

<https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2022.2-21>

JEL Classification: : M19, M31, M39

Maria Olearova,

Ph.D., University of Presov in Presov, Slovakia

 ORCID ID, 0000-0001-9086-7975

email: maria.olearova@unipo.sk

Beata Gavurova,

Ph.D., Professor, Technical University of Kosice, Slovakia

 ORCID ID, 0000-0002-0606-879X

email: beata.gavurova@tuke.sk

Radovan Bacik,

Ph.D., Associate Professor, University of Presov in Presov, Slovakia

 ORCID ID, 0000-0002-5780-3838

email: radovan.bacik@unipo.sk

Correspondence author: radovan.bacik@unipo.sk

CONSUMER SHOPPING MOTIVE IDENTIFICATION: STUDY OF WEBROOMING VS. SHOWROOMING

Abstract. Although several researchers have already addressed the issue of channel preferences, the issue of webrooming and showrooming is still insufficiently researched. Therefore, based on the theoretical framework of the three-dimensional structure of the perception of smart shopping, the main goal of this research was to research which shopping motives lead consumers to prefer individual shopping channels (webrooming vs. showrooming). The research was conducted on a sample of 486 Slovak consumers and focused on a homogeneous category of fashion products. In general, given the sample of respondents and the nature of the selected fashion products, the shopping preferences favoured webrooming over showrooming, indicating that consumers prefer to search for product information online and then make purchases in brick-and-mortar stores. However, the differences between purchasing channels are statistically significant, given the individual purchasing motives. Thus, the results suggest that consumers who wish to save time in the purchasing process prefer webrooming and those motivated to save money and feel that they are making the right shopping decision prefer showrooming. However, webrooming and showrooming prove that this multichannel trend is strong and is likely to continue to grow, which may also result in a change in consumer behaviour. Today, consumers lead much more time-consuming lives and therefore appreciate and expect an efficient, smooth, and customized shopping process that covers multiple channels. The presented research contributes to expanding the theoretical knowledge base in terms of the use of shopping channels. The findings of this research could be useful also for businesses, as a better integration across channels might bring about consumer confidence, increase consumer loyalty and conversion rates, and increase sales opportunities. This paper presents the discussion of findings, the limits of this research, and the proposal for future research.

Keywords: showrooming, webrooming, consumer behaviour, shopping channel, motivation.

Introduction. Consumers have various reasons for shopping, either to gain new experience (hedonic) or for more pragmatic reasons - goal-oriented (utilitarian) (Davis et al., 2014). Shopping motivation is activated by process goals that define how consumers perform shopping activities (Buttner et al., 2013). For example, cost-saving motivation and convenience lead buyers to shop online, while socialization and immediate shopping lead shoppers to visit brick-and-mortar stores (Boardman and McCormick, 2018).

Previous research has shown the impact of shopping motivation on shopping channel preference: offline stores (Yim et al., 2014), online stores (Davis et al., 2017), or mobile stores (Khajehzadeh et al., 2014). However, shoppers sometimes combine different types of shopping channels. Moon (2004) argued

Cite as: Olearova, M., Gavurova, B., & Bacik, R. (2022). Consumer Shopping Motive Identification: Study of Webrooming vs. Showrooming. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 2, 231-243. <http://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2022.2-21>

231

Received: 26 January 2022

Accepted: 15 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022



Copyright: © 2022 by the author. Licensee Sumy State University, Ukraine. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

that searching for information on a particular channel does not necessarily lead to purchasing through the same channel. Different information processing can lead shoppers to prefer specific channels they deem appropriate, so understanding purchasing motivation may help retailers understand consumer behaviour (Buttner et al., 2013; Wijonarko et al., 2019; Hassan and Lee, 2021).

Although several researchers have already addressed the issue of channel preferences, the issue of webrooming and showrooming is still insufficiently researched. For example, Aw (2019) designed and empirically tested a model on a sample of 300 respondents that determined the determinants of webrooming in omnichannel sales.

The group of authors Aw et al. (2021) empirically confirmed a research model that includes consumer characteristics (i.e. the need for touch, need for interaction and price comparison) as well as channel-related factors (i.e. convenience in online search, perceived usefulness of online reviews, perceived usefulness of retailers and perceived risk of buying online).

Mukherjee and Chatterjee (2021) used consumer purchase decision-making theories to propose a model that identifies showrooming and webrooming as a combination of two decisions, channel choice during information search and channel choice during actual purchase. Another group of authors (Kleinlercher et al., 2020; Ardielli, 2020, Ferencakova et al., 2020) focused on examining important determinants of webrooming, basing the conceptual framework on the theory of expected utility. These authors assumed four groups of determinants: psychographic variables, shopping motivations, channel-related variables, and product-related variables.

In order to expand scientific knowledge in this area, the research made use of the study by Flavian et al. (2020) to understand the behaviour of Slovak consumers in their search for and actual purchase of a selected category of products. The research relied on the theoretical framework of the three-dimensional structure of smart shopping perception (Atkins and Youn-Kyung, 2012) and tried to find out which motives of this framework lead Slovak consumers to prefer certain shopping channels (webrooming or showrooming).

The first part of this paper offers an overview of the literature and outlines its own research assumptions based on the statements of the researchers. The following section describes the methods used and clarifies the methodological procedures used in the research. The next part shows the results of applying mathematical and statistical methods and discusses the research findings. The final chapter of this paper presents the limits of this research and a proposal for future research.

