

Title	The impact of experiential augmented reality applications on fashion purchase intention
Type	Article
URL	https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/14087/
Date	2018
Citation	Watson, Anna and Alexander, Bethan and Salavati, Leyla (2018) The impact of experiential augmented reality applications on fashion purchase intention. International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management. ISSN 0959-0552
Creators	Watson, Anna and Alexander, Bethan and Salavati, Leyla

Usage Guidelines

Please refer to usage guidelines at <http://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact ualresearchonline@arts.ac.uk.

License: Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives

Unless otherwise stated, copyright owned by the author



**The impact of experiential augmented reality applications
on fashion purchase intention**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJRDM-06-2017-0117.R3
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Augmented reality, Mobile applications, Experiential retail, Hedonic motivation, Purchase intention

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The impact of experiential augmented reality applications on fashion purchase intention

Purpose

Utilizing the stimulus-organism-response (SOR) model, the purpose of this study is to examine the effects of augmented reality (AR) (specifically augmentation) on consumers' affective and behavioral response and to assess whether consumers' hedonic motivation for shopping moderates this relationship.

Design/methodology/approach

An experiment using the manipulation of AR and no AR was conducted with 162 participants aged between 18 and 35. Participants were recruited through snowball sampling and randomly assigned to the control or stimulus group. The hypothesized associations were analyzed using linear regression with bootstrapping.

Findings

The paper demonstrates the benefit of using an experiential AR retail application (app) to positively impact purchase intention. The results show this effect is mediated by positive affective response. Furthermore, hedonic shopping motivation moderates the relationship between augmentation and the positive affective response.

Research limitations/implications

Because of the chosen research approach, the results may lack generalizability to other forms of augmentation. Therefore, researchers are encouraged to test the proposed model using different types of AR stimuli. Furthermore, replication of the study with other populations would increase the generalizability of the findings.

Practical implications

Results of this study provide a valuable reference for retailers of the benefits of using AR when attempting to optimize experiential value in online environments.

Originality/value

The study contributes to experiential retail and consumer purchase behavior research by deepening the conceptualization of the impact of experiential technologies, more specifically AR apps, by considering the role of hedonic shopping motivations.

Keywords: Augmented reality, Mobile applications, Experiential retail, Hedonic motivation, Purchase intention.

Article type: Research paper

1. Introduction

Retail has experienced seismic shifts over recent years due to the growth of digitalization and online channels (Verhoef *et al.*, 2015). Grewal *et al.* (2017) argued that retailing is evolving at an accelerated rate due to changes made possible by new technologies. One such technology, with “the potential to transform the shopping experience” (Duncan *et al.*, 2013, p. 6) is augmented reality (AR). AR can enhance sensory perceptions for consumers by superimposing virtual elements directly into the real-time environment (Yaoyuneyong *et al.*, 2016). With the increasing ubiquity of smartphones and tablets, AR applications (apps) are increasingly being embraced by retailers as a tool for creating immersive customer experiences. For example, Burberry, Topshop, Sephora, and Panasonic are all examples of retailers which have recently launched AR mobile apps. However, whilst it has been argued that AR will play an important role in the future of retail (Grewal *et al.*, 2017; Javornik, 2016a), our understanding of how it impacts consumer behavior is still relatively under researched.

This paper, therefore, seeks to contribute to our understanding of how AR apps influence consumer behavior. Given that accessible AR technology is a relatively recent phenomenon, the literature is nascent, although growing rapidly. Much of the literature on AR has focused on adoption-based factors, using traditional technology acceptance models (Huang and Liao, 2015; Lee *et al.*, 2006; Pantano and Servidio, 2012; Rese *et al.*, 2014, 2016), or the impact of specific AR features on emotional and behavioral responses (e.g. Huang and Liu, 2014; Huang and Liao, 2017). However, the impact of consumer traits has received less attention in the AR literature (Javornik, 2016b). As Fiore and Kim (2007) highlighted, person variables (consumer characteristics) may influence the strength and direction of the relationship between environmental stimuli (in this case AR) and its consequences. Indeed, a number of

1
2
3 studies of traditional and online formats, have found that characteristics such as the shopper
4 style moderate the relationship between retail atmospherics and consumer responses (Chang
5 *et al.*, 2011; Eroglu *et al.*, 2001; Lee *et al.*, 2006; Morrin and Chebat, 2005). However, within
6
7 the context of AR, there are very few studies that have considered consumer traits. This paper
8
9 seeks to address this gap by exploring a key consumer trait: hedonic shopping orientation.
10
11

12
13 We consider whether the extent to which a consumer is hedonically motivated influences
14 their response to AR stimuli. Consumers who are hedonically oriented in their motivation to
15 shop are more concerned with the entertainment, fun, and sensory stimulation aspects of
16 shopping (Babin *et al.*, 1994). This contrasts with consumers who are more utilitarian in their
17 motivations, who are more mission- or task-oriented (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003). We focus
18 on hedonic shopping motivations given that the experience of AR is likely to be more
19 hedonic than utilitarian (Javornik, 2016b) and, therefore, may particularly appeal to
20 consumers with hedonic shopping values.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 To explore the effect of AR on consumers, we focus on the defining characteristic of AR
34 (compared with other interactive technologies, such as virtual reality), i.e. augmentation. We
35 consider the effect of augmentation through an application of the traditional stimulus-
36 organism-response (SOR) model. This model enables researchers to empirically identify
37 causal links between physical experiential retail elements, consumers' affective responses,
38 and purchase intentions and behaviors (e.g. Baker *et al.*, 1992; Chang *et al.*, 2011; Donovan
39 and Rossiter, 1994). The model is well established and provides a useful mechanism for
40 considering how new and emerging experiential retail technologies influence consumers'
41 affective and behavioral responses, and has been applied by a number of researchers in the
42 context of online shopping behaviors (Eroglu *et al.*, 2001; Hu *et al.*, 2016; Huang, 2012;
43
44 Menon and Kahn, 2000). The objectives of this study are thus primarily twofold: to
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 understand the effect of augmentation (as the stimulus) on consumers' affective and
4
5 behavioral responses; and to determine whether consumers who are hedonically motivated
6
7 respond differently to the augmentation experience, i.e. to examine the potential moderating
8
9 effect of hedonic shopping motivation. In so doing, we respond to the call by Javornik
10
11 (2016b) for AR studies to consider consumer characteristics.
12
13
14

15
16 The first section of the study presents an overview of the literature on experiential retailing
17
18 and experiential AR and its effects on consumers' affective states and purchase behavior
19
20 from which hypotheses are deduced. The methodology used in this research is then described,
21
22 followed by a presentation of the key results and discussion. Finally, the study's limitations
23
24 and contributions are elucidated, and we present a model to help guide future research and
25
26 theory development.
27
28
29
30

31 **2. Theoretical background**

32 *2.1 AR in experiential retailing*

33
34
35
36 Innovation in interactive technologies is dramatically modifying the retail landscape,
37
38 enabling retailers to provide new, entertaining, memorable, and emotional experiences for
39
40 consumers (Bäckström and Johansson, 2006; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Papagiannidis
41
42 *et al.*, 2017; Srinivasan and Srivastava, 2010). The experiential aspects of consumption were
43
44 originally conceived by Holbrook and Hirschman (1982), as "hedonic consumption" (distinct
45
46 from utilitarian consumption): such experiential consumption can derive from aesthetic
47
48 enjoyment, playful activities, and multisensory and emotional inputs within the retail context.
49
50

51
52 Thus, experiential retailing involves the whole shopping experience, rather than just the
53
54 product, and addresses the enjoyment of shopping (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982).

