

THE EFFECT OF BRAND EXPERIENCE ON BRAND EQUITY AND VISIT INTENTIONS IN VIRTUAL ALFAMIND STORE

Tiffani Alexia Hotama¹⁾, Yokie Radnan Kristiyono^{2)*}

^{1), 2)} *Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang, Indonesia*

e-mail: paulus.radnan@uph.edu
(Corresponding Author indicated by an asterisk *)

ABSTRACT

Over the past decade, the retail industry has made a systematic transition, with the advent of online and mobile shopping, reshaping consumer behavior and business models around the world. The COVID-19 pandemic has changed consumer behavior in interacting with stores, so consumers will prefer virtual stores. To provide comprehensive empirical evidence for this study, the authors will review literature relevant to brand experience, their brand equity and visit intentions. Therefore, in this study, we will find out whether there is a positive influence of brand experience on brand equity and visit intentions. This study uses quantitative methods. Data was taken using Google Form which was distributed to 50 people for the preliminary study and 200 respondents for the actual research. Data collection was done by using convenience sampling. The data obtained was processed using the SmartPls 3.0 application. The results of this study indicate that there is a positive influence between sensory and brand equity. There is no positive influence between behavior on brand equity. There is a positive influence between emotional on brand equity. There is a positive influence between intellectual and brand equity. There is no positive influence between sensory and visit intentions. There is no positive influence between behavior on visit intentions. There is a positive influence between emotional on visit intentions. There is no positive influence between intellectual and visit intentions. There is a positive influence of brand equity on visit intentions.

Keywords: Brand Experience; Brand Equity; Visit Intentions

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has changed consumer behavior in interacting with stores, so consumers will prefer virtual stores. Virtual shopping platforms allow consumers to experiment with new value-added services. Offers such as live chat with store associates, virtual tours, quizzes and interactive games, and social shopping with friends are designed to make the online shopping experience as easy as possible. Buyers can assess and configure products in 3D, zoom in and out from various angles to evaluate product quality and suitability, and make purchases in real-time (Silversea Media Group, 2021). Companies can innovate by creating virtual stores, this can be done to overcome limitations due to current conditions, where people cannot come directly to the store.

Virtual shopping is an internet-based advancement that impacts consumer decision making. This innovation can be a strategy to change a company's inventory, enter new markets to attract new customers, and promote advertising in a competitive environment (Kumar, 2018). In the simplest terms, virtual tours bridge the gap between online and offline in-store. An experience will be created, and virtual tours can combine online and physical stores. Thus, it is not surprising that the use of virtual reality technology (virtual reality) is very large and growing, with an estimated 6 billion dollars in 2020 and an estimated 171 million users by the end of 2018 (Pizzi et al., 2019).

In the research conducted Fornari et al. (2016) explained that consumers will evaluate an online store better, if the store has an offline store, which in turn will increase brand equity. In simple terms, online and offline stores will complement each other rather than compete. An offline store can take advantage of technology by creating a virtual store (virtual store), where consumers can visit digitally (virtual tours), and feel as if they are visiting the store offline. By using 360-degree online media and applying virtual reality technology, consumers can visit without having to travel physically. Consumers can visit the store in a realistic environment, and can enhance their experience (Baek et al., 2020).

The purpose of this study is to determine the positive influence of sensory on brand equity, determine the positive influence of behavior on brand equity, determine the positive influence of emotional on brand equity, determine the positive influence of intellectual on brand equity, and determine the positive influence of sensory on visit intentions, to determine the positive impact between behavioral and visit intentions, to determine the positive influence between emotional and visit intentions, to determine the positive influence between intellectual and visit intentions, to determine the positive influence of brand equity on visit intentions customers. In addition, Alfamind provides the sensation of shopping like in a real store so that marketing products can be more interesting and fun and can provide a brand experience to consumers who visit. So that it will indirectly promote the store to other consumers and create brand equity and visit intentions. Traditional shops are experiencing a reduction in in-store customers as consumers spend more time buying online. Based on a well-known brand experience account, we suggest that a virtual tour of a store could influence brand equity and encourage store visit intentions, helping the industry in the omnichannel era.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Brand Experience

Brand Experience refers to internal consumer responses (e.g. sensations, feelings, and cognitions) subjectively and behavioral responses evoked by brand-related stimuli (Baek et al., 2020). Brand experience defined as the consumer's subjective internal responses

(sensations, feelings, and cognitions) and behavioral responses induced at various levels of interaction, both direct and indirect, with brand-related stimuli (Gao & Lan, 2020). Brand experience are sensations, feelings, cognitions, and behavioral responses evoked by brand-related stimuli that are part of the brand's design and identity, packaging, communication, and environment (Hepola et al., 2017).