Theoretical framework and hypothesis development. The cross-channel purchasing process combines online and offline channels to minimize inputs and/or maximize the outcomes of the purchasing decision process (Gensler et al., 2012; Verhoef et al., 2007). Inputs are related to the time, effort, and money invested in the purchase, and the output is the customer's feeling that they made the right purchase or that they found the best deal (Khan et al., 2021; Unguren et al., 2021). This economic perspective was shared by Atkins and Youn-Kyung (2012). They proposed a three-dimensional structure of purchasing motives: the perception of saving time/effort, the perception of making the right purchase, and the perception of saving money. Based on previous studies, the paper established the following assumptions.

Saving time/effort. Online shopping saves time and effort for consumers, as product information is easier to find and compare (Kollmann et al., 2012; Worimegbe et al., 2021). Yang et al. (2017) argued that the Internet allows consumers to search for information more efficiently than offline media, saving time and effort in purchasing. Therefore, Lala and Chakraborty (2015) argue that shopping at an offline store requires more time than online shopping.

Juaneda-Ayensa et al. (2016) revealed that buyers would continue their online shopping process when the effort in offline shopping is high. Gensler et al. (2017) found that saving time was an important reason why consumers prefer showrooming. With brick-and-mortar stores, customers own products immediately, which, according to Aragoncillo and Orús (2018) and Wollenburg et al. (2018), saves time (delivery takes

time). Flavian et al. (2020) noted that consumers perceive greater time/effort savings in webrooming than in showrooming. Based on the above, the following hypothesis was established:

H1: It is assumed that there is a statistically significant difference between webrooming and showrooming in the perception of saving time/effort.

Making the right shopping decision. In cross-channel behavior, consumers tend to change channels to get to know a wider range of products (Konus et al., 2008). These findings are widely used in entrepreneurship activity planning based on approaches of strategic management (Kostiukevych et al., 2020; Muriqi et al., 2021; Pakurar et al., 2019). Recent studies have shown that webrooming reduces consumer uncertainty and helps customers feel confident that the product best matches their shopping needs and goals (Flavian et al., 2016; Wolny and Charoensuksai, 2015). Various studies have also shown that online search increases consumer knowledge (Keng et al., 2012), reduces information asymmetries, and increases control over the purchasing process (Heitz-Spahn, 2013). Schul and Mayo (2003) showed that when consumers combine channels, they create personalized information, which increases their perceived control over the process and their belief that they had made the right decision. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H2: It is assumed that there is a statistically significant difference between webrooming and showrooming in the perception of making the right shopping decision.

Saving money. Correspondingly, price comparisons have been identified as a purchasing motive influencing cross-channel consumer behaviour (Santos and Gonçalves, 2019; Heitz-Spahn, 2013). The total cost of the product plays an important factor in the selection of channels (Trenz, 2015). Cost-saving motivation leads buyers to shop online, while socialization motivates buyers to visit brick-and-mortar stores (Boardman and McCormick, 2018).

In terms of money savings, Gensler et al. (2017) found that customers first visit brick-and-mortar stores and later shop online. That is because the online channel is usually associated with lower product prices than brick-and-mortar stores (Fassnacht and Unterhuber, 2016). Chatterjee (2010) mentioned that price-oriented shoppers are more proactive in comparing prices, and therefore these shoppers are likely to begin their purchasing process by searching for products online. Some authors (Rapp et al., 2015; Rejón-Guardia and Luna-Nevarez, 2017) have found that finding cheaper products on the Internet is the main reason people prefer showrooming. Therefore, the following hypothesis was proposed:

H3: It is assumed that there is a statistically significant difference between webrooming and showrooming in the perception of money savings.

Methodology and research methods. Data collection. The research could be characterized as quantitative. The research aimed to collect primary data using an anonymous questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of a series of scenarios (Flavian et al., 2020) focused on individual purchasing motives based on Atkins and Youn-Kyung (2012): (1. time/effort saving, 2. right purchase decision, 3. money-saving).

A homogeneous category of fashion products was selected for the research as these products are often purchased in both webrooming and showrooming modes. The concept of purchasing scenarios was based on a study by Flavian et al. (2020). Due to the high level of inactivity of retailers in the field of fashion products in Slovakia, the concept of scenarios was modified based on available options for the collection of primary data on the domestic market. The modification of these scenarios consisted of three steps:

Change of the reason to buy the product (originally, the reason for purchasing a T-shirt was a weekend party with friends, but the reason was changed into a family celebration). The reason for this change was to include the older respondents in the research. Therefore the scenario now suits all age categories of respondents.

Change in the scope of the shopping scenario (because in this case, one respondent used a single shopping channel in all three shopping scenarios, the scope of the scenario was changed to reflect only

the basic idea of cross-channel shopping, i.e., 1. product search on the Internet/brick-and-mortar store and 2. buying a product on the Internet / in a brick-and-mortar store from the point of view of selected shopping motives. Change in the script's main character (while in the original study, the main character of the script was Alex - as a third party, in this research, the main character are the research participants themselves. The reason for this change was to increase the authenticity of the shopping scenario).

Table 1 identifies the explicit wording of the purchase scenarios for the given shopping channels and shopping motives.

Table 1. Scenarios by shopping channels and shopping motives

| Shopping channel | Shopping motive | Scenario |
|------------------|------------------|---|
| Webrooming | Save time/effort | S1: You are looking for a T-shirt to wear at a family celebration on the Internet, but you will purchase a brick-and-mortar to save time and effort. |
| | Right purchase | S2: You are looking for a T-shirt to wear at a family celebration on the Internet, but you will purchase in a brick-and-mortar store because you want to try it on. |
| | Save money | S3: You are looking for a T-shirt to wear at a family celebration on the Internet, but you will purchase in a brick-and-mortar store to save money. |
| Showrooming | Save time/effort | S1: You are looking for a T-shirt to wear at a family celebration in a brick-and-mortar store, but you will make the purchase online to save time and effort. |
| | Right purchase | S2: You are looking for a T-shirt to wear at a family celebration in a brick-and-mortar store, but you will make the purchase online because you have more options. |
| | Save money | S3: You are looking for a T-shirt to wear at a family celebration in a brick-and-mortar store, but you will make the purchase online to save money. |

Sources: developed by the authors based on (Flavian et al., 2020).