55
56 Research has shown some product classes are deemed more hedonic, as their benefits
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 naturally lie in their aesthetics and symbolic or sensory character (Lim and Ang, 2008). Two
4 such product classes that have a high experiential appeal are fashion and cosmetics (Clarke *et*
5 *al.*, 2012; Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982; Wang *et al.*, 2000). When shopping for these
6 product categories, consumers tend to be more hedonically motivated (Clarke *et al.*, 2012).
7 Thus, experiential aspects of shopping may be particularly important for consumers when
8 purchasing beauty or fashion products (Park *et al.*, 2006), such as in the context of this study,
9 which explores the effect of an AR cosmetics app.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 For a long time, retail atmospherics have been the focus of research when examining retail
21 features that can create experiences and influence consumers' emotions and purchase
22 behavior (Alexander and Nobbs, 2016; Clarke *et al.*, 2012; Hultén, 2011; Kotler, 1973).
23 Kotler (1973) was one of the first to evidence the importance of creating sensory touch points
24 within the retail environment to generate consumer experiences, shifting attention from the
25 product to the holistic retail experience, and highlighting the causal effects of experiential
26 retail elements on consumers' emotional response and purchase behavior. Indeed, some
27 studies have shown the benefits of consuming experiences rather than physical possessions
28 (Pine and Gilmore, 2011) and, increasingly, trade sources assert experiential retailing as a
29 key differentiator for businesses (Abnett, 2016; Mintel Trends, 2016). Driven by the rising
30 share of digital consumers with demanding expectations in terms of technology, retailers are
31 embracing novel technologies to generate immersive consumer experiences (Abnett, 2016;
32 Papagiannidis, *et al.*, 2017). AR is one such form that is being increasingly used, yet extant
33 empirical studies on consumer behavior are scarce (Javornik, 2016b; Rese *et al.*, 2016). This
34 study seeks to contribute to this growing stream of literature by exploring the effect of
35 augmentation, as the key distinguishing feature of AR, on consumers' emotional and
36 behavioral responses.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.2 AR

Interest in, and usage of, augmented reality interactive technology (ARIT) is rapidly increasing. Extensive smartphone adoption, cost decreases, rising mobility and AR's ability to provide experiential value and influence consumer purchasing decision, have all contributed to this rise. Thus, AR has shifted from the laboratory to the commercial retail realm (Rese *et al.*, 2016), empowering consumers to evaluate products and make decisions with more certainty (Kim and Forsythe, 2008). Whilst AR is not a new industry phenomenon, there remains a paucity of systematic studies concerning the impact of AR on consumers or users, and especially AR apps (Javornik, 2016b; Poushneh and Vasquez-Parraga, 2017; Rese *et al.*, 2016). Previous AR research has been within the domain of human-computer interaction (e.g. Azuma *et al.*, 2001; Carmigniani and Furht, 2011), potential usage (Kim and Forsythe, 2008; Rese *et al.*, 2016) and has only more recently extended into the realm of consumer behavior (Javornik, 2016a). Javornik (2016b) and Rese *et al.* (2016) provided a useful assimilation of extant AR research within a retailing context, which we consider here under three key themes: definition and evolution; adoption; and features.

2.2.1 AR definition and evolution

AR is a technology that layers virtual elements over physical environments, and thus blends virtual worlds with reality. The superimposed virtual elements can involve videos, images, or other virtual items and are situated between the real-life environment and the user (Javornik, 2016b). Hence, AR enables consumers to interact with virtual elements in the context of their real-life surrounding: consumers can access AR on their own mobile devices, such as smart phones, tablets and laptops (Augment, 2015; Rese *et al.*, 2016). AR has mostly been studied in the context of computer technology (Javornik, 2016b; Rese *et al.*, 2016) and the most

1
2
3 accepted definition of AR, introduced by Azuma *et al.* (2001, p. 34), stems from the same
4
5 area of research:

6
7 “An AR system supplements the real world with virtual (computer-generated) objects
8
9 that appear to coexist in the same space as the real world. (...) we define an AR system
10
11 to have the following properties:

- 12
- 13
- 14 • combines real and virtual objects in a real environment
- 15
- 16 • runs interactively, and in real time and
- 17
- 18 • registers (aligns) real and virtual objects with each other.”
- 19

20
21
22 Azuma *et al.*'s (2001) definition underlines the combination of virtual and real elements and
23
24 their real-time mutual alignment. In other words, AR enables an augmentation of reality with
25
26 virtual elements (Javornik, 2016b). Milgram *et al.* (1994) put this unique augmentation
27
28 ability of AR into context by means of their reality–virtuality continuum, in which AR is
29
30 defined as part of a mixed-reality dimension.

31
32
33
34
35 While in a virtual environment (virtual reality), real elements are layered over virtual worlds,
36
37 AR is capable of adding virtual elements to real elements. These real elements include
38
39 persons, products, or surroundings (Javornik, 2016b). In retail, this means that AR can enrich
40
41 either retail products, consumers, or retail environments with virtual elements in real time,
42
43 with the potential to create immersive consumer experiences (Bulearca and Tamarjan, 2010;
44
45 Huang and Liao, 2015). Consequently, with AR technology becoming more affordable, many
46
47 retailers have implemented AR in their experiential retail repertoires (Deloitte, 2016; Mintel
48
49 Trends, 2016).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Whilst AR is not in itself new – Javornik (2016b) suggested that the first forms of AR date
4 back to the 1950s in cinematography – it was not until the 1990s that AR gained increased
5 attention within computer science and its adoption became more widespread. The first
6 commercial use of AR was in 2008 by the automobile industry in the form of a 3-D
7 simulation. Since then, many forms of AR apps have emerged, including virtual annotations
8 (Google Glass), virtual try-ons, content augmentation, holograms, and projection mapping
9 (Javornik, 2016a). The shift to digitalization has enabled AR usage to extend beyond niche
10 industries to impacting the consumer journey, especially within retail’s online and mobile
11 environments (Javornik, 2016b; Poushneh and Vasquez-Parraga, 2017; Scholz and Smith,
12 2015). Indeed, the increasing ubiquity of smartphones has led to a surge in interest in mobile
13 AR apps (Dacko, 2017).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 A recent example of the use of AR on mobile devices is makeup brand Rimmel’s makeup
30 mirror mobile app. Rimmel’s “Get The Look” app enables consumers to try out the makeup
31 styles of everyone “from friends in real life through to celebrities in magazine images”
32 (Forbes, 2016). The app overlays the user’s face via the front-facing camera with the
33 previously scanned makeup look. This means that, after scanning the face of a real-life friend
34 or a model in a print campaign, the user sees the scanned makeup look applied on their own
35 face and can purchase corresponding Rimmel products via the app (Forbes, 2016). Even
36 when moving their head, the makeup realistically stays on the consumer’s mirrored face
37 (Javornik *et al.*, 2016). This AR makeup mirror app features similar experiential qualities to
38 in-store AR mirrors: the user interacts by scanning a person’s face, before the app enriches
39 the user’s own face image by overlaying their face with the makeup look. The resulting
40 visual image provides users with a real-time illusionary reflection of themselves. Thus, the
41 AR try-on mirror apps can be defined as experiential because of their sensory and
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 multifaceted experiential qualities. This study, therefore, utilizes a leading cosmetics brand
4 AR app, which uses such a virtual mirror to empirically investigate the effects of an
5 experiential AR retail technology. Table I provides other recent examples of AR technologies
6
7 introduced by retailers across a range of different sectors.
8
9
10

11
12 <<Insert Table I about here>>
13
14
15
16
17

18 Dacko (2017) suggested a number of potential benefits of AR apps for retailers. He suggested
19 that, by enabling consumers to virtually try on clothing and make up (such as in the case of
20 the Rimmel app), AR can improve conversion and return rates. He further argued that, by
21 providing a more interactive and interesting experience, AR can enliven otherwise static shelf
22 displays (e.g. the Walgreen app) and help drive store footfall. Finally, he suggested that AR
23 apps enable a more personalized shopping experience (e.g. the Converse or Topology
24 Eyewear apps). However, whilst AR suggests a number of potential benefits to retailers, the
25 focus of the AR literature has tended to be on consumer adoption, and it is only relatively
26 recently that explorations of how AR impacts consumers' emotional and behavioral response
27 has begun to be explored.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 2.2.2 Consumer adoption of AR

