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ABSTRACT

The Marketing 4.0 phenomenon has drawn positive attention recently due to digitization and the need for upgraded frameworks. It was recently proposed with four components: brand identity, brand image, brand integrity, and brand interaction (4i). Brand interaction caters to the latest digitization trends in the industry. This study applies the Marketing 4.0 framework in a cross-national emerging economy context. It proposes a model that examines the impact of Marketing 4.0 on the online customer experience (OCE) and online repurchase intention (ORPI). Five hundred twenty-eight online shoppers of the branded apparel segment from two emerging economies participated in the study. The findings indicate the validity of the adapted Marketing 4.0 scale across the samples. All the direct hypotheses are accepted except one proving the positive impact of Marketing 4.0 on the OCE and the ORPI. Furthermore, the OCE significantly mediates the relationships between Marketing 4.0 elements and the ORPI, except for brand interaction (BINT).
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1. INTRODUCTION

The primary characteristics of digitization, such as ubiquity, localization, accessibility, and personalization, have impacted small, medium, and large businesses (Dash et al., 2021; Rouibah et al., 2021; Jara et al., 2012). These characteristics have changed organizations’ distribution, promotion, and marketing research processes. In addition, the increased digitization has disrupted or created...
many marketing models or platforms. Simultaneously, these characteristics have also influenced consumer behavior. Consequently, consumers are searching and shopping online for products and services. During this transitional phase, a new holistic approach known as Marketing 4.0 (Jara et al., 2012; Kotler et al., 2016) has come to the rescue. Marketing 4.0 investigates the digital methods for understanding, reaching, satisfying, and retaining customers by establishing effective relationships (Vassileva, 2017; Jara et al., 2012). In Marketing 4.0, brands become more flexible and adaptive to emerging technological changes to satisfy their consumers (Kotler et al., 2016).

Moreover, online apparel shopping portals offering promotions and incentives have attracted customers to online purchasing. Therefore, online shopping is gaining popularity in the apparel industry (Tawira & Ivanov, 2022). In emerging economies, firms and consumers are adopting technology for shopping purposes (Kullak et al., 2023). Revenue in the Apparel market amounts to US$1.74tn in 2023. The market is expected to grow annually by 2.84% (CAGR 2023-2027) (Statista, 2023).

The study uses the Marketing 4.0 framework to provide theoretical backing for the relationship between Online Customer Experience (OCE) determinants and Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI). The Marketing 4.0 framework assesses the digital interactions using four variables, i.e., Brand Image (BIM), Brand Identity (BID), Brand Integrity (BIN), and Brand Interaction (BINT). However, the review of existing studies indicates using the Technology Adoption Model (TAM) to research OCE and repurchase intention (Foroudi et al., 2018; Ray et al., 2019; Oliveira et al., 2023). Some researchers have applied the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) to explore the phenomenon of OCE and repurchase intention (Sun et al., 2022; Loh & Hassan, 2022). Some studies have used the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT I & II) (Palos Sanchez et al., 2021) as an underpinning theory for investigating OCE and repurchase intention (Khan et al., 2022; Hunag, 2023). Previous literature indicates the use of Marketing 4.0 (partially) to examine the evaluation of brands (Yegin & Ikram, 2022), brand perception (Yasar & Korkusuz Polat, 2022), customer satisfaction and engagement (Ghonim et al., 2022).

The extant literature indicates that studies still need to thoroughly decipher the phenomenon of Marketing 4.0 (Dash et al., 2021; Vassileva, 2017). Most studies have only observed Marketing 4.0 as a phenomenon (Fuciu & Dumitrescu, 2018; Kartajaya et al., 2019). This study bridges the gap in the existing literature by validating the Marketing 4.0 scale in a cross-sectional emerging economy context. Recent data indicates that Saudi Arabia and India are leading the charts in GDP growth rates among large economies (Arab News, 2023). Both countries are witnessing massive growth in e-commerce, and branded apparel segment is booming (Statista, 2023). Hence, cross-national samples from these two countries are considered. The study examines the Marketing 4.0 impact on OCE and ORPI and the mediation impact of OCE between Marketing 4.0 and ORPI. It also advances the understanding of ORPI and its antecedents. The study lends insights into whether Marketing 4.0 contributes to OCE and ORPI. OCE’s mediation impact is a novel contribution to the literature because no study has explored OCE as a mediator between Marketing 4.0 and ORPI. Our findings have important implications for practitioners.