The data collection process took place in two stages. In the first stage of the research, the pilot survey testing the adequacy of individual scenarios was conducted. Two questionnaires were made, each for one purchasing channel. These questionnaires contained three scenarios based on the purchasing motives. After reading each scenario, the respondents' task was to evaluate the scenario in terms of the following (Bagozzi et al., 2016):

1. The buying scenario is realistic.
2. The buying scenario is credible.
3. The probability of being in the situation.

Respondents were asked to respond to each of these items using a seven-point Likert scale, where 1 = very unrealistic / very untrustworthy / very unlikely and 7 = very realistic / very trustworthy / very likely.

The total pilot survey sample consisted of 110 respondents, of which 67% were women, and 33% of the total sample were men. Concerning the reliability of individual purchasing scenarios, this study paid attention to the values of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient ($\alpha > 0.7$). The reliability analysis showed that in all cases, the reliability was higher than 0.7, which indicated that the purchasing scenarios were suitable for the main research.

In the second stage, the main research was carried out. Two questionnaires were made based on different purchasing channels (webrooming and showrooming), both of which included scenarios focused on three purchasing motives, according to Atkins and Youn-Kyung (2012).

Table 2. Results of purchasing scenario realities

| | Show S1 | Show S2 | Show S3 | Web S1 | Web S2 | Web S3 |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| Cronbach's Cronbach's Alpha | 0.9090 | 0.9220 | 0.8852 | 0.9119 | 0.9515 | 0.9503 |

Sources: developed by the authors.

Therefore, each respondent had only one purchasing channel at their disposal at one time. The respondent's task was to give their opinion on all three purchasing scenarios. After reading each scenario, respondents were asked to respond to items related to the given shopping scenario (Table 3), with respondents' subjective responses being measured using a seven-point Likert scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

Table 3. Researched variables according to purchasing motives

| Latent variables | Manifest variables | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Time/Effort savings | T/E_Sav1 | This purchase is a bargain. |
| | T/E_Sav2 | Making this purchase would not be difficult for me. |
| | T/E_Sav3 | I would not put much effort into this purchase. |
| | T/E_Sav4 | By making this purchase, I use my time effectively. |
| | T/E_Sav5 | I wouldn't waste my time making this purchase. |
| | T/E_Sav6 | I would be able to make this purchase quickly. |
| Right purchase | R_Purch1 | This purchase would be what I exactly prefer. |
| | R_Purch2 | This purchase would perfectly suit my needs. |
| | R_Purch3 | This purchase meets my expectations. |
| | R_Purch4 | With this purchase, I would get a quality product. |
| | R_Purch5 | This purchase would be very good for me. |
| Money savings | M_Sav1 | With this purchase, I would get what I want for a price I would be willing to pay. |
| | M_Sav1 | With this purchase, I would get the product at a lower price than usual. |
| | M_Sav1 | With this purchase, I would get the product at a reasonable price. |
| | M_Sav1 | This purchase is a bargain. |

Sources: developed by the authors based on (Atkins and Youn-Kyung, 2012).

Research sample. The research rests on availability sampling. The aim was to maintain a proportional distribution of respondents for each shopping channel. Only respondents who purchased any type of clothing through any shopping channel (online or offline) in the last six months were included in the sample. After excluding incomplete or irrelevant replies, a data set consisting of $n = 243$ observations for each purchasing channel was determined. The total research sample consisted of $n = 486$ respondents.

Results. The following part of the paper assesses the differences in purchasing channels from the view of selected purchasing motives and verifies the above hypotheses using mathematical-statistical analyses carried out on a sample of main research data ($n = 486$).

The hypotheses will be verified in three parts. The first part deals with normality assessment using the Shapiro - Wilk test. The next part uses the difference test - the non-parametric test of differences - the Wilcoxon test of two independent selections (Mann-Whitney U test). The last part describes the relations under each shopping motive (statistically significant differences).

Table 4 summarizes the outputs of descriptive statistics to determine the properties of the processed manifest items of individual purchase scenarios. The results are sorted based on shopping channels. The given statistical characteristics show the values of the central tendency (average and median), characteristics of variability (standard deviation), position characteristics (skewness and point) as well as quartile characteristics (first and third quartile).