There are four dimensions of brand experience from a multidimensional perspective (Baek et al., 2020):

1. Sensory

Due to brand stimulation, consumers form a certain brand perception after experiencing the brand. Among the various brand stimuli, sensory stimuli are the main ones. For brand management, sensory stimuli appeal to the five human senses (sight, hearing, touch, smell, and taste) and have great potential to build strong and unique impressions in consumers' minds (Gao & Lan, 2020). Sensory experience refers to bodily sensations based on five sensory modalities, namely, visual, auditory, olfactory, taste and tactile senses (Baek et al., 2020). Brand Experience Sensory brands have received increasing attention from researchers, who have stated that sensory brand experiences can promote process and Brand Equity.

2. Behavioral

Behavioral experience refers to motor responses to stimuli, such as engaging in physical activity, lifestyle and interactions with brands (Baek et al., 2020).

3. Emotional

Emotional experience refers to the sentiments and emotions caused by the brand stimulus. Emotions also arise from cognitive assessments of events or one's own thoughts (Hepola et al., 2017). Emotions have an important role in the differentiation and provision of better experiences because emotions are mental states of readiness arising from the assessment of events that enable individuals to give meaning to brands (Moreira et al., 2017).

4. Intellectual

Intellectual experience refers to thought processes or the stimulation of ideas. Morgan-Thomas & Veloutsou (2013) used the concept of online brand experience to investigate individual responses to online brands. In this study, researchers will explore the brand experience evoked by a visit to a virtual store, which can be referred to as the experience of visiting a store. By visiting a virtual store, visitors will get a sensory, physical, emotional, and intellectual store experience.

Brand Equity

Brand equity is a brand advantage that has just been demonstrated by consumers and is a major determinant of brand success (Baek et al., 2020). Brand equity can be seen as the added value associated with a particular product by the thoughts, words and actions of consumers and the different consumer responses between branded and unbranded products when both have the same level of marketing arousal and product attributes (Hepola et al., 2017).

Visit Intentions

Consumers visit shopping centers for several reasons such as to socially communicate with others, to relax and have fun, to buy goods, and so on. All of these activities have a positive impact on their minds and affect their intention to visit again (Badar & Irfan, 2018).

According to Kusuma & Marta (2016), intention is one of the psychological aspects that has a considerable influence on behavioral attitudes and intentions are also a source of

motivation that will direct someone to take an action. Leri & Theodoridis (2019) defines behavioral intention as the degree to which a person plans to do or not consciously perform some behavior in the future. Although behavioral intentions do not always lead to actual behavior, the stronger the intention, the more likely an individual is to perform certain behaviors.

Clemens et al. (2009) explained that basically behavioral intentions are related to customer retention (length of relationship with customers) and customer loyalty. Wahyuningsih (2011) said that behavioral intentions occur when consumers buy a product or service for the second or more time at the same place, and it is because of this experience that consumers come back to make a purchase.

Hypothesis Development

Brand Experience and Brand Equity

Many studies on the relationship between brand equity and brand experience have been carried out, such as that of Xixiang et al. (2016), Iglesias et al. (2019), and Shahzad et al. (2019). Consistent with the idea that brand experience positively affects brand-consumer relationships (Jones & Runyan, 2013). Brand equity can reflect consumers' thoughts, feelings, and actions towards brands, and thus in this study, researchers can explore how sensory, emotional, intellectual, and behavioral brand experiences shape brand equity. In particular, sensory experience was found to be an important determinant of brand equity (Baek et al., 2020).

Based on this, the hypotheses proposed in this study are as follows

H1a = There is a positive influence between sensory on brand equity

H1b = There is a positive influence between behavior on brand equity

H1c = There is a positive influence between emotional and brand equity

H1d = There is a positive influence between intellectual and brand equity

Brand Experience and Visit Intentions

Brand experience can positively influence consumers' willingness to shop with a brand. In an online context where a computer-mediated environment enables real-time brand interactivity and experience (Baek et al., 2020). The emergence of positive emotions, such as excitement, excitement, and pleasure, may depend on the consumer's prior recommendations during a store visit. That is, the previous consumer experience with the store can reduce novelty for new consumers who visit the store for the second or next time through the virtual store (Jin et al., 2021).

Based on this, the hypotheses proposed in this study are as follows:

H2a = There is a positive influence between sensory on visit intentions

H2b = There is a positive influence between behavior on visit intentions

H2c = There is a positive influence between emotional and visit intentions

H2d = There is a positive influence between intellectual and visit intentions

Brand Equity and Visit Intentions

Brand equity is an important driver of behavioral intention. The definition itself involves a consumer's predilection for a brand that can lead to a preference or purchase intention because of the added value to its brand name (Baek et al., 2020). The virtual experience of the store will build the brand equity of the destination and consequently, the brand equity will lead to their intention to visit the store.

Based on this, the hypotheses proposed in this study are as follows:

H3 = There is a positive influence of brand equity on visit intentions

RESEARCH METHOD

Types of research

The type of research used is quantitative research with an explanatory format. Explanation is intended to explain a generalization of the sample to the population, or explain the relationship, difference or influence of one variable on another. Therefore, research with an explanatory format uses samples and hypotheses in the research. Research with this explanatory format can be done through surveys (Abdullah, 2015).