42 Given that early research on AR was most prominent in human-computer interaction
43 literature (Javornik, 2016a), it is perhaps unsurprising that much of the literature has
44 considered adoption factors (for a review, see Rese *et al.*, 2016), drawing on the technology
45 acceptance model (TAM) and its variants. Within these studies both hedonic and utilitarian
46 features have been explored, in keeping with TAM. Perceived usefulness and perceived ease
47 of use seek to capture the more utilitarian features of AR, whilst perceived enjoyment is used
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to capture the hedonic values. As Huang and Liao (2015) noted, whilst perceived usefulness
4 and perceived ease of use have been considered the most critical factors to encourage
5 consumer adoption of AR technologies, the inclusion of experiential value constructs such as
6 perceived enjoyment would seem to improve the explanatory power of TAM. Indeed, several
7 studies have found that enjoyment and experiential value influence consumer behavior in
8 virtual environments (Huang and Liu, 2014; Kim and Forsythe, 2008; Lee *et al.*, 2006).
9
10 According to Huang and Liu (2014, p. 83) the highly interactive experience of AR transcends
11 traditional means of retailer interactions (e.g. product picture reviews, etc.) and, borrowing
12 from Fogg (2003), they asserted that AR should be viewed as a “persuasive technology,
13 capable of forming and delivering experiential value rather than performing only as a
14 functional technology”. It would seem that it is the hedonic value of AR that potentially
15 distinguishes it from other interactive technologies (Javornik, 2016b). Thus, to better
16 understand the effect of AR technologies on consumer behavior, researchers have begun to
17 explore its features and their role in creating utilitarian and hedonic value and how this
18 impacts purchase intention (rather than adoption *per se*). Our study seeks to contribute to this
19 nascent literature by exploring the affective and behavioral responses arising from AR
20 experiences and, in particular, by considering the effect of hedonic motivations on these
21 responses.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 2.2.3 AR features

45
46 To explore the potential impact of AR technologies on consumer response, recent researchers
47 have considered its core characteristics (interactivity, hypertextuality, modality, connectivity,
48 location-specificity, mobility, virtuality) with a particular focus on interactivity (Javornik,
49 2016a; Poushneh and Vasquez-Parraga, 2017), modality (Huang and Liu, 2014; Jin, 2009),
50 and augmentation. Interactivity has been extensively investigated and refers to the “extent to
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which users can participate in modifying the form and content of a mediated environment in
4 real time” (Steuer, 1992, p. 84). It has been suggested that interactivity entertains and
5 immerses users, thus creating a positive affective response (Fiore *et al.*, 2005). Several
6 authors have explored how interactivity creates experiential value through its ability to create
7 flow, i.e. the immersion of consumers into a highly absorbing state when using interactive
8 features (Javornik, 2016b; van Noort *et al.*, 2012). Modality refers to the types of content
9 provided by the medium (Javornik, 2016b), such as audio or visual formats. It is through this
10 stimulation of the senses that consumers respond, with a suggestion that stimulations to
11 multiple senses will be more effective than those appealing to just one (Li *et al.*, 2002).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The ability to create flow – complete immersion into the virtual consumption experience –
25 has also been explored from a number of other perspectives. For example, Huang and Liao
26 (2017) considered the role of two sensory features of AR in creating a multisensory flow
27 experience: haptic imagery (the creation of a sense of touch); and self-location (i.e. the
28 consumer’s self is located within the virtual image). They found that these AR features,
29 through “the vivid and realistic embodiment of spatial vision” (Huang and Liao, 2017, p.
30 465) create a first-person perspective and sense of self-location, and thus an authentic
31 experience. Huang and Liu (2014) explored whether the persuasive effects of narrative (cause
32 and effect simulations), media richness (environment simulations), and presence (object
33 simulations) differ. Their findings suggested that AR designed to create narrative is critical in
34 creating experiential value.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Javornik (2016a) argued that the ability of AR to create immersive experiences is through its
51 defining characteristic of augmentation. Javornik (2016a) argued that augmentation is unique
52 to AR in its ability to enhance physical reality, i.e. its ability to overlay physical
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 environments with virtual elements. As Javornik (2016a) noted, AR is more than just another
4
5 interactive technology as its ability to augment or modify the visual representation of reality
6
7 in real time creates a more immersive flow compared to other equally interactive experiences.
8
9 Indeed, studies by Javornik (2016a) and Poushneh and Vasquez-Parraga (2017) both serve to
10
11 demonstrate the importance of augmentation in promoting immersion, playfulness, and
12
13 excitement, resulting in enhanced experiential value creation. We therefore focus on this key
14
15 feature of augmentation in considering how AR retail apps influence consumer behavior.
16
17
18
19

20 *2.3 Theoretical framework*

21
22 To explore the impact of AR on purchase intention, the study draws on an adaptation of
23
24 Mehrabian and Russel's (1974) SOR model. The classical model proposes that, when an
25
26 individual encounters a stimulus (S), he/she develops internal states (O), which in turn
27
28 dictates his/her responses (R). Thus, in keeping with Kotler (1973), the model suggests that
29
30 sensory stimulation impacts the consumer's affective state, which then influences purchase
31
32 intentions. Since its application to the retail environment by Donovan and Rossiter (1982),
33
34 several researchers have used the framework to empirically identify causal links between
35
36 experiential retail elements, consumers' affective responses, and approach purchase
37
38 behaviors (e.g. Baker *et al.*, 1992; Chang *et al.*, 2011; Donovan and Rossiter, 1994; Huang
39
40 2012; Huang and Liu, 2014; Menon and Kahn 2000; Wu *et al.*, 2013). More recently,
41
42 corresponding to literature concerning offline experiential retail (Donovan and Rossiter,
43
44 1994; Kotler, 1973), a number of studies have applied the SOR model to explore both the
45
46 direct and indirect effects of experiential online retail elements on consumer behavior (Eroglu
47
48 *et al.*, 2001; Huang, 2012; Menon and Kahn, 2000), with online retail cues providing the
49
50 stimulus (S). This study aims to investigate whether the use of an AR retail app leads to
51
52 similar effects on consumers' affective state and behaviors that other experiential retail
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 elements have shown and explores whether consumers' shopping motivation orientation
4
5 creates differential outcomes.
6
7
8

9 10 *2.3.1 Augmentation and positive affective response*

11 The extant literature suggests that experiential retail elements evoke positive affective
12
13 responses (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982, 1994; Hoffman and Novak, 2009; Kim and
14
15 Forsythe, 2007, 2008; Kotler, 1973). This study investigates whether an AR app similarly
16
17 evokes a positive affective state, and thus the AR app provides the "stimulus" (S). As
18
19 highlighted earlier, interactivity is a characteristic of AR and the literature suggests that
20
21 interactivity is linked with positive affective responses (O) (Fiore *et al.*, 2005; Huang, 2012).
22
23 Of course, interactivity is not unique to AR, but Javornik (2016a) proposed that AR
24
25 technologies provide a unique form of interactivity through augmentation, which refers to its
26
27 "ability to overlay physical environments with virtual elements" (Javornik, 2016b, p. 259). It
28
29 is the quality of augmentation which has been found to be the most relevant characteristic of
30
31 AR retail technologies in understanding its influence on consumers (Javornik, 2016a).
32
33 Indeed, parallel to effects of other experiential retail features, augmentation has been shown
34
35 to influence consumers' affective states and behavioral intentions (Javornik, 2014, 2016a),
36
37 and it is for this reason which we focus on this feature of AR. Therefore, the following
38
39 hypothesis is proposed:
40
41
42

- 43
44 • *H1*: The presence of AR in an app leads to stronger positive affective responses compared
45
46 with non-augmented apps.
47
48
49

50 51 *2.3.2 Purchase intention*

52 The predictive power of positive affective states has been explored in many studies
53
54 concerning the working mechanism of experiential retailing elements (Baker *et al.*, 1992;
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Chang *et al.*, 2011; Donovan and Rossiter, 1994; Eroglu *et al.*, 2001; Huang, 2012; Menon
4 and Kahn, 2000). The literature indicates that approach behaviors (purchase intentions and
5 behaviors) can be increased by positive affective states such as arousal, pleasure, positive
6 emotion, and positive mood. Purchase intention (R) is an effective measure to anticipate
7 consumers' response behavior (Li *et al.*, 2001; Li *et al.*, 2002). It measures a combination of
8 consumers' interest in, and possibility of, buying a product (Kim and Ko, 2012) and is
9 strongly related to the individual's future purchase action (Hung *et al.*, 2011; Kim and Ko,
10 2012). It is for this reason that it has been adopted by many studies (Baker *et al.* 1992;
11 Huang, 2012) to estimate consumers' future purchase behavior. Consumers who experience a
12 greater (positive) emotional response will have stronger purchase intentions. The following
13 relationship is therefore proposed:

- 14 • *H2*: The effect of augmentation on purchase intention is mediated by positive affective
15 responses.