Table 4. Outputs of descriptive statistics of individual scenarios

| SCENARIO no. 1 | | T/E_Sav1 | T/E_Sav2 | T/E_Sav3 | T/E_Sav4 | T/E_Sav5 | T/E_Sav6 |
|----------------|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Webrooming | Average | 4.30 | 4.72 | 4.40 | 4.70 | 4.59 | 4.65 |
| | Median | 4.00 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| | Standard deviation | 1.94 | 2.01 | 1.89 | 1.73 | 1.84 | 1.95 |
| | Skewness | -0.08 | -0.39 | -0.08 | -0.29 | -0.32 | -0.31 |
| | Kurtosis | -1.27 | -1.23 | -1.37 | -1.09 | -1.06 | -1.20 |
| | First quartile | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| | Third quartile | 6.00 | 7.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 7.00 |
| Showrooming | Average | 4.23 | 4.58 | 4.11 | 4.25 | 4.20 | 4.44 |
| | Median | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 |
| | Standard deviation | 1.79 | 1.80 | 1.94 | 1.79 | 1.95 | 1.77 |
| | Skewness | -0.06 | -0.25 | 0.00 | 0.02 | -0.04 | -0.19 |
| | Kurtosis | -1.14 | -1.21 | -1.30 | -1.24 | -1.33 | -1.12 |
| | First quartile | 3.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| | Third quartile | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| SCENARIO no.2 | | R_Purch1 | R_Purch2 | R_Purch3 | R_Purch4 | R_Purch5 | |
| Webrooming | Average | 4.65 | 4.78 | 4.81 | 4.76 | 4.79 | |
| | Median | 4.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | |
| | Standard deviation | 1.93 | 1.75 | 1.81 | 1.70 | 1.74 | |
| | Skewness | -0.20 | -0.35 | -0.25 | -0.16 | -0.18 | |
| | Kurtosis | -1.27 | -0.90 | -1.27 | -1.16 | -1.27 | |
| | First quartile | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | |
| | Third quartile | 7.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | |
| Showrooming | Average | 4.32 | 4.35 | 4.44 | 4.30 | 4.52 | |
| | Median | 5.00 | 4.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | |
| | Standard deviation | 1.77 | 1.71 | 1.65 | 1.66 | 1.74 | |
| | Skewness | -0.18 | -0.11 | -0.15 | -0.34 | -0.26 | |
| | Kurtosis | -1.06 | -1.11 | -1.11 | -1.02 | -1.24 | |
| | First quartile | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | |
| | Third quartile | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | |
| SCENARIO no.3 | | M_Sav1 | M_Sav2 | M_Sav3 | M_Sav4 | | |
| Webrooming | Average | 4.35 | 4.04 | 4.30 | 4.40 | | |
| | Median | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | | |
| | Standard deviation | 1.85 | 1.79 | 1.78 | 1.78 | | |
| | Skewness | -0.14 | 0.00 | -0.09 | -0.05 | | |
| | Kurtosis | -1.09 | -0.99 | -1.11 | -1.19 | | |
| | First quartile | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | | |
| | Third quartile | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | | |
| Showrooming | Average | 4.93 | 4.98 | 4.78 | 5.12 | | |
| | Median | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 6.00 | | |
| | Standard deviation | 1.65 | 1.61 | 1.68 | 1.68 | | |
| | Skewness | -0.41 | -0.49 | -0.37 | -0.62 | | |
| | Kurtosis | -0.90 | -0.89 | -1.08 | -0.90 | | |
| | First quartile | 3.00 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 4.00 | | |
| | Third quartile | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | | |

Sources: developed by the authors.

Table 5. Researched variables according to purchasing motives

| | | T/E_Sav1 | T/E_Sav2 | T/E_Sav3 | T/E_Sav4 | T/E_Sav5 | T/E_Sav6 |
|-------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Webrooming | Statistic | 0.914122 | 0.879488 | 0.900856 | 0.913442 | 0.91637 | 0.896305 |
| | df | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| | Sig. | 1.3E-10 | 5.87E-13 | 1.42E-11 | 1.15E-10 | 1.93E-10 | 6.94E-12 |
| Showrooming | Statistic | 0.924866 | 0.908246 | 0.91525 | 0.918881 | 0.911162 | 0.924858 |
| | df | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 |
| | Sig. | 9.24E-10 | 4.74E-11 | 1.58E-10 | 3.03E-10 | 7.77E-11 | 9.23E-10 |
| Webrooming | | R_Purch1 | R_Purch2 | R_Purch3 | R_Purch4 | R_Purch5 | |
| | Statistic | 0.194074 | 0.185036 | 0.217506 | 0.171033 | 0.209606 | |
| | df | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | |
| Showrooming | Sig. | 6.41E-25 | 1.52E-22 | 1.2E-31 | 4.2E-19 | 2.74E-29 | |
| | Statistic | 0.160291 | 0.154128 | 0.156471 | 0.186843 | 0.19747 | |
| | df | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | |
| Webrooming | Sig. | 1.16E-16 | 2.44E-15 | 7.77E-16 | 5.22E-23 | 7.63E-26 | |
| | | M_Sav1 | M_Sav2 | M_Sav3 | M_Sav4 | | |
| | Statistic | 0.172033 | 0.130438 | 0.15965 | 0.173886 | | |
| Showrooming | Df | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | | |
| | Sig. | 2.44E-19 | 8.74E-11 | 1.6E-16 | 8.84E-20 | | |
| | Statistic | 0.178386 | 0.205469 | 0.202274 | 0.233624 | | |
| Webrooming | Df | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | | |
| | Sig. | 7.14E-21 | 4.34E-28 | 3.51E-27 | 9.4E-37 | | |

Sources: developed by the authors.

The choice of test to assess statistically significant differences is preceded by a normality test. Based on the output of the normality test, it was shown that in all examined purchasing motives, the p-value is less than 0.05, which indicates that the conditions of normality are not met. Therefore non-parametric tests for each purchasing channel would be used to analyze the differences.

Table 6. Mann-Whitney U test – saving time/effort

| | T/E_Sav1 | T/E_Sav2 | T/E_Sav3 | T/E_Sav4 | T/E_Sav5 | T/E_Sav6 |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Mann-Whitney U | 28870.500 | 27728.000 | 26883.000 | 25352.000 | 26098.500 | 27259.500 |
| Wilcoxon W | 58516.500 | 57374.000 | 56529.000 | 54998.000 | 55744.500 | 56905.500 |
| Z | -0.428 | -1.178 | -1.729 | -2.734 | -2.241 | -1.483 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.669 | 0.239 | 0.084 | 0.006 | 0.025 | 0.138 |

Sources: developed by the authors.

