1	Credible	1	Total	4
Real	2	Trustworthy	5		
Total	12	Total	14		
Different		Connected			
Unique	4	Likable	1		
Special	3	Comfortable	1		
Different	3	Relatable	1		
Hand/home made	3	Personalized	1		
Different choice from high street	2	Forward thinking	1		
One-of-a-kind	2	Personal	1		
Original	2	Thoughtful	1		
Refreshing	1	Total	7		
Newness	1				
Fashionable	1				
Creative	1				
Total	19				

Table 4: Profile of participants surveyed in quantitative study (n=201)

<u>Gender</u>		<u>Items bought frequently online</u>	
Male	39.3%	Clothing & accessories	58.2%
Female	60.7%	Home appliances	6.5%
		Entertainment products (e.g. DVD)	10.0%
		Footwear/shoes	4.5%
		Health & beauty products	8.5%
		Other - groceries	7.0%
<u>Age categories (in years)</u>		<u>Average spent online</u>	
26-35	43.2%	Less than £25	13.9%
36-45	28.9%	£25-£50	45.8%
46-55	20.4%	£51-£75	20.9%
56-65	6.5%	£76-£100	11.9%
66-75	1.0%	£101-£125	4.5%
		£126-£150	1.5%
		More than £150	1.5%
<u>Employment status</u>			
Full-time	58.0%		
Part-time	24.0%		
Student	1.0%		
Retired	4.5%		
Not working at the moment	12.5%		

Table 5. Authenticity factors and construct validity

Factors	Mean (SD)	Fact. Load.	CR	AVE
<i>Convenient (M = 5.90, SD = 1.05)</i>			.91	.72
Online-only brands...				
▪ are delivered directly to my door.	5.80 (1.15)	0.75		
▪ are accessible 24 for seven.	5.97 (1.23)	0.87		
▪ save my time and arrive quickly.	5.84 (1.19)	0.89		
▪ relieve me of the burden of going to the store, queuing, dealing with the crowd.	6.01 (1.18)	0.86		
<i>Connected(M = 4.69, SD = 1.26)</i>			.92	.74
Online-only brands...				
▪ add meaning to people’s lives.	4.53 (1.37)	0.82		
▪ reflect important values people care about.	4.98 (1.27)	0.78		
▪ connect people with their real selves.	4.58 (1.50)	0.89		
▪ connect people with what is important.	4.69 (1.49)	0.93		
<i>Rare (M = 3.10, SD = 1.51)</i>			.81	.68
Online-only brands...				
▪ are not accessible to everyone.	2.95 (1.67)	0.94		
▪ are not known by everyone.	3.26 (1.64)	0.72		
<i>Quality (M = 5.34, SD = 1.13)</i>			.95	.83
Online-only brands...				
▪ are high quality brands.	5.25 (1.21)	0.85		
▪ use good quality materials.	5.37 (1.19)	0.92		
▪ make high quality products.	5.39 (1.20)	0.95		
▪ are known for quality.	5.34 (1.26)	0.91		

Table 5 (cont.)

Factor	Mean (SD)	Fact. Load.	CR	AVE
<i>Different (M = 5.30, SD = 1.05)</i>			.89	.66
Online-only brands...				
▪ are unique.	5.40 (1.30)	0.78		
▪ are different.	5.31 (1.25)	0.85		
▪ are special.	5.16 (1.19)	0.82		
▪ are one-of-a-kind.	4.88 (1.38)	0.80		
▪ are different from choices available on the high street.	5.66 (1.26)	0.76		
▪ are original.	5.40 (1.15)	0.82		
<i>Affordable (M = 4.82, SD = 1.24)</i>			.93	.69
Online-only brands...				
▪ offer a good deal.	5.07 (1.35)	0.69		
▪ are cheaper than brands sold in high street stores.	4.44 (1.54)	0.91		
▪ are more affordable than brands sold in high street.	4.57 (1.49)	0.92		
▪ have competitive prices.	5.21 (1.31)	0.80		
<i>Timeless (M = 4.76, SD = 1.07)</i>			.83	.56
Online-only brands...				
▪ have a history.	4.38 (1.40)	0.60		
▪ are timeless brands.	4.48 (1.35)	0.57		
▪ survive times.	5.00 (1.29)	0.90		
▪ survive trends.	5.20 (1.26)	0.85		
<i>Honest (M = 6.08, SD = .88)</i>			.88	.65
Online-only brands...				
▪ are honest brands.	6.19 (.99)	0.85		
▪ always accomplish value promises.	5.92 (1.05)	0.87		
▪ care about their customers.	6.10 (.99)	0.72		
▪ never betray customers.	6.11 (1.08)	0.78		

Table 6: Predictive validity of authenticity factors on consumers' eWoM related to OOBs

	Composite mean	Std. dev	Standardized Beta	t-value	<i>p</i>
eWoM¹	5.77	1.03			
Convenient	5.90	1.05	.22	2.82	.005
Connected	4.69	1.26	.07	.90	.368
Timeless	4.76	1.07	.25	3.09	.002
Rare	3.10	1.51	-.17	-2.41	.017
Quality	5.34	1.13	.23	2.85	.005
Different	5.30	1.05	-.03	-.37	.709
Affordable	4.82	1.24	-.14	-1.85	.066
Honest	6.08	.88	.017	.22	.824

Notes: ¹Dependent variable

Figure 1: Perceived authenticity framework and defining dimensions of OOBs