16 2.3.3 Hedonic motivation

17 Several authors have highlighted the ability of AR to add enjoyment and playfulness to the
18 simulative shopping experience (Huang and Liu, 2014; Huang and Liao, 2017; Javornik,
19 2016a). Javornik (2016b) contended that AR seems to provide a more hedonic rather than
20 utilitarian experience. In this regard, it seems probable that consumers' shopping motivations
21 may create differential emotional responses and outcomes. Consumers with hedonic shopping
22 motivations are primarily concerned with hedonic fulfilment, such as experiencing fun,
23 amusement, fantasy, and sensory stimulation (Babin *et al.*, 1994). Their focus is on the
24 enjoyment of the experience itself (Childers *et al.*, 2001) and, therefore, we would expect
25 consumers who have high hedonic motivations to derive greater pleasure from augmentation,
26 compared to those with lower hedonic motivations.

1
2
3
4
5 Although a number of studies have considered how hedonic versus utilitarian motivations
6 influence shopping behaviors (e.g. Arnold and Reynolds, 2012; Childers *et al.*, 2001; To *et*
7 *al.*, 2007), studies exploring the moderating effect of hedonic motivations on experiential
8 retailing are limited (Fiore and Kim, 2007; Chang *et al.*, 2011). The literature does suggest,
9 however, that consumers with higher hedonic motivation are more likely to engage in
10 interactive aspects of shopping (Arnold and Reynolds 2003; Chang *et al.*, 2011; Hirschman
11 and Holbrook, 1982). Interactivity is a key feature of AR apps (Javornik, 2016b), suggesting
12 that consumers with greater hedonic shopping motivations may engage more fully with such
13 technologies to enhance their experience. As Arnold and Reynolds (2012) argued, consumers
14 with stronger hedonic motivations who seek hedonic experiences appear to find them and
15 experience them more strongly. It seems probable, therefore, that hedonically motivated
16 shoppers will derive greater pleasure from the AR experience.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Thus, whilst *H1* proposes that the presence of AR in an app leads to stronger positive
34 affective responses compared with non-augmented apps, we also propose that the increase in
35 positive affective response will be influenced by the extent to which a consumer exhibits
36 hedonic shopping motivations. We argue that consumers who have high hedonic motivations
37 will experience a greater increase in their positive emotional response when experiencing
38 augmentation than those who have low hedonic motivations, i.e. shopping motivation will
39 moderate the relationship between augmentation and positive affective response. Thus:
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

- 48 • *H3*: The effect of an augmented experience on positive affective response is greater for
49 consumers with higher hedonic shopping motivations, compared with those with lower
50 hedonic motivations.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The resulting theoretical framework incorporates the advanced SOR model by Fiore and Kim
4 (2007) and the hedonic motivation moderator (Chang *et al.*, 2011) to empirically investigate
5 the effects of an experiential AR app on consumers' positive affective responses and
6 purchase intentions and moreover to determine the moderating role of individual hedonic
7 motivation on this relationship.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **3. Methodology**

18
19 To test the hypotheses, an online experiment was conducted with 162 participants, where the
20 experiential AR makeup retail app of a leading cosmetics brand served as the stimulus. Two
21 conditions existed within the experiment, using an approach in keeping with Javornik
22 (2016a). In the condition "augmentation," participants interacted with the AR makeup app
23 (having downloaded it), while in the condition "non-augmentation," they interacted with the
24 mobile makeup shopping site from the same brand. Thus, the effect of the stimulus
25 "augmentation," could be measured in relation to purchase behavior.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Convenience sampling was used for the study. Participants were recruited at a Swiss
37 University, through university social media, as well as through makeup forums and the
38 commentary section of YouTube makeup tutorial videos. Snowball sampling was employed
39 to gain a larger sample. All participants of the experiment were female and aged between 18
40 and 35 years. Of the total sample, the majority were aged under 25, with 37.7% of the sample
41 aged 18–21, and 42.6% aged 22–25. The remainder (19.7%) were aged between 26 and 35.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49 University students, and those recruited through online makeup forums were considered
50 appropriate for studying the effects of AR because they are computer-literate and comfortable
51 with new technology (Lee *et al.*, 2006) and, therefore, more likely to try, or use, these
52 features. Respondents were randomly assigned to either the control or stimulus group, with
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the final sample comprising 70 respondents who had used the AR app, and 92 in the control
4
5 group.
6
7
8

9 Whilst the total sample size is relatively small, we believe 162 respondents are sufficient for
10 the analysis. Whilst views do differ as to minimum numbers, Stevens (1996), for example,
11 suggested that approximately 15 subjects per predictor are needed. In our regressions there
12 are a maximum of three predictors, and therefore our sample size meets the criteria.
13
14
15

16 Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) suggested a minimum $n=50$, with an additional 8 subjects per
17 independent variable. This would suggest a minimum sample size of 74, which we exceed.
18
19

20 Furthermore, our sample size is in line with, or exceeds, similar studies (e.g. Javornik, 2016a
21 ($n=60$); Moon *et al.*, 2008 ($n=116$)).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The experimental groups used an AR makeup app with a virtual reality mirror, which allowed
30 users to “try on” different makeup styles. The virtual mirror responded to the users’
31 movements, enabling the makeup to be viewed from different angles. Thus, in keeping with
32 Javornik’s (2016a, p. 990) definition of AR, the technology combined real and virtual objects
33 in a real environment, ran interactively, and in real time, and aligned real and virtual objects
34 together. The non-AR website also allowed users to “try on” makeup products, but either
35 through “applying” the makeup onto a choice of four different models, or onto an uploaded
36 image. Although the user could zoom in on different parts of the image, the image was static.
37
38
39 Thus, the website had similar content to the AR app, but without AR features. In this sense,
40 we could control for augmentation.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The experimental session comprised four parts. First, the participants completed demographic
53 questions, followed by questions pertaining to hedonic motivation. Next, the participants
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were asked to interact (for approximately five minutes) with either the experiential AR app or
4 the mobile makeup shopping site, depending on the experimental condition. After the
5 interaction, the participants completed the remaining questions. This part included questions
6 concerning the positive affective response, perceived augmentation, and purchase intention.
7
8 The experiment took approximately 15 minutes to complete.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 3.1 Measurement of constructs

17
18 Augmentation was assessed using a dummy scale (manipulation compared with control
19 group). As a further check that augmentation had indeed occurred, respondents who
20 experienced the AR app were asked questions pertaining to “perceived augmentation,” using
21 the five-item, seven-point Likert scale developed by Javornik *et al.* (2016). The scale
22 exhibited high reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.99. The mean score was 6.22,
23 confirming that the app did provide an augmented experience. This compares with a mean
24 score of augmentation of 1.42, confirming that those who used the virtual reality app (as
25 opposed to the AR app), did not experience augmentation.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Positive affective responses were operationalized with Chang *et al.*’s (2011) seven-item
38 positive emotion scale. Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they were
39 “excited,” “enthusiastic,” “joyful,” “entertained,” “happy,” “interested,” and “inspired” using
40 a seven-point Likert scale (1=entirely disagree to 7=completely agree). The scale exhibited
41 high reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha value of 0.93.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Behavioral response was measured using the variable “purchase intention” by adapting the
51 four-item scale used in previous research (Dodds *et al.*, 1991; Moon *et al.*, 2008; Sweeney *et*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *al.*, 1999). All four items were measured on a seven-point Likert scale, where respondents
4
5 were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each of the following statements:
6

- 7 1. I will purchase the cosmetics I interacted with.
- 8
- 9 2. Given a choice, my friends will choose the cosmetics I interacted with
- 10
- 11 3. There is a strong likelihood that I will buy the cosmetics I interacted with
- 12
- 13 4. I will recommend the cosmetics I interacted with to my friends.
- 14

15 The scale exhibited high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.91.

16
17
18
19 The moderating variable, "hedonic motivation for shopping," was measured using Chang *et*
20
21 *al.*'s (2011) four-item scale. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they
22
23 agreed with each of the following statements on a scale of 1 (entirely disagree) to 7
24
25 (completely agree):
26

- 27
- 28 1. Shopping is a way I like to spend my leisure time.
- 29
- 30 2. Shopping is one of my favorite activities.
- 31
- 32 3. Shopping in general is fun.
- 33
- 34 4. I am a person who is looking for more fun and enjoyment of shopping.
- 35

36 Again, the scale exhibited high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.94.

37
38
39
40 As a further check of construct validity, principal component analysis was undertaken to
41
42 examine the factor structure of the variable measurement scales. The analysis showed a
43
44 significant Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p=0.00$) and a satisfactory value for KMO
45
46 (KMO=0.92). All scales had acceptable factor structures, with all items having factor
47
48 loadings above 0.70 and all factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.