Table 6 shows the results of the difference test. If the p-value reaches a value lower than the significance level of 0.05, it is possible to speak of a statistically significant difference. Based on the above, we state that the significant difference between webrooming and showrooming in the perception of time/effort savings was reflected in the case of two items (T / E_Sav4 and T / E_Sav5).

Obviously, the difference was reflected in the item where respondents had to agree/disagree with the statement that they would use their time effectively in this purchase. It is also clear that a significantly higher value is measured in webrooming, primarily given by the median value. However, the upper and lower quartile is about the same. Thus, in this case, the median value is decisive. Based on the above, it could be stated that more positive replies were generated for webrooming than showrooming.

The difference was also recorded in the case of the item T / E_Sav5 (I would not waste my time on this purchase). The measured median value is also significantly higher for webrooming in this item. The upper quartile is about the same, but the lower also indicates a more positive value in webrooming. Concerning the results of the differences testing, it could be stated that the respondents feel less time is lost to webrooming than to showrooming. The results probably reflect that the Internet offers opportunities to search for product information more quickly, which leads to webrooming preferences in terms of time and effort savings.

Table 7. Mann-Whitney U test – right purchase

| | R_Purch1 | R_Purch2 | R_Purch3 | R_Purch4 | R_Purch5 |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Mann-Whitney U | 26258.000 | 25150.500 | 25575.500 | 25063.000 | 26678.500 |
| Wilcoxon W | 55904.000 | 54796.500 | 55221.500 | 54709.000 | 56324.500 |
| Z | -2.138 | -2.867 | -2.591 | -2.925 | -1.870 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.033 | 0.004 | 0.010 | 0.003 | 0.061 |

Sources: developed by the authors.

Table 7 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U difference test, showing that the p-value is less than the significance level of 0.05 in almost all items examined (except R_Purch5). From the above, it could be stated that a statistically significant difference between webrooming and showrooming in the perception of making the right shopping choice is evident based on the given items.

The difference between the shopping channels in the selected shopping motive (right shopping choice) was reflected in the item where respondents were asked whether the purchase would be what they preferred. In this case, a significantly higher value, defined by the median value, is measured for showrooming. The differences are also evident in the quartile characteristics. While the lower quartile acquires similar values in both cases, the upper quartile is significantly higher in webrooming and, in addition, reaches a maximum value. In addition, it is significantly higher than the median value in showrooming. Based on the above, it could be stated that showrooming recorded more positive values.

The differences in the given shopping motives are also evident in the item R_Purch2, «This purchase would perfectly suit my needs». The median value is significantly higher in webrooming than in showrooming. And while the upper quartile is about the same for both shopping channels, the lower indicates a more positive value for webrooming. In the case of the lower quartile of showrooming, we can only talk about negative values. Regarding the outputs of the differences testing, it could be stated that webrooming meets the customers' needs more than showrooming, given the purchasing scenario.

According to the above results, it could be stated that significantly higher rates were measured for showrooming. Consumers feel that they are making the right choice with showrooming earlier, which suggests that consumers feel more confident if they first try and check the product in a brick-and-mortar store and then buy it online.

Table 8 shows the results of the difference using the Mann-Whitney U test. In this case, the p-value acquires a value lower than the significance level of 0.05 in all four examined items.

Table 8. Mann-Whitney U test – money saving

| | M_Sav1 | M_Sav2 | M_Sav3 | M_Sav4 |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Mann-Whitney U | 24447.000 | 20761.500 | 25116.500 | 22831.000 |
| Wilcoxon W | 54093.000 | 50407.500 | 54762.500 | 52477.000 |
| Z | -3.332 | -5.741 | -2.893 | -4.399 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.004 | 0.000 |

Sources: developed by the authors.

The differences in the perception of money savings were thus reflected in the item M_Sav1, where the median value is significantly higher in showrooming than in webrooming, although, as is clear, the upper and lower quartiles are approximately the same in both shopping channels. Given the results of the differences testing, we can say that consumers feel they would get what they want at the price they are willing to pay if they shop in the showrooming mode.

A significant difference was also found for the item M_Sav2, where the median value is significantly higher in showrooming than webrooming. In this case, the lower quartile is also higher in showrooming, although the upper quartile acquires the same values.

It is also evident from the other items that higher median values were measured for showrooming. Based on the above results, it could be stated that consumers feel they save money in the showrooming scenario, which suggests that customers prefer to search in brick-and-mortar stores, where they can try the product and then buy it online, as it is cheap.

Several findings support previous scientific studies based on the analyses presented in the previous section. In general, given the sample of respondents and the nature of the selected fashion products, the shopping preferences favoured webrooming over showrooming, indicating that consumers prefer to search for product information online and then make purchases brick-and-mortar stores. However, the differences between purchasing channels are statistically significant, given the individual purchasing motives. Research has shown that consumers motivated by saving time/effort will prefer making their purchase in webrooming mode. These results suggest that consumers use the Internet to search for product information, as it is quicker and gives access to more detailed information. The advantage is that consumers can search for information anywhere and at any time, which allows them to make better and especially faster shopping decisions. These results are consistent with a study by Kang (2018), who argues that comfort preferences are not related to showrooming but webrooming. Also, the results of an experimental study by Flavian et al. (2020) showed that the perception of time and effort savings was higher in webrooming than in showrooming. However, according to the authors, the effect was only marginally significant. However, some literature provides contrary information. Gensler et al. (2017) suggested that saving time was an important reason why consumers preferred showrooming. Inconsistent use of convenience when describing shopping using different channels may mean that different channels may be more or less advantageous depending on what buyers would like to buy and the situation itself. Therefore, Gensler et al. (2017) stated that completing purchases online after checking the product in the brick-and-mortar shop is more convenient than returning to the brick-and-mortar shop.