Research Design

The research design used is a causality research design. Causality research design is a research design designed to examine the possibility of a causal relationship between variables. In this design, the causal relationship is generally predictable by the researcher, so that the researcher can state the classification of causal variables, intermediate variables, and dependent or dependent variables (Abdullah, 2015).

Population and Sample

This research uses *purposive sample*. Sampling aims (*purposive sample*) is not based on strata, random, or region, but is based on a specific goal. The use of this technique is usually done due to several considerations, including due to limited time, energy, and cost, so it is not possible to take large and distant samples (Abdullah, 2015). The following criteria are used for sampling, as follows:

1. Alfamind application users who live in Jakarta and surrounding areas
2. Have been using the Alfamind app for the last 1 year

According to Raykov & Marcoulides (2006), the sample gain can be calculated using a method by multiplying the number of indicators by 10 times. Based on this study, which uses 20 indicators, the sample taken is the number of parameters or indicators multiplied by 10. The minimum number of samples in this study is 20 (indicators) multiplied by 10, namely 200 respondents, namely Alfamind application users in Jakarta and Tangerang.

Data analysis technique

The data analysis technique in this research is SEM analysis. Equation modeling Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is a statistical technique for testing and estimating causal relationships using a combination of statistical data and qualitative causal assumptions (Abdullah, 2015). SEM is a further development of Path analysis. In the SEM method the causality relationship between exogenous variables and endogenous variables can be determined more completely. By using SEM, not only can the causality relationship (direct and indirect) on the observed variables or constructs be detected, but also the components that contribute to the formation of the construct can be determined. Thus the causal relationship between the variables or constructs that we are studying becomes more informative, complete, and accurate (Abdullah, 2015).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Result

Demographic Profile

In this study, the questionnaire was distributed to users of the Alfamind Store application in Jakarta, through the dissemination of questionnaires, obtained respondent profiles based on gender, age, occupation and the number of times respondents visited the Alfamind application in the last 6 months.

Gender. Based on gender, out of a total of 200 respondents, there were 69 respondents who were male (34.5%) and 131 respondents were female (65.5%). Thus, it can be concluded that the majority of respondents to this study are female. The percentage of the number of respondent profiles by gender can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. Respondents' Profiles by Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Man	69	34.5%
Woman	131	65.5%
Total	200	100.0%

Age. Based on age, out of a total of 200 respondents, there were 62 respondents (31%) aged 18–25 years, as many as 111 respondents (55.5%) aged 26–33 years and as many as 27 respondents (13.5%) aged > 33 years. Thus, it can be concluded that the majority of respondents to this study have the age of 26–33 years. The percentage of the number of respondents' profiles by age can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Respondents' Profiles by Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
18– 25 years old	62	31%
26–33 years old	111	55.5%
> 33 years old	27	13.5%
Total	200	100,0%

Work. Based on employment, out of a total of 200 respondents, 8 respondents (4%) were students, 103 respondents (51.5%) were students, and 89 respondents (44.5%) were others. Thus, it can be concluded that the majority of respondents to this study have jobs as students. The percentage of the number of respondent profiles based on the last education can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Respondents' Profiles by Last Education

Work	Frequency	Percentage
College Students	8	4%
Undergraduate Students	103	51.5%
Other	89	44.5%
Total	200	100.0%

At this stage, a validity test is carried out using *SmartPLS*. The validity test carried out is the validity of the construct. Testing the validity of the construct can be carried out by paying attention to the strongness of the correlation between the construct and the construct-forming indicators, as well as its weak relationship with other constructs.

Outer Model

The *outer value* of the model can be seen from *the loading factor* for each construct indicator. *The rule of thumb* used to assess reliability is that the value of the *loading factor* must be greater than 0.7.

Table 4. Loading Factor

Variables	Indicators	Factor Loading	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	Results
Behavioural	B1	0.819	0.653	Valid
	B2	0.846		
	B3	0.757		
Brand Equity	BE1	0.746	0.722	Valid
	BE2	0.820		
	BE3	0.871		
	BE4	0.948		
Emotional	E1	0.869	0.753	Valid
	E2	0.925		
	E3	0.805		
Intellectual	I1	0.880	0.758	Valid
	I2	0.915		
	I3	0.813		
Sensory	S1	0.935	0.805	Valid
	S2	0.907		
	S3	0.848		
Visit Intention	V1	0.883	0.702	Valid
	V2	0.872		
	V3	0.713		
	V4	0.871		

From table 4, it appears that all indicators have a *loading factor* value of > 0.7 . This means that the indicators of variables or constructs in the table are valid. The table above shows that all variables have an AVE value > 0.5 so it can be said to be valid.

Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

The next discriminant validity test uses *the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio* (HTMT), which is the value used to measure the validity of construct discriminants measured reflectively compared to other construct sizes in the same model (Hair et al., 2021). HTMT is defined as the average value of the indicator correlation across constructs (i.e., heterotrait-heteromethod correlation) relative to the average (geometric) of the mean correlation for indicators measuring the same construct (i.e., monotrait-heteromethod correlation) (Hair et al., 2021).

Table 5. Discriminant Validity Test

	Behavioural	Brand Equity	Emotional	Intellectual	Sensory	Visit Intention
Behavioural						
Brand Equity	0.818					
Emotional	0.772	0.865				
Intellectual	0.727	0.913	0.843			
Sensory	1.007	0.896	0.680	0.815		
Visit Intention	0.803	0.949	0.937	0.809	0.794	

The measurement of Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) can be said to have good discriminate validity if the HTMT value < 0.9 . From the results above, there is a variable relationship that has an HTMT value of > 0.9 , namely *Behavioural* to *Sensory*, *Brand Equity* to *Intellectual* and *Visit intentions*, *Emotional* to *Visit intentions*. So, it can be said to have a bad discriminate validity value. While other variable relationships explain that it has a good discriminate validity value.

Furthermore, HTMT measurements are carried out by bootstrapping to obtain a confidence interval that allows an assessment of whether the value differs significantly from a certain threshold (Hair et al., 2021). Here is the calculation of HTMT after bootstrapping.

Table 6. Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio

	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	5.0%	95.0%
Brand Equity -> Behavioural	0.818	0.814	0.722	0.888
Emotional -> Behavioural	0.772	0.775	0.658	0.893
Emotional -> Brand Equity	0.865	0.862	0.796	0.916
Intellectual -> Behavioural	0.727	0.728	0.616	0.830
Intellectual -> Brand Equity	0.913	0.912	0.872	0.950
Intellectual -> Emotional	0.843	0.839	0.769	0.898
Sensory -> Behavioural	1.007	1.016	0.957	1.091
Sensory -> Brand Equity	0.896	0.895	0.852	0.932
Sensory -> Emotional	0.680	0.680	0.581	0.774
Sensory -> Intellectual	0.815	0.815	0.745	0.881
Visit Intention -> Behavioural	0.803	0.799	0.703	0.880
Visit Intention -> Brand Equity	0.949	0.946	0.894	0.991
Visit Intention -> Emotional	0.937	0.935	0.880	0.984
Visit Intention -> Intellectual	0.809	0.805	0.738	0.862
Visit Intention -> Sensory	0.794	0.792	0.724	0.847

The data above explains that it has a good discriminate validity value, because the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) value is still within the range of HTMT values < 0.9 . However, the sensory variable Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) value is still in the range of 0.9–1, so it can be said that the discriminant validity value is not good.

Composite Reliability dan Cronbach's Alpha

Reliability testing in *SmartPLS* can be done by looking at the *Composite Reliability value*. The following are *the composite reliability values and Cronbach's Alpha*:

Table 7. Composite Reliability

	<i>Composite Reliability</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	Result
Behavioural	0.849	0.736	Reliable
Brand Equity	0.911	0.869	Reliable
Emotional	0.901	0.835	Reliable
Intellectual	0.904	0.840	Reliable
Sensory	0.925	0.879	Reliable
Visit Intention	0.903	0.857	Reliable

From the table above, it can be seen that the *composite reliability* values of each variable are very reliable because they have *composite reliability* above 0.7. This has the intention of measuring the internal consistency for each variable. Indicators of all variables are considered reliable to be used as research instruments. The table above shows the results of the reliability test of all variables in this study can be declared reliable because the value of *cronbach's alpha* meets the predetermined value of the rule of thumb, which is a value greater than 0.7.

Q2 Predictive Relevance

Q2 predictive relevance is used to present the synthesis of validation and fitting functions with predictions from manifest variables and estimates from construct parameters. Q2 Predictive Relevance values of 0.002, 0.15 and 0.35 indicate that the model is weak, moderate, strong. The value of $Q^2 > 0$ indicates that the model has predictive relevance, while $Q^2 < 0$ indicates that the model lacks predictive relevance (Ghozali & Latan, 2015). The value of Q2 can be seen in the following table.

Table 8. Q predicy

	$Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)$
Brand Equity	0.516
Visit Intention	0.506

From the table above, it shows that the Q2 Predictive Relevance value for *sensory, behavioural, emotional and intellectual* towards *brand equity* is in a strong model. For *sensory, behavioural, emotional and intellectual* towards *visit intentions* are on a strong model

Structural Model Testing

Testing of the inner model or structural model is carried out to see the relationship between the construct, significance value and R-square of the research model. The structural model was evaluated using R-square for the dependent construct of the t-test and the significance of the coefficients of the structural path parameters.

R-Square Test Results

In assessing the model with PLS, it begins by looking at the R-square for each dependent latent variable. Table 9 is the result of R-square estimation using SmartPLS.