49
50
51 Convergent validity was evaluated using the average variance extracted (AVE). All
52
53 constructs had AVE values exceeding 0.50, confirming that the measures exhibited
54
55 satisfactory convergent validity (Barclay *et al.*, 1995). In addition, the composite reliability
56
57

1
2
3 scores were above the threshold of 0.60 (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988). Discriminant validity of the
4
5 measures was explored by examining the correlations between the constructs. Square roots of
6
7 the AVE (reported on the diagonal in Table II) were all greater than the construct
8
9 correlations, suggesting the constructs were more strongly related with their own measures
10
11 than with any of the other constructs.
12

13
14 <<Insert Table II about here>>
15
16
17
18
19

20 **4, Results**

21
22 Table II presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations of the constructs.
23

24 *H1* proposed a positive relationship between augmentation and positive affective response. In
25
26 order to test this hypothesis a t-test was executed. Those respondents who had experienced
27
28 the augmentation had an average positive affect score of 4.87, compared with those who had
29
30 not of 3.78 ($p=0.00$), supporting *H1*. The relationship between perceived augmentation and
31
32 purchase intention and the mediating effect of positive affective response was analyzed using
33
34 linear regression, with the mediation effects assessed with bootstrapping analysis, using
35
36 model 4 of the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013). As can be seen in Table III, positive
37
38 affective response mediated the relationship between augmentation and purchase intention,
39
40 supporting *H2* (F-change statistic=35.01, $p=0.00$). The total indirect effect was 0.616 (SE
41
42 0.1381, $z=4.4606$). The upper and lower confidence intervals of the indirect path with
43
44 bootstrapping did not cross zero, suggesting a significant mediation effect, and this was
45
46 confirmed by the Sobel test ($p=0.000$).
47
48
49

50
51 <<Insert Table III about here>>
52
53

54 To test the moderating effect of hedonic motivation on the relationship between
55
56 augmentation and positive affective response, the variables were centered before exploring
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the interaction affects. A linear regression model with bootstrapping analysis was run using
4 model 7 of the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013), with positive affective response as the
5 dependent variable. As can be seen from Table IV, the results confirmed the findings from
6 the t-test analysis, showing a significant and positive relationship between augmentation and
7 positive affective response. Support was found for *H3*, as the interaction variable (hedonic
8 motivation \times augmentation) was significant ($p=0.015$). The R-square increase due to the
9 interaction was also significant (F-change statistic=6.099, $p=0.015$). The significance of the
10 interaction effect was present at high (1 standard deviation above the mean), low (1 standard
11 deviation below the mean), and moderate (at the mean) levels of hedonic motivation, with the
12 greatest effect at higher levels of hedonic motivation (see Figure 1). Figure 2 summarizes the
13 results for the proposed model.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 <<Insert Table IV about here>>
28

29
30 <<Insert Figures 1 and 2 about here>>
31
32
33
34

35 **5. Discussion**

36
37 This study drew on the SOR model (Mehrabian and Russell, 1974) to understand the
38 potential effect of augmentation on purchase intention, where augmentation formed part of
39 the stimulus. The SOR model is well established in the broader experiential retailing
40 literature, but its application to AR is limited. Whilst Javornik (2016a) did consider both
41 affective and behavioral responses to AR technologies, she did not consider the relationship
42 between affective and behavioral responses (rather they are treated as different dimensions of
43 brand related responses). The findings here suggest that augmentation creates a more positive
44 emotional response than interactions without augmentation. This finding is in keeping with
45 Javornik (2016a), who also found that augmentation creates stronger positive emotional
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 responses than other forms of interactivity. However, our results further show that it is this
4
5 enhanced emotional response that creates greater purchase intention for those experiencing
6
7 augmentation, i.e. the effect of augmentation on behavior (in this case purchase intention) is
8
9 mediated by the positive affective response it evokes. To understand why this enhanced
10
11 emotional response is achieved, it is useful to consider some of the key features of
12
13 augmentation. Augmentation provides modality richness, the “intensity with which a
14
15 mediated environment is able to present information to the senses” (Li *et al.*, 2002, p. 45),
16
17 presumably by creating greater sensory depth. Thus, as suggested by Javornik (2016a), AR
18
19 does not necessarily create greater interactivity than apps without AR; rather, it creates a rich
20
21 sensory experience, resulting in stronger emotional (and therefore behavioral) responses.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Our results also reveal that the response to augmentation may differ according to the
28
29 shopping orientation of the consumer. Consumers who are more hedonically motivated
30
31 experience a greater positive emotional response than those with low levels of hedonic
32
33 motivation. As can be seen from Figure 2, whilst the positive affective response is higher
34
35 under the augmentation condition at all levels of hedonic motivation, the steeper line under
36
37 the augmentation condition shows that, at higher levels of hedonic motivation, the positive
38
39 emotional response is stronger. This result can be explained if it is considered that consumers
40
41 who are motivated by hedonic needs place more value on the shopping experience itself,
42
43 rather than simple task completion (Hirschman and Holbrook, 1982) and, as such, are more
44
45 likely to engage in interactive aspects of shopping (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003).
46
47 Furthermore, as Javornik (2016b) argued, AR would seem to provide a more hedonic rather
48
49 than utilitarian experience. Thus, consumers who are more concerned with hedonic
50
51 fulfillment derive greater pleasure from the augmented experience. However, this is one of
52
53 few studies to the authors’ knowledge to consider how different consumer characteristics
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 might lead to differential outcomes, and the first to the authors' knowledge to consider the
4
5 role of hedonic motivations. Our findings provide some insights into the differential effect of
6
7 shopping motivation and suggest that further exploration of other consumer characteristics
8
9 could be a fruitful avenue for future research to improve our understanding of the potential
10
11 value of retail AR apps.
12

13 14 15 16 *5.1 Implications and limitations*

17
18 The findings suggest that the implementation of experiential AR elements in online retail
19
20 may help increase consumers' positive affective responses and influence their desire to
21
22 purchase. AR apps appear to improve the sensory richness of the experience and thus should
23
24 be considered as a potentially valuable tool in creating effective interactions with consumers.
25
26 The study sought to contribute to our understanding of the potential impact of AR by
27
28 introducing the consumer trait of hedonic motivation. Whilst the experiential values of
29
30 consumers have been considered in other contexts (e.g. online retailing; Fiore and Kim,
31
32 2007), this is the first study to consider this with respect to AR. The moderating role of
33
34 hedonic motivation found here would suggest that retailers of product categories where
35
36 consumers tend to be more hedonically motivated, such as fashion and cosmetics (Clarke *et*
37
38 *al.*, 2012), may obtain greater benefit from AR apps than retailers whose shoppers may have
39
40 more utilitarian motives (e.g. grocery). However, it is worth noting that, whilst the emotional
41
42 response caused by augmentation was magnified for consumers who were hedonically
43
44 motivated, even those with low hedonic motivation experienced an enhanced positive
45
46 affective response.
47
48
49
50

51
52 It should be noted that this study used convenience sampling, principally drawn from a
53
54 student population. Although the sample may be considered an appropriate audience of target
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 customers, the sample composition does limit the external validity of the study. Replication
4
5 of the study with a larger, more representative sample of the wider population would improve
6
7 the generalizability of the findings and enable further exploration of the potential differential
8
9 effect of other consumer characteristics. Furthermore, just one form of AR app was used in
10
11 the experiment, essentially exploring a single technique of augmentation (virtual mirror).
12
13 Future studies could explore how different augmentation techniques compare in the affective
14
15 and behavioral responses they provoke. In this regard, it may be that augmentation techniques
16
17 that create both modality richness both in terms of depth and breadth (i.e. the number of
18
19 senses that are stimulated) may evoke stronger affective (and thus behavioral) responses. We
20
21 further consider such potential directions for future studies in the next section.
22
23
24
25