In addition, Gensler et al. (2017) argued that people who intend to check quality in brick-and-mortar stores before making an online purchase also somewhat price sensitive. At the same time, this statement is consistent with the results of our research, which showed that people prefer showrooming in terms of saving money, which indicates that consumers buying fashion products will first visit a brick-and-mortar store to try, test, and inspect the product and then use online channels to make the actual purchase as they believe that product prices are lower and that they will save money. The study by Flavian et al. (2020) showed the same results. The authors claim showrooming tendencies were the highest when consumers wanted to save money.

As mentioned above, shopping motivation seems to be crucial when choosing individual channels. When consumers are motivated to make the right purchase, they do not have to consider saving time/effort or money (i.e., minimizing inputs) but instead focus more on maximizing the output of the purchase. We boomers tend to see their way of shopping as right than those who prefer showrooming because they have more control over the final result of the purchase (Flavian et al., 2020). These claims are also supported by Walsh and Mitchell (2010), who argue that webroomers are motivated to make the best purchase by intensively searching for information on the Internet so that they can be confident in their decisions in brick-and-mortar stores. However, the research results presented here are contrary to the above statements. Rather, they show that consumers feel more confident and that they are making the right choice if they can try, touch, or taste the product before purchasing it. However, these activities are only possible in brick-and-mortar stores, which explains why consumers driven by this motive prefer showrooming. Previous research shows that six out of ten people who prefer showrooming originally planned to buy products in a brick-and-mortar store (Kalyanam and Tsay, 2013). The main reason why customers unintentionally prefer showrooming is the larger range in online stores. Sahney, Gosh and Shrivastava (2013) stated that customers go to a brick-and-mortar store intending to buy a product but eventually buy it online because they do not find what they were looking for in the brick-and-mortar store. The range of products online is larger compared to brick-and-mortar stores, and this is, according to the authors, why people motivated to make the right purchasing decision prefer showrooming. It could be stated that these statements are also consistent with the presented research results.

Conclusions. As is evident from previous studies, and the results of our research confirm this, the tendency to use more channels during the purchasing process is growing. Some studies even show that using multiple channels is more profitable for companies than using a single purchasing channel (Vanheems et al., 2013). Webrooming and showrooming prove that this multichannel trend is strong and is likely to continue to grow, which may also result in a change in consumer behaviour. Today, consumers lead much more time-consuming lives and therefore appreciate and expect an efficient, smooth, and customized shopping process that covers multiple channels.

The presented research contributes to expanding the theoretical knowledge base in terms of the use of shopping channels. In addition, the research took place in poorly explored waters - the Slovak market. These findings are complemented by (limited) studies on consumer behaviour from different perspectives. The purchasing scenarios used in the research were modified to be more authentic and relatable for the respondent. That may help further studies which intend to examine the phenomenon of webrooming and showrooming in more depth.

However, the presented research has several limitations. First, the researchers worked with cross-sectional data, suggesting that consumer preferences and motives may change fundamentally due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Another limitation is the sample structure, which was predominantly targeted at women. It could be assumed that men's preferences and motives may be different. This assumption should be examined in further research.

Only a homogeneous category of fashion products was selected for the research, so the results cannot be generalized to other products. At the same time, the research should focus on other product categories generally purchased online as well as offline or those requiring a lower level of physical pre-purchase checks. As the research did not examine whether respondents switch between channels of only one store or use shopping channels of multiple stores, the future research should target people who have experience with online and offline single-store shopping to understand the reasons why the research sample decided to switch between the purchasing channels of the same store.

In addition, the research should focus on broadening the three-dimensional structure of how people perceive smart shopping by adding additional shopping motives, which would give clear information on

shopping channel preferences. The research should focus, for example, on costs and barriers related to search, shopping experience, or consumer confidence in stores.

Author Contributions: conceptualization, M. O. and R. B.; methodology, M. O.; software, R. B.; validation, B. G.; formal analysis, R. B.; investigation, M. O and B. G.; resources, M. O.; data curation, M. O. and R. B.; writing-original draft preparation, B. G.; writing-review and editing, R. B.; visualization, M. O.; supervision, R. B.; project administration, B. G.; funding acquisition, R. B.

Funding: This research was funded by VEGA 1/0488/22: Research in digital marketing in the field of tourism with an emphasis on the principles of sustainability in a post-pandemic market environment; and VEGA 1/0694/20: Relational marketing research - perception of e-commerce aspects and its impact on purchasing behaviour and consumer preferences; and VEGA: 1/0590/22: Exploration of the natural, the social and economic potential of areas with environmental burdens in the Slovak Republic for the development of specific forms of domestic tourism and quantification of environmental risks.