Table 9. R Square

	R Square
Brand Equity	0.768
Visit Intention	0.774

Source: PLS Data Processing Results (2022)

R-square value of the Brand Equity variable of 0.768 and Visit Intention of 0.774. The higher the R-square value, the greater the ability of the exogenous variable to be explained by the endogenous variable so that the better the structural equation. For the Brand Equity variable, it has an R-square value of 0.768 which means 76.8% variance Brand Equity is capable of being explained by Sensory, Behavioural, Emotional, and Intellectual variables while the rest is explained by other variables outside the research model. The Visit Intention variable has an R-square value of 0.774 which means 77.4% visit intentions variances are capable of being explained by Sensory, Behavioural, Emotional, and Intellectual variables while the rest are explained by other variables outside the research model.

Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis testing is used to test the effect of exogenous variables (x) on endogenous variables (y) by looking at the t-values on each path. The t-count value is obtained from the results of data processing using a procedure called bootstrapping, SmartPLS can produce t-Statistics of Path Coefficients (Inner Model) and T-Statistics of Outer Loadings to test the significance of the structural model and measurement model. By using a one-sided t-table, a significance level of 5%, it is known that the t-table, which is 1.65, the path coefficient will be said to be significant if the t-statistic is greater than t-table and is said to be insignificant if the t-statistic is smaller than t-table.

Table 10. Mean, STDEV, T-Values, P-Values

Hypothesis		Original Sample	t Statistics	p values	Results
1a	Sensory -> Brand Equity	0.458	6.443	0.000	Supported
1b	Behavioral -> Brand Equity	-0.079	1,129	0.130	Rejected
1c	Emotional -> Brand Equity	0.336	7.178	0.000	Supported
1d	Intellectual -> Brand Equity	0.268	5.326	0.000	Supported
2a	Sensory -> Visit Intention	0.082	1.101	0.136	Rejected
2b	Behavioral -> Visit Intention	0.078	1.321	0.094	Rejected
2c	Emotional -> Visit	0.371	6,996	0.000	Supported

	Intention				
2d	Intellectual -> Visit Intention	-0.063	1,448	0.074	Rejected
3	Brand Equity -> Visit Intention	0.495	8.062	0.000	Supported

Source: PLS Data Processing Results (2022)

From the hypothesis test, it produces the inner model as follows:




Figure 1. Inner Model
 Source: Processed data (2022)

Discussion

This research is a model replication study of the model used by Baek et al. (2020). With the following results:

Discussion of Hypothesis 1a

The results of the research on the first hypothesis, namely "Brand Experience has a positive effect on Brand Equity" indicate that the results obtained are the influence between Sensory on Brand Equity is significant with a t-statistic of $6.443 > 1.65$, then hypothesis 1a is accepted.

The direction of the relationship between Sensory and Brand Equity is positive with the original sample estimate value of 0.458, where if Sensory increases by one scale unit, it can increase Brand Equity by 0.458 scale unit.

The results of this study are statistically accepted, but are not supported by research by Baek et al. (2020). Research conducted by Baek et al. (2020) shows that the sensory dimension has no effect on brand equity, while in this study, the sensory dimension has an influence on brand equity. This shows that Alfamind visitors have a visual impression as an addition to brand equity. The results of this study are also new findings that can be used as a reference for further research.

Discussion of Hypothesis 1b

The results obtained from the influence of Behavioral on Brand Equity are not significant with a t-statistic of $1.129 < 1.65$, so hypothesis 1b is rejected. The direction of the relationship between Behavioral and Brand Equity is negative with the original sample estimate value is -0.079 , where if Behavior increases by one scale unit, it can reduce Brand Equity by 0.079 scale unit.

The results of this study were statistically rejected, but supported by research by Baek et al. (2020). Research conducted by Baek et al. (2020) shows that the behavioral dimension also has no effect on brand equity. The results of this study indicate that the Alfamind application cannot be used as brand equity because it is likely that respondents are more comfortable coming directly to a physical store or using other e-commerce sites that already have reliable brand equity.

Discussion of Hypothesis 1c

The results obtained from the effect of Emotional on Brand Equity is significant with a t-statistic of $7.178 > 1.65$, so hypothesis 1c is accepted. The direction of the relationship between Emotional and Brand Equity is positive with the original sample estimate value of 0.336 , where if Emotional increases by one scale unit, it can increase Brand Equity by 0.336 scale units.

The results of this study are consistent with research by Baek et al. (2020). This shows that visiting Alfamind creates experiences and opinions for brand evaluation by consumers.

Discussion of Hypothesis 1d

The results obtained from the influence between Intellectual on Brand Equity is significant with a t-statistic of $5.326 > 1.65$, so hypothesis 1d is accepted. The direction of the relationship between Intellectual and Brand Equity is positive with the original sample estimate value, namely 0.268 , where if Intellectual increases by one scale unit, it can increase Brand Equity by 0.268 scale unit

The results of this study are consistent with research by Baek et al. (2020). This shows that visiting Alfamind adds brand equity to Alfamind by creating curiosity and providing solutions to consumer problems.