26 *5.2 Future research directions*

27
28 Our study has highlighted that the effect of AR apps may differ depending on the consumer
29
30 shopping orientation. In this context, we explored just one orientation, that of hedonic
31
32 shopping motivation. We focused on this, given that it has been suggested that AR provides a
33
34 more hedonically oriented experience (Javornik, 2016b). Furthermore, we have focused on
35
36 the key distinguishing feature of AR, that of augmentation. However, as was noted in our
37
38 review of the AR literature, AR technologies can provide a number of additional features,
39
40 such as interactivity and modality. Thus, future studies could build upon our initial
41
42 framework, to consider how different AR features can be used to create differential
43
44 experiential values to appeal and add value in differing retail contexts. In this case, we
45
46 focused on a beauty app, where hedonic experiences are likely to be particularly valued. It is
47
48 possible that in other contexts, such as grocery, AR experiences which provide more
49
50 utilitarian (that is task-oriented) experiences may be valued more by consumers.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Whilst there have been a number of attempts to classify experiential sources of value,
4
5 Holbrook's (1996) typology, and variants thereof, is probably the most widely adopted.
6
7 Holbrook proposed that experiences can be classified by the extent to which they offer
8
9 extrinsic or intrinsic value where, broadly speaking, intrinsic value pertains to hedonic value
10
11 and extrinsic value relates to utilitarian value (Dacko, 2017). Holbrook also proposed that
12
13 experiences can be categorized as being more active or reactive, such that value "is active
14
15 when it entails some physical or mental manipulation of some tangible or intangible object"
16
17 (Holbrook, 1996, p. 139). Conversely, reactive value derives from an appreciation for, or
18
19 response to, a consumption object (Holbrook, 1996). Using these two dimensions, Holbrook
20
21 proposed four types of consumption experience: efficiency (active/extrinsic); excellence (of
22
23 service quality) (reactive/extrinsic); aesthetic (reactive/intrinsic); and playfulness
24
25 (active/intrinsic). The ability of AR, and different AR features, to provide experiential value
26
27 along these different dimensions could be a useful avenue to explore. In this regard, Dacko's
28
29 (2017) recent study provides a useful foundation. He found, through an analysis of the online
30
31 descriptions of AR shopping apps available through Google Play's app store, that AR apps
32
33 appear to primarily offer extrinsic or utilitarian value, although he noted that apps often
34
35 provided at least some secondary intrinsic value. Given our findings here, this may mean that
36
37 AR apps may not be fully exploiting the opportunities that providing more intrinsic value
38
39 could produce.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Dacko (2017) also noted that consumers primarily seem to use apps because of the efficiency
47
48 benefits they offer (i.e. extrinsic value). From our findings here, it would be useful to explore
49
50 how the appeal of apps (in terms of their experiential value) may differ between consumers
51
52 with different shopping motivations.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It should be noted that Holbrook (1996) also distinguished between experiences that are
4 oriented to the self (i.e. the value pertains to me) or to others (i.e. value is derived from how it
5 pertains to others). Whilst researchers have tended to focus on Holbrook's typology as it
6 relates to self (Dacko, 2017; Mathwick *et al.*, 2001), the extent to which AR can create social
7 value (or, in Holbrook's terminology, "other") could also be an interesting avenue to explore
8 given the increased connectedness of consumers through mobile devices (Pantano and
9 Gandini, 2017).
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 We therefore propose that our model could be extended to consider how different AR
21 features can be used to generate different types of experiential value and, in turn, how these
22 different forms of experiential value influence affective and behavioral responses. In so
23 doing, and drawing on previous studies of retail contexts, a number of moderating factors
24 could be considered, such as shopping motivation (Childers *et al.*, 2011; Chang *et al.*, 2011),
25 product involvement (Fiore and Kim, 2007), situational context (e.g. time pressure) (Fiore
26 and Kim, 2007; Park *et al.*, 1989), and product category. Of course, these are just a few
27 potential influences. Furthermore, whilst this study has focused on purchase intention as the
28 outcome variable, other outcomes such as customer satisfaction and loyalty could also be
29 considered (Fiore and Kim, 2007). Figure 3 shows how our model could be extended to
30 include the components suggested above. We hope that this framework will help guide theory
31 development to better understand AR, and also potentially guide retailers in developing
32 successful AR apps.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 <<INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE>>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abnett, K. (2016), "Stage experiences or go extinct", *businessoffashion.com*, (July), pp.1–7, available at: <https://www.businessoffashion.com/community/voices/discussions/what-will-the-store-of-the-future-look-like/op-ed-stage-experiences-or-go-extinct> [accessed 12 August 2016].
- Alexander, B. and Nobbs, K. (2016), "Multi-sensory fashion retail experiences: The impact of sound, smell, sight and touch on consumer based brand equity", in Vecchi, A. and Buckley, C. (Eds), *Handbook of Research on Global Fashion Management and Merchandising*, IGI Global, Hershey, PA, pp. 420–443.
- Arnold, M.J. and Reynolds, K.E. (2003), "Hedonic shopping motivations", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 79 No. 2, pp. 77–95.
- Arnold, M.J. and Reynolds, K.E. (2012), "Approach and avoidance motivation: Investigating hedonic consumption in a retail setting", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 88 No. 3, pp. 399–411.
- Augment (2015), "Virtual reality vs. augmented reality", available at: <http://www.augment.com/blog/virtual-reality-vs-augmented-reality/> [Accessed July 14, 2016].
- Azuma, R., Bailiot, Y., Behringer, R., Feiner, S., Julier, S. and MacIntyre, B. (2001), "Recent advances in augmented reality", *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, Vol. 21 No. 6, pp. 34–47.
- Babin, B.J., Darden, W.R. and Griffen, M. (1994), "Work and/or fun: measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 644–656.
- Bäckström, K. and Johansson, U. (2006), "Creating and consuming experiences in retail store environments: comparing retailer and consumer perspectives", *Journal of Retailing*

- 1
2
3 *and Consumer Services*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp.417–430.
- 4
5 Bagozzi, R.P. and Yi, Y. (1988), "On the evaluation of structural equation models", *Journal*
6
7 *of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 16 No.1, pp. 74–94.
- 8
9 Baker, J., Levy, M. and Grewal, D. (1992), "An experimental approach to making retail store
10
11 environmental", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 445-460.
- 12
13 Barclay, D.W., Higgins, C.A. and Thompson, R. (1995), "The partial least squares approach
14
15 to causal modeling: personal computer adoption and use as illustration", *Technology*
16
17 *Studies*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 285-309.
- 18
19
20 Bulearca, M. and Tamarjan, D. (2010), "Augmented reality: a sustainable marketing tool?",
21
22 *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, Vol 2 No. 2-3,
23
24 pp. 237-252.
- 25
26 Carmigniani, J. and Furht, B. (2011), "Augmented reality: An overview", in Furht, B. (Ed.),
27
28 *Handbook of Augmented Reality*, Springer, New York, NY, pp.3-46.
- 29
30 Chang, H.J., Eckman, M. and Yan, R.N. (2011), "Application of the Stimulus-Organism-
31
32 Response model to the retail environment: the role of hedonic motivation in impulse
33
34 buying behavior", *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer*
35
36 *Research*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 233–249.
- 37
38
39 Childers, T.L., Carr, C.L., Peck, J. and Carson, S. (2001), "Hedonic and utilitarian
40
41 motivations for online retail shopping behavior", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 77 No. 4,
42
43 pp. 511-535.
- 44
45
46 Clarke, D.W., Perry, P. and Denson, H. (2012), "The sensory retail environment of small
47
48 fashion boutiques", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, Vol. 16 No. 4,
49
50 pp.492–510.
- 51
52
53 Dacko, S.G. (2017), "Enabling smart retail settings via mobile augmented reality shopping
54
55 apps", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 124, pp.243-256.
- 56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Deloitte (2016), *Retail Trends in 2016*, available at:

4
5 [https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/uk/Documents/consumer-
8
9 business/deloitte-uk-consumer-review-march-2016.pdf](https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/uk/Documents/consumer-
6
7 business/deloitte-uk-consumer-review-march-2016.pdf) [accessed September 27, 2017].