References

- Aragoncillo, L., & Orús, C. (2018). Impulse buying behaviour: an online-offline comparative and the impact of social media. *Spanish Journal of Marketing - ESIC*, 22(1), 42-62. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Ardielli, E., (2020). Evaluation of eParticipation Service's Availability on Czech Municipal Websites. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge*, 8(1), 19-33. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Atkins, K. G., & Youn-Kyung, K. (2012). Smart shopping: conceptualization and measurement. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 40(5), 360. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Aw, E. C. X. (2019). Understanding the webrooming phenomenon: shopping motivation, channel-related benefits and costs. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 47(10), 1074-1092. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Aw, E. C. X., Basha, N. K., Ng, S. I., & Ho, J. A. (2021). Searching online and buying offline: Understanding the role of channel-, consumer-, and product-related factors in determining webrooming intention. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 58, 102328. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bagozzi, R. P., Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., & Flavian, C. (2016). The role of anticipated emotions in purchase intentions. *Psychology & Marketing*, 33(8), 629-645. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Boardman, R., & McCormick, H. (2018). Shopping channel preference and usage motivations: Exploring differences amongst a 50-year age span. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 22 (2), 270-284. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Buttner, O. B., Florack, A., & Göritz, A. S. (2013). Shopping orientation and mindsets: How motivation influences consumer information processing during shopping. *Psychology & Marketing*, 30(9), 779-793. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Chatterjee, P. (2010). Causes and consequences of "order online pick up in-store shopping behavior. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 20(4), 431-448. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Davis, R., Lang, B., & San Diego, J. (2014). How gender affects the relationship between hedonic shopping motivation and purchase intentions?. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 13(1), 18-30. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Davis, R., Smith, S. D., & Lang, B. U. (2017). A comparison of online and offline gender and goal directed shopping online. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 38, 118-125. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fassnacht, M., & Unterhuber, S. (2016). Consumer response to online/offline price differentiation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 28, 137-148. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ferencakova, L., Gajdka, K., Netek, V. & Kapoun, P. (2020). Engaging Customers on Facebook Coffee Shops' Brands' Fan Pages. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge*, 8(1), 65-75. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Flavian, C., Gurrea, R., & Orús, C. (2016). Choice confidence in the webrooming purchase process: The impact of online positive reviews and the motivation to touch. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 15(5), 459-476. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Flavian, C., Gurrea, R., & Orus, C. (2020). Combining channels to make smart purchases: The role of webrooming and showrooming. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 52, 101923. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gensler, S., Neslin, S. A., & Verhoef, P. C. (2017). The showrooming phenomenon: it's more than just about price. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 38, 29-43. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gensler, S., Verhoef, P. C., & Böhm, M. (2012). Understanding consumers' multichannel choices across the different stages of the buying process. *Marketing Letters*, 23(4), 987-1003. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hassan, M., & Lee, G. (2021). Online payment options and consumer trust: determinants of e-commerce in Africa. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge*, 9 (2), 1-13. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Heitz-Spahn, S. (2013). Cross-channel free-riding consumer behavior in a multichannel environment: An investigation of shopping motives, sociodemographics and product categories. *Journal of retailing and consumer services*, 20(6), 570-578. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Jang, S., Prasad, A., & Ratchford, B. T. (2017). Consumer search of multiple information sources and its impact on consumer price satisfaction. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 40, 24-40. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Juaneda-Ayensa, E., Mosquera, A., & Sierra Murillo, Y. (2016). Omnichannel customer behavior: key drivers of technology acceptance and use and their effects on purchase intention. *Frontiers in psychology*, 7, 1117. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kalyanam, K., & Tsay, A. A. (2013). Free riding and conflict in hybrid shopping environments: Implications for retailers, manufacturers, and regulators. *The antitrust bulletin*, 58(1), 19-68. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kang, J. Y. M. (2018). Showrooming, webrooming, and user-generated content creation in the omnichannel era. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 17(2), 145-169. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Keng, C. J., Liao, T. H., & Yang, Y. I. (2012). The effects of sequential combinations of virtual experience, direct experience, and indirect experience: the moderating roles of need for touch and product involvement. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 12(2), 177-199. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Khajehzadeh, S., Oppewal, H., & Tojib, D. (2014). Consumer responses to mobile coupons: The roles of shopping motivation and regulatory fit. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(11), 2447-2455. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Khan, M.A., Yasir, M. & Khan, M. A. (2021). Factors Affecting Customer Loyalty in the Services Sector. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 22 (12), 184-197. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 12(22), 184-197. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kleinlercher, K., Linzmajer, M., Verhoef, P. C., & Rudolph, T. (2020). Antecedents of webrooming in omnichannel retailing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3342. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kollmann, T., Kuckertz, A., & Kayser, I. (2012). Cannibalization or synergy? Consumers' Consumers' channel selection in online-offline multichannel systems. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 19(2), 186-194. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Konus, U., Verhoef, P. C., & Neslin, S. A. (2008). Multichannel shopper segments and their covariates. *Journal of retailing*, 84(4), 398-413. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kostiukevych, R., Mishchuk, H., Zhidebekkyzy, A., Nakonieczny, J., & Akimov, O. (2020). The impact of European integration processes on the investment potential and institutional maturity of rural communities. *Economics & Sociology*, 13(3), 46-63. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Lala, V., & Chakraborty, G. (2015). Impact of consumers' consumers' effort investments on buying decisions. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 32(2), 61-70. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Moon, B. J. (2004). Consumer adoption of the Internet as an information search and product purchase channel: some research hypotheses. *International Journal of Internet Marketing and Advertising*, 1(1), 104-118. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Mukherjee, S., & Chatterjee, S. (2021). Webrooming and showrooming: a multi-stage consumer decision process. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 39 (5), 649-669. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Murqij, S., Baranyai, Z., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2021). Comparative analysis of cooperative & non-cooperative farmers in Kosovo. *Economics and Sociology*, 14(3), 242-263. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Pakurar, M., Haddad, H., Popp, J., Khan, T., & Olah, J. (2019). Supply chain integration, organizational performance and balanced scorecard: An empirical study of the banking sector in Jordan. *Journal of international studies*, 12(2), 129-146. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Rapp, A., Baker, T. L., Bachrach, D. G., Ogilvie, J., & Beitelspacher, L. S. (2015). Perceived customer showrooming behavior and the effect on retail salesperson self-efficacy and performance. *Journal of Retailing*, 91(2), 358-369. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Rejón-Guardia, F., & Luna-Nevarez, C. (2017). «Showrooming» in consumer electronics retailing: an empirical study. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 16(2), 174-201. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Sahney, S., Ghosh, K., & Shrivastava, A. (2013). Conceptualizing consumer «trust» in online buying behaviour: an empirical inquiry and model development in Indian context. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 7(3), 278. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Santos, S., & Gonçalves, H. M. (2019). Multichannel consumer behaviors in the mobile environment: Using fsQCA and discriminant analysis to understand webrooming motivations. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 757-766. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Schul, Y., & Mayo, R. (2003). Searching for certainty in an uncertain world: The difficulty of giving up the experiential for the rational mode of thinking. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 16(2), 93-106. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Trenz, M. (2015). *Multichannel Commerce: A consumer perspective on the integration of physical and electronic channels*. Springer. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Unguren, E., Tellioglu, S. & Turker, N.(2021). Determining the Role of Hotel Attributes in Building Customer Loyalty Using Importance–Performance Analysis: A Study in the Context of Tourist Nationalities. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 22 (12), 105-130. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 12(22), 105-130. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Vanheems, R., Kelly, J. S., & Stevenson, K. (2013). The Internet, the Modern Death of a Salesman: Multichannel Retailing's Retailing's Impact on the Salesperson's Salesperson's Role. *International Journal of Integrated Marketing Communications*, 5(2). [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Verhoef, P. C., Neslin, S. A., & Vroomen, B. (2007). Multichannel customer management: Understanding the research-shopper phenomenon. *International journal of research in marketing*, 24(2), 129-148. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Walsh, G., & Mitchell, V. W. (2010). The effect of consumer confusion proneness on word of mouth, trust, and customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Marketing*, 44 (6), 838–859. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Wijonarko, G., Nastišin, L., Fedorko, R., Bačik, R., & Rigelský, M. (2019). Engagement factors analysis of companies managing their presence on Facebook platform: a quantitative approach research in airlines sector. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 20. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)