Simultaneously, the results show that the relationship between brand equity and brand experience is consistent with the idea that brand experience positively affects brand-consumer relationships (Jones & Runyan, 2013), although in some dimensions the Brand Experience shows different results. Brand equity can reflect consumers' thoughts, feelings, and actions towards brands, and thus in this study, researchers can explore how sensory, emotional, intellectual, and behavioral brand experiences shape brand equity. In particular, sensory experience was found to be an important determinant of brand equity (Baek et al., 2020).

Discussion of Hypothesis 2a

The results of the research on the second hypothesis, namely "Brand Experience has a positive effect on Visit Intentions" indicate that the results obtained from the influence of Sensory on Visit intentions are not significant with a t-statistic of $1.101 < 1.65$, so hypothesis 2a is rejected. The original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.082 , where if Sensory increases by one scale unit, it can increase Visit intentions by 0.082 scale units

The results of this study are not consistent with the research by Baek et al. (2020). Research conducted by Baek et al. (2020) shows that the sensory dimension has an influence

on visit intentions, while in this study, the sensory dimension has no effect on visit intentions. This shows that Alfamind visitors do not have a visual impression when visiting the Alfamind application. The results of this study are also new findings that can be used as a reference for further research.

Discussion of Hypothesis 2b

The results obtained from the influence between Behavioral and Visit intentions are not significant with a t-statistic of $1.321 < 1.65$, so hypothesis 2b is rejected. The original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.078, where if Behavior increases by one scale unit, it can increase Visit intentions by 0.078 scale unit.

The results of this study are not consistent with the research by Baek et al. (2020). Research conducted by Baek et al. (2020) shows that the behavioral dimension has an influence on visit intentions, while in this study, the behavioral dimension has no effect on visit intentions. The results of this study indicate that visiting Alfamind cannot be used as a habitual behavior because it is possible that respondents are more comfortable coming directly to physical stores. In addition, respondents also visited Alfamind not based on their own desires, meaning that respondents visited because of encouragement from other people. The results of this study are also new findings that can be used as a reference for further research.

Discussion of Hypothesis 2c

The results obtained from the influence between Emotional and Visit intentions are not significant with a t-statistic of $6.996 > 1.65$, so hypothesis 2c is accepted. The original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.371, where if Emotional increases by one scale unit, it can increase Visit intentions by 0.371 scale units.

The results of this study are accepted, but not supported by research by Baek et al. (2020). Research conducted by Baek et al. (2020) shows that the emotional dimension has no effect on visit intentions, while in this study, the emotional dimension has an influence on visit intentions. This shows that consumers who visit Alfamind feel emotionally strong when visiting Alfamind.

Discussion of Hypothesis 2d

The results obtained from the influence between Intellectual on Visit intentions are significant with a t-statistic of $1.448 < 1.65$, so hypothesis 2d is rejected. The original sample estimate value is negative, namely -0.063, where if Intellectual increases by one scale unit, it can reduce Visit intentions by 0.063 scale unit.

The results of this study were rejected, but consistent with the research by Baek et al. (2020). This shows that visiting Alfamind does not fully describe curiosity and solutions to consumer problems as a whole.

Simultaneously, the research results show that Brand Experience can affect the Visit intentions of Alfamind application users, although several dimensions of Brand Experience show different results. Because after all, virtual stores cannot fully describe their store environment through their website or in reality. The emergence of positive Brand Experiences, such as excitement, excitement, and pleasure, may depend on the consumer's previous recommendations when visiting the store. That is, the previous consumer experience with the store can reduce novelty for new consumers who visit the store for the second or next time through the virtual store (Jin et al., 2021).

Discussion of Hypothesis 3

The results of the research on the third hypothesis, namely "Brand Equity has a positive effect on Visit intentions" indicate that the influence of Brand Equity on Visit intentions is significant with a t-statistic of $8.062 > 1.65$, so hypothesis 3 is accepted. The original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.495, where if Brand Equity increases by one scale unit, it can increase Visit intentions by 0.495 scale unit.