10 Dodds, W.B., Monroe, K.B. and Grewal, D., (1991), "Effects of price, brand, and store
11
12 information on buyers' product evaluations", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 28
13
14 (June), pp. 307–319.

15
16 Donovan, R.J. and Rossiter, J.R. (1982), "Store atmosphere: an environmental psychology
17
18 approach", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 58 No. 1, pp. 34–57.

19
20 Donovan, R.J. and Rossiter, J.R. (1994), "Store atmosphere and purchasing behavior".
21
22 *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 70 No. 3, pp. 283–294.

23
24 Duncan, E., Hazan, E. and Roche, K. (2013), "iConsumer: digital consumers altering the
25
26 value chain", available at:
27
28 [https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/industries/telecommunications/our%20i
33
34 nsights/developing%20a%20fine%20grained%20look%20at%20how%20digital%20co
35
36 nsumers%20behave/iconsumervaluechain.ashx](https://www.mckinsey.com/~media/mckinsey/industries/telecommunications/our%20i
29
30 nsights/developing%20a%20fine%20grained%20look%20at%20how%20digital%20co
31
32 nsumers%20behave/iconsumervaluechain.ashx)

37 Eroglu, S.A., Machleit, K.A. and Davis, L.M. (2001), "Atmospheric qualities of online
38
39 retailing: A conceptual model and implications", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.
40
41 54 No. 2, pp. 177–184.

42 Fiore, A.M. and Kim, J. (2007), "An integrative framework capturing experiential and
43
44 utilitarian shopping experience", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution
45
46 Management*, Vol. 35 No. 6, pp. 421–442.

47
48 Fiore, A. M., Kim, J. and Lee, H. (2005), "Effect of image interactivity technology on
49
50 consumer responses toward the online retailer", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol.
51
52 19 No. 3, pp. 38-53.

53
54 Fogg, B.J. (2003), *Persuasive Technology: Using Computers to Change What We Think and*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Do, Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA.

4
5 Forbes. (2016), "Shazam for beauty: Rimmel's new augmented reality app lets users nab real
6
7 life make-up looks", available at:
8
9 [http://www.forbes.com/sites/rachelarthur/2016/07/04/shazam-for-beauty-rimmels-](http://www.forbes.com/sites/rachelarthur/2016/07/04/shazam-for-beauty-rimmels-new-augmented-reality-app-lets-users-nab-real-life-make-up-looks/#2b52bcec5f4b)
10
11 [new-augmented-reality-app-lets-users-nab-real-life-make-up-looks/#2b52bcec5f4b](http://www.forbes.com/sites/rachelarthur/2016/07/04/shazam-for-beauty-rimmels-new-augmented-reality-app-lets-users-nab-real-life-make-up-looks/#2b52bcec5f4b)
12
13 [accessed July 14, 2016].

14
15
16 Grewal, D., Roggeveen, A.L. and Nordfält, J. (2017). "The future of retailing", *Journal of*
17
18 *Retailing*, Vol. 93 No. 1, pp. 1-6.

19
20 Hayes, A.F. (2013), *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process*
21
22 *Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*, The Guildford Press, New York, NY.

23
24 Hirschman, E.C. and Holbrook, M.B. (1982), "Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts,
25
26 methods and propositions", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 92–101.

27
28 Hoffman, D.L. and Novak, T.P. (2009), "Flow online: lessons learned and future prospects",
29
30 *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 23–34.

31
32
33 Holbrook, M. B. (1996). "Customer Value - A framework for analysis and research",
34
35 *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp.138-142.

36
37 Holbrook, M.B. and Hirschman, E.C. (1982), "The experiential aspects of consumption:
38
39 Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol 9 No. 2,
40
41 pp. 132-140.

42
43
44 Hu, X., Huang, Q., Zhong, X., Davison, R. M. and Zhao, D. (2016), "The influence of peer
45
46 characteristics and technical features of a social shopping website on a consumer's
47
48 purchase intention", *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 36 No. 6,
49
50 pp. 1218-1230.

51
52
53 Huang, E. (2012), "Online experiences and virtual goods purchase intention", *Internet*
54
55 *Research*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp.252–274.

- 1
2
3 Huang, T-L. and Liu, F.H. (2014), "Formation of augmented-reality interactive technology's
4 persuasive effects from the perspective of experiential value, *Internet Research*, Vol.
5 24 No. 1, pp. 82-109.
6
7
8
9 Huang, T. and Liao, S.-L. (2015), "A model of augmented-reality interactive technology: the
10 moderating role of cognitive innovativeness", *Electronic Commerce Research*, Vol. 15
11 No. 2, pp. 269-295.
12
13
14
15 Huang, T-L. and Liao, S.-L. (2017), "Creating e-shopping multisensory flow experience
16 through augmented-reality interactive technology", *Internet Research*, Vol. 27 No. 2,
17 pp. 449-475.
18
19
20
21
22 Hultén, B. (2011), "Sensory marketing: the multi-sensory brand-experience concept",
23 *European Business Review*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 256–273.
24
25
26
27 Hung, K., Chen, A.H., Peng, N., Hackley, C., Tiwsakul, R.A. and Chou, C. (2011),
28 "Antecedents of luxury brand purchase intention", *Journal of Product and Brand*
29 *Management*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 457–467.
30
31
32
33 Javornik, A. (2014), "[Poster] Classifications of augmented reality uses in marketing", *IEEE*
34 *International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality*, IEEE, pp. 67–68.
35
36
37 Javornik, A. (2016a), "It's an illusion, but it looks real! Consumer affective, cognitive and
38 behavioral responses to augmented reality applications", *Journal of Marketing*
39 *Management*, Vol. 32 No. 9-10, pp. 987-1011.
40
41
42
43 Javornik, A. (2016b), "Augmented reality: Research agenda for studying the impact of its
44 media characteristics on consumer behaviour", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer*
45 *Services*, Vol. 30, pp. 252–261.
46
47
48
49 Javornik, A., Rogers, Y., Moutinho, A. M. and Freeman, R. (2016), "Revealing the shopper
50 experience of using a 'magic mirror' augmented reality make-up application",
51 *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Designing Interactive Systems*, ACM,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

pp. 871-882.

Jin, S.-A.A. (2009), "The roles of modality richness and involvement in shopping behavior in 3D virtual stores", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 234–246.

Kim, J. and Forsythe, S. (2007), "Hedonic usage of product virtualization technologies in online apparel shopping", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 35 No. 6, pp. 502–514.

Kim, J. and Forsythe, S. (2008), "Adoption of virtual try-on technology for online apparel shopping", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 45–59.

Kim, A.J. and Ko, E. (2012), "Do social media marketing activities enhance customer equity? An empirical study of luxury fashion brand", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 65 No. 10, pp. 1480–1486.

Kotler, P. (1973), "Atmospherics as a marketing tool", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 49 No. 4, pp. 48–64.

Lee, H.-H., Fiore, A.M. and Kim, J. (2006), "The role of the technology acceptance model in explaining effects of image interactivity technology on consumer responses", *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, Vol. 34 No. 8, pp. 621-644.

Li, H., Daugherty, T. and Biocca, F. (2001), "Characteristics of virtual experience in electronic commerce: A protocol analysis", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 13–30.

Li, H., Daugherty, T. and Biocca, F. (2002), "Impact of 3-D advertising on product knowledge, brand attitude, and purchase intention: The mediating role of presence", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 43–57.

Lim, E.A.C. and Ang, S.H. (2008), "Hedonic vs. utilitarian consumption: A cross-cultural perspective based on cultural conditioning", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 61 No.

3, pp. 225–232.

Mathwick, C., Malhotra, N., and Rigdon, E. (2001). "Experiential value: conceptualization, measurement and application in the catalog and internet shopping environment",

Journal of Retailing, Vol. 77 No. 1, pp. 39-56

Mehrabian, A. and Russell, J.A. (1974), *An Approach to Environmental Psychology*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Menon, S. and Kahn, B. (2000), "Cross-category effects of induced arousal and pleasure on the internet shopping experience", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 31–40.