Wollenburg, J., Holzapfel, A., Hubner, A., & Kuhn, H. (2018). Configuring retail fulfillment processes for omnichannel customer steering. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 22(4), 540-575. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Wolny, J., & Charoensuksai, N. (2016). Multichannel customer journeys: Mapping the effects of zmot, showrooming and webrooming. In *Marketing challenges in a turbulent business environment* (pp. 205-206). Springer, Cham. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Worimegbe, P. M., Worimegbe, T. M., & Abiola-Oke, E. (2020). Gamification and Customers Experience in the Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 21 (11), 71-87. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 11(21), 71-87. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Yim, M. Y. C., Yoo, S. C., Sauer, P. L., & Seo, J. H. (2014). Hedonic shopping motivation and co-shopper influence on utilitarian grocery shopping in superstores. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 42(5), 528-544. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Марія Олеарова, Ph.D., Пряшівський університет в Пряшеві, Словаччина

Беата Гавурова, Ph.D., професор, Технічний університет Кошице, Словаччина

Радован Бачік, доцент, Пряшівський університет в Пряшеві, Словаччина

Мотиваційні чинники поведінки споживачів: на прикладі вебруму та шоуруму

У статті проаналізовано канали комунікації зі споживачами та їх мотиви використання вебруму та шоуруму під час здійснення покупок. Результати дослідження засвідчили, що означені питання є недостатньо висвітлені в науковій літературі. Метою статті є визначення мотивів споживачів купувати товари через відповідні канали комунікації (вебрум чи шоурум). В основу проведеного дослідження покладено тривимірну структуру сприйняття розумних покупок. Детерміновану вибірку даних сформовано на основі результатів опитування 486 покупців однорідної категорії товарів індустрії моди. За результатами дослідження встановлено, що споживачі надають перевагу вебруму перед шоурумом. Таким чином, це свідчить про те, що перш ніж придбати товар у магазині, споживачі шукають інформацію про нього в Інтернеті. При цьому враховуючи індивідуальні мотиви купівлі, авторами наголошено на статистично значущій відмінності між каналами комунікації. У ході дослідження встановлено, що споживачі, які бажають заощадити час у процесі покупки, віддають перевагу вебруму, а ті, хто налаштований економити гроші та відчувати правильність рішення щодо покупки – шоурум. Авторами зазначено, що вебрум та шоурум є новітньою тенденцією, яка, ймовірно, продовжуватиме розвиватись, що сприятиме зміні поведінки споживачів. Сучасні споживачі ведуть більш трудомісткий спосіб життя, тому цінують і очікують ефективного, плавного та індивідуального процесу покупок, який охоплює декілька каналів. Теоретична цінність проведеного дослідження полягає у розвитку подальших наукових напрацювань, присвячених питанням використання каналів комунікації зі споживачами. Отримані результати мають практичне значення і можуть бути прийняті до впровадження бізнесом, оскільки інтеграція між каналами комунікації може підвищити довіру та лояльність споживачів, коефіцієнт конверсії та продажі. Враховуючи отримані результати, авторами означено обмеження даного дослідження та запропоновано напрямки майбутніх досліджень.

Ключові слова: шоурум, вебрумінг, споживча поведінка, торговий канал, мотивація.