The results of this hypothesis are in line with the results of the hypothesis from previous research conducted by Baek et al. (2020). Brand Equity is an important driver of behavioral intention. The definition itself involves a consumer's predisposition to a brand that can lead to a preference or purchase intention because of the added value to its brand name (Baek et al., 2020). The results of this study indicate that consumers feel that the Alfamind application is a better application than other applications when consumers visit the Alfamind application.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

Based on the analysis obtained through SmartPLS, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. H1a = There is positive influence between sensory on brand equity with t-statistic of $6.443 > 1.65$. The direction of the relationship between Sensory and Brand Equity is positive with the original sample estimate value of 0.458, so hypothesis 1a is accepted but not supported. This means that Alfamind visitors have a visual impression as an addition to brand equity.
2. H1b = There is no positive effect between behavior on brand equity with a t-statistic of $1.129 < 1.65$. The direction of the relationship between Behavioral and Brand Equity is negative with the original sample estimate value of -0.079, so hypothesis 1b is rejected but supported. This means that the Alfamind application cannot be used as brand equity because it is possible that respondents are more comfortable coming directly to physical stores.
3. H1c = There is positive influence between emotional on brand equity with t-statistic of $7.178 > 1.65$. The direction of the relationship between Emotional and Brand Equity is positive with the original sample estimate value of 0.336, so hypothesis 1c is accepted and supported. This means that visiting Alfamind creates experiences and opinions for brand evaluation by consumers.
4. H1d = There is positive influence between intellectual on brand equity with t-statistic of $5.326 > 1.65$. The direction of the relationship between Intellectual and Brand Equity is positive with the original sample estimate value of 0.268, so hypothesis 1d is accepted and supported. This means that visiting Alfamind adds brand equity to Alfamind by creating curiosity and providing solutions to consumer problems.
5. H2a = There is no positive influence between sensory on visit intentions with a t-statistic of $1.101 < 1.65$ and the original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.082, so hypothesis 2a is rejected and not supported. This means that Alfamind visitors do not have a visual impression when visiting the Alfamind application.
6. H2b = There is no positive effect between behavior on visit intentions with a t-statistic of $1.321 < 1.65$ and the original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.078, so hypothesis 2b is rejected and not supported. This means that visiting Alfamind

cannot yet be used as a habitual behavior because it is likely that respondents are more comfortable coming directly to physical stores.

7. H2c = There is positive influence between emotional on visit intentions with a t-statistic of $6.996 > 1.65$ and the original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.371, so hypothesis 2c is accepted but not supported. This means that consumers who visit Alfamind feel emotionally strong when visiting Alfamind.
8. H2d = There is no positive influence between intellectual and visit intentions with a t-statistic of $1.448 < 1.65$ and the original sample estimate value is negative, namely -0.063, so the 2d hypothesis is rejected but supported. This means that visiting Alfamind does not fully describe curiosity and solutions to consumer problems as a whole.
9. H3 = There is positive influence of brand equity on visit intentions with a t-statistic of $8.062 > 1.65$ and the original sample estimate value is positive, namely 0.495, so hypothesis 3 is accepted and supported. This means that consumers feel that the Alfamind application is a better application than other applications when consumers visit the Alfamind application.

Managerial Implications

Based on the results of this study, the results of the managerial implications are expected to contribute recommendations to the company, namely:

Sensorily, companies facing a decline in store visitors could benefit from this research by incorporating engaging, more experience-oriented content into brand communications. Providing consumers with a sensory and behavioral brand experience can help drive visits to virtual stores.

Behaviorally, Alfamind can introduce virtual stores through social media by providing promotions such as easy payment methods, guarantee after sales, discounts and others. The move can also build new stores without the expensive investment of reaching customers, so they can serve as positive virtual experiences that promote visit intent.

Emotionally, companies can also provide virtual tours interactively 360 degrees to customers through their mobile applications. Providing an unforgettable virtual tour experience that will create strong opinions and feelings, it can increase brand equity and ultimately promote visit intentions.

Intellectually, basically, the Alfamind app is easy to adopt and compatible with most devices (e.g. computer screens and mobile phones). So that it can make it easier for consumers and provide solutions to consumer problems. It can be maintained and improved. Thus, this technique allows a great opportunity to promote a store.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the research results that have been described and discussed, the researchers suggest several things in the form of guidelines that can be built in conducting further research by other researchers so that they can be even better, namely:

1. Use more respondents with wider geographic locations and can use longitudinal research to get more accurate results because different geographies will contain different characteristics and longer time can help to analyze more deeply too.
2. Use other subjects, so that better results can be found than previous studies.
3. You can add other variables, such as demographics to be used as control variables or you can also add a trust variable to see if consumers trust this application.

It is hoped that further research can be carried out using probability sampling techniques, where all elements of the population have the same opportunity to be selected as samples. Thus, the results of the study can be generalized.