Milgram, P., Takemura, H., Utsumi, A. and Kishino, F. (1994), "Augmented reality: A class of displays on the reality-virtuality continuum", in Das, H. (Ed.), *Proceedings of SPIE Conference: Telem manipulator and Telepresence Technologies*, Vol. 2351 No. 26, available at: <http://spie.org/Publications/Proceedings/Volume/2351>.

Mintel Trends (2016), "Alternative realities", available at:

http://academic.mintel.com.arts.idm.oclc.org/trends/?__cc=1#/trend/769426.

Moon, J., Chadee, D. and Tikoo, S. (2008), "Culture, product type, and price influences on consumer purchase intention to buy personalized products online", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 61 No. 1, pp. 31–39.

Morrin, M. and Chebat, J. (2005), "Person-place congruency: The interactive effects of shopper style and atmospherics on consumer expenditures", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol 8 No. 2, pp. 181-191.

Pantano, E., and Gandini, A. (2017), "Exploring the forms of sociality mediated by innovative technologies in retail settings". *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 77, pp. 367-373.

Pantano, E. and Servidio, R. (2012), "Modeling innovative points of sales through virtual and

- immersive technologies", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 279-286.
- Papagiannidis, S., Pantano, E., See-To, E. W., Dennis, C. and Bourlakis, M. (2017). "To immerse or not? Experimenting with two virtual retail environments", *Information Technology and People*, Vol. 30 No 1, pp. 163-188.
- Park, C.W., Iyar, E.S. and Smith, D.C. (1989), "The effects of situational factors on in-store grocery shopping behavior: the role of store environment and time available for shopping", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 422-433.
- Park, E.J., Kim, E.Y. and Forney, J.C. (2006), "A structural model of fashion-oriented impulse buying behavior", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, Vol. 10 No.4, pp. 433-446.
- Pine, J. B. and Gilmore, J.H. (2011), *The Experience Economy*, updated edition, Harvard Business School Press, Boston. MA.
- Poushneh, A. and Vasquez-Parraga, A. Z. (2017), "Discernible impact of augmented reality on retail customer's experience, satisfaction and willingness to buy", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 34, pp. 229-234.
- Rese, A., Schreiber, S. and Baier, D. (2014), "Technology acceptance modeling of augmented reality at the point of sale: Can surveys be replaced by an analysis of online reviews?", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 869-876.
- Rese, A., Baier, D., Geyer-Schulz, A. and Schreiber. S. (2016), "How augmented reality apps are accepted by consumers: A comparative analysis using scales and opinions", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 124, pp. 306-319.
- Scholz, J. and Smith, A.N. (2016), "Augmented reality: designing immersive experiences that maximise consumer engagement", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 59, pp. 149-161.
- Srinivasan, S.R. and Srivastava, R.K. (2010), "Creating the futuristic retail experience

- 1
2
3 through experiential marketing: Is it possible? An exploratory study", *Journal of Retail*
4 *and Leisure Property*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 193–199.
- 5
6
7 Steuer, J. (1992), "Defining virtual reality: dimensions determining telepresence", *Journal of*
8 *Communication*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 73-93.
- 9
10
11 Stevens, J. (1996), "*Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences*", 3rd ed.,
12 Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- 13
14
15 Sweeney, J., Soutar, G.N. and Johnson, L.W. (1999), "The role of perceived risk in the
16 quality-value relationship: A study in a retail environment", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.
17 75 No. 1, pp. 77–105.
- 18
19
20 Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2001), *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 4th ed., Harper
21 Collins, New York, NY.
- 22
23
24 To, P., Liao, C. and Lin, T. (2007), "Shopping motivations on internet: A study based on
25 utilitarian and hedonic value", *Technovation*, Vol. 27 No. 12, pp. 774-787.
- 26
27
28 van Noort, G., Voorveld, H.A.M., and van Reijmersdal, E.A. (2012), "Interactivity in brand
29 web sites: Cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses explained by consumers'
30 online flow experience", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 223-234.
- 31
32
33 Verhoef, P.C., Kannan, P.K. and Inman, J.J. (2015), "From multi-channel retailing to omni-
34 channel retailing. Introduction to the special issue on multi-channel retailing", *Journal*
35 *of Retailing*, Vol. 91 No. 2, pp. 174-181.
- 36
37
38 Wang, C., Chen, Z., Chan, A.K.K. and Zheng, Z. (2000), "The influence of hedonic values on
39 consumer behaviors", *Journal of Global Marketing*, Vol 14 No. 1, pp. 169–186.
- 40
41
42 Wu, W., Lee, C., Fu, C. and Wang, H. (2013), "How can online store layout design and
43 atmosphere influence consumer shopping intention on a website?", *International*
44 *Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol 42 No. 1, pp. 4-24.
- 45
46
47 Yaoyuneyong, G., Foster, J., Johnson, E. and Johnson, D. (2016), "Augmented reality
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

marketing: Consumer preferences and attitudes toward hypermedia print ads”, *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 16-30.

Table I. Experiential retail technologies: AR practices.

Retailer	AR implementation
Burberry <i>Beauty</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Digital Runway Nail Bar” placed in beauty concept store. • Enabled consumers to virtually try on nail colors with augmented reality technology.
Topology <i>Eyewear</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Users upload a video selfie (looking front, then left and right) that is used to create a 3D scan of their face. • Enabled users to design customized glasses that fit them specifically.
Walgreens <i>Pharmacy</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piloted AR app that could be attached to the shopping cart to help users navigate the store. • The app enabled personalized coupons, offers, and rewards to “pop out” of the shelf as customers walked around a store. Customers could also collect loyalty rewards for walking down particular aisles.
Topshop <i>Fashion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Augmented reality try-on mirrors. • Consumers could virtually try on clothes and explore different styles.
Dulux <i>Homeware</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Dulux Visualizer enabled users to “paint” the walls of their rooms as they moved around with their mobile devices. • Users could select, store, and view different color schemes and also share the images with friends through the app.
Net-a-porter <i>Fashion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autumn 2011 print campaign with integrated AR abilities. • By scanning campaign images with an AR app, consumers got access to video interviews and fashion tips.
Ikea <i>Homeware</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer 2013 launched an AR catalogue. • Gave customers a virtual preview of furniture in their room. The user placed the printed version of the catalog in the spot where they intend to put the new furniture and then, using the device’s camera, the AR app placed the furniture into the room, using approximate dimensions.
Converse <i>Fashion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR app. • Enabled consumers to playfully try on virtually any shoe and purchase them.
Rimmel <i>Beauty</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR app. • Enabled consumers to virtually try on makeup products and purchase them.

Table II. Means, standard deviations and correlations of the variables (AVE in italics).

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	
1) Hedonic motivation	4.41	1.46	<i>0.89</i>		
2) Positive affective response	4.28	1.10	0.482***	<i>0.81</i>	
3) Purchase intention	3.62	1.17	0.372***	0.520***	<i>0.84</i>

Note: *** $p=0.01$.

Table III. Linear regression results (purchase intention).

	B	SE	t statistic	LLCI	ULCI	Adjusted R-square
<u>Model 1</u>						
Constant	3.293	0.137	24.105***			
Augmentation (dummy)	0.653	0.195	3.344***	0.2670	1.040	0.078
<u>Model 2</u>						
Constant	1.213	0.372	3.261***	0.477	1.949	
Augmentation (dummy)	0.037	0.203	0.185	-0.364	0.439	
Positive affective response	0.554	0.094	5.917***	0.369	0.739	0.271


Note: *** $p=0.01$.

Table IV. Linear regression results with moderator (positive affective response).

	B	SE	t statistic	LLCI	ULCI	R-square
Constant	4.308	0.064	67.292***	4.182	4.435	
Augmentation	1.174	0.128	9.169***	0.921	1.428	
Hedonic motivation	0.376	0.044	8.508***	0.289	0.464	
Augmentation*hedonic motivation	0.227	0.088	2.574**	0.053	0.402	0.545


Notes: *** $p=0.01$; ** $p=0.05$.

Figure 1
Conditional effects of augmentation on positive affective response




1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Figure 2
Model with causal paths



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Figure 3
Proposed framework



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41