APPENDIX

R Square

	R Square
Brand Equity	0.768
Visit Intention	0.774

Mean, STDEV, T-Values, P-Values

Hypothesis		<i>Original Sample</i>	<i>t Statistics</i>	<i>p values</i>	Results
1a	Sensory -> Brand Equity	0.458	6.443	0.000	Supported
1b	Behavioral -> Brand Equity	-0.079	1,129	0.130	Rejected
1c	Emotional -> Brand Equity	0.336	7.178	0.000	Supported
1d	Intellectual -> Brand Equity	0.268	5.326	0.000	Supported
2a	Sensory -> Visit Intention	0.082	1.101	0.136	Rejected
2b	Behavioral -> Visit Intention	0.078	1.321	0.094	Rejected
2c	Emotional -> Visit Intention	0.371	6,996	0.000	Supported
2d	Intellectual -> Visit Intention	-0.063	1,448	0.074	Rejected
3	Brand Equity -> Visit Intention	0.495	8.062	0.000	Supported

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M. (2015). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif*. Aswaja Pressindo.
- Badar, M. S., & Irfan, M. (2018). Shopping mall services and customer purchase intention along with demographics. *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 1–17.
- Baek, E., Choo, H. J., Wei, X., & Yoon, S. -Y. (2020). Understanding the virtual tours of

- retail stores: How can store brand experience promote visit intentions?. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 48(7), 649–666. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-09-2019-0294>
- Clemens, M. D., Wu, J. H. -C., Hu, B. -D., & Christopher, G. (2009). An empirical study of behavioral intentions in the Taiwan hotel industry. *Innovative Marketing*, 5(3), 30–50. <https://www.businessperspectives.org/index.php/journals/innovative-marketing/issue-122/an-empirical-study-of-behavioral-intentions-in-the-taiwan-hotel-industry>
- Fornari, E., Fornari, D., Grandi, S., Menegatti, M., & Hofacker, C. F. (2016). Adding store to web: Migration and synergy effects in multi-channel retailing. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 44(6), 658–674. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-07-2015-0103>
- Gao, F., & Lan, X. (2020). Sensory brand experience: Development and validation in the Chinese context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01436>
- Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2015). *Partial least squares: Konsep, teknik dan aplikasi menggunakan program SmartPLS 3.0 untuk penelitian empiris*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Hair, J. F., Jr., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R*. Springer.
- Hepola, J., Karjaluoto, H., & Hintikka, A. (2017). The effect of sensory brand experience and involvement on brand equity directly and indirectly through consumer brand engagement. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 26(3), 282–293. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-10-2016-1348>
- Iglesias, O., Markovic, S., & Rialp, J. (2019). How does sensory brand experience influence brand equity? Considering the roles of customer satisfaction, customer affective commitment, and employee empathy. *Journal of Business Research*, 96, 343–354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.043>
- Jin, B., Kim, G., Moore, M., & Rothenberg, L. (2021). Consumer store experience through virtual reality: Its effect on emotional states and perceived store attractiveness. *Fashion and Textiles*, 8(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40691-021-00256-7>
- Jones, R. P., & Runyan, R. C. (2013). Brand experience and brand implications in a multi-channel setting. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 23(3), 265–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593969.2013.781531>
- Kumar, S. (2018). A study on potentiality of virtual shopping concept for selected FMCG products in Bangalore. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 9(2), 103–111. https://iaeme.com/MasterAdmin/Journal_uploads/IJM/VOLUME_9_ISSUE_2/IJM_09_02_012.pdf
- Kusuma, A. B. T., & Marta, L. S. (2016). Pengaruh kesadaran merek, sikap dan nilai yang dirasa terhadap niat pembelian ulang Sarimi di Surabaya Timur. *Journal of Business and Banking*, 5(2), 299–318. <https://journal.perbanas.ac.id/index.php/jbb/article/view/709>
- Leri, I., & Theodoridis, P. (2019). The effects of the winery visitor experience on emotions,

- satisfaction and on post-visit behaviour intentions. *Tourism Review*, 74(3), 480–502. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-07-2018-0092>
- Moreira, A. C., Fortes, N., & Santiago, R. (2017). Influence of sensory stimuli on brand experience, brand equity and purchase intention. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 18(1), 68–83. <https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2016.1252793>
- Morgan-Thomas, A., & Veloutsou, C. (2013). Beyond technology acceptance: Brand relationships and online brand experience. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.019>
- Pizzi, G., Scarpi, D., Pichierri, M., & Vannucci, V. (2019). Virtual reality, real reactions?: Comparing consumers' perceptions and shopping orientation across physical and virtual-reality retail stores. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 96, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.02.008>
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2006). *A first course in structural equation modelling* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shahzad, M. F., Bilal, M., Xiao, J., & Yousaf, T. (2019). Impact of smartphone brand experience on brand equity: With mediation effect of hedonic emotions, utilitarian emotions and brand personality. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 10(2), 440–464. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-04-2017-0045>
- Silversea Media Group. (2021, November 11). *Is virtual shopping the future of e-commerce?*. <https://silversea-media.com/is-virtual-shopping-the-future-of-e-commerce/>
- Wahyuningsih. (2011). Customer value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions: The effects of consumer search behavior. *ASEAN Marketing Journal*, 3(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.21002/amj.v3i1.2011>
- Xixiang, S., Gilal, R. G., & Gilal, F. G. (2016). Brand experience as a contemporary source of brand equity in 21st century: Evidence from the Chinese consumer market. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 4(9), 63–76. <http://w.ijern.com/journal/2016/September-2016/06.pdf>