Given this background, we raise and try to answer the following research questions:

**RQ1**: Does the Marketing 4.0 scale pass the validity test in a cross-national emerging economy context?  
**RQ2**: Do Marketing 4.0 components impact OCE?  
**RQ3**: Do Marketing 4.0 components impact ORPI?  
**RQ4**: Does OCE mediate the association between Marketing 4.0 and ORPI? (mediation) (As the literature suggests OCE to be a determinant of ORPI, we also wanted to know the direct and indirect effects.)  
**RQ5**: How do the two countries differ in the proposed relationships? (Multi-group analysis)

The following section (Section 2) discusses the variables and the proposed hypotheses (Section 3) used in the conceptual model. The methodology section (Section 4) describes our study’s design,
including sampling, measures, and data analysis techniques. The results section (Section 5) elucidates and explains the study’s findings. The discussion section (Section 6) interprets the results, especially the validation of the Marketing 4.0 scale in a global context and the proposed hypotheses. Finally, the paper concludes with our unique contribution by highlighting the theoretical and managerial implications. It also provides a few limitations indicating future research directions.

2. MARKETING 4.0 FRAMEWORK

Literature suggests that Marketing 4.0 has emerged as a strategic marketing tool when brands use digitization to satisfy consumers (Dash et al., 2021; Da Silva, 2021; von Briel, 2018). The marketing 4.0 era allows customers to voice aspirations and opinions, share online experiences, and help marketers to use digital media to converse with consumers. Marketers permit freedom of discussion on online platforms to create conversations with consumers (Seyyedamiri & Khosravani, 2020). Customers want to be part of the marketing process and share their experiences with other consumers using online platforms (Li et al., 2021; Jara et al., 2012). Marketers try to use it as a business model where online customer interaction opportunities allow customers to express themselves and help marketers better serve them (Llopis-Albert et al., 2021; Rose et al., 2011). These interactions also shape online purchases and online repurchase intention (ORPI). Online purchases continue to rise because of increased internet penetration after COVID-19-imposed lockdowns (Emarketer, 2021). Marketing 4.0 shapes a new era in which the academic and practitioner examinations of online customer experience (OCE) and purchase intention become more holistic and structured (Wereda & Wozniak, 2019). Marketers emphasize that personal relationships impact the online experience and purchase intention (Rahman et al., 2020; Đukić et al., 2018). Similarly, Marketing 4.0 variables, i.e., brand image (BIM) and brand identity (BID), determine the purchase (re) intention and customer satisfaction (Dash et al., 2021).

2.1. Brand Identity (BID)

It is a personality in totality that includes uniqueness in the eye of customers, where customers relate it to the brand image (Aaker, 2012; Tuškej & Podnar, 2018). Brand identity includes name, logo, punch line, color, shape, and visual identity on social media. It also includes the brand’s distinctive characteristics (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003). Thus, brand identity becomes a simple reason for customers’ purchase decisions (Djafarova & Trofimenko, 2018). Many scales were developed to assess it. The PIRT scale outlines “personality, image, reputation, and trust” as the four measures (Rajagopal, 2008). Tsaur et al. (2016) developed a scale with five measures: “image, quality, personality, awareness, and culture.” Hence, it can be inferred that it reflects all visual attributes created by the company and perceived by its customers (Aaker, 1996; Dash et al., 2021).

2.2. Brand Image (BIM)

Kotler et al. (2016) define brand image as customers’ perceptions of the company’s products and services. It enables customers to understand and compare their needs and wants (Hossain et al., 2020). In an online environment, electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) is an effective tool for creating a brand image that influences customers. Similarly, the online BIM (OBIM) model reiterated that minor changes in external factors, such as political, social, and technological factors, might affect the OBIM score and play a vital role in developing marketing strategies (Mitra et al., 2020). It can be assessed with the help of three measures: “mystery, sensuality and intimacy, and these elements represent facets of the cognitive, sensory, and emotional dimensions of a brand” (Roberts, 2004; Cho, 2011; Dash et al., 2021).

2.3. Brand Integrity (BIN)

Every business brand relies on ethics, integrity, or credibility that shoppers consider essential. Therefore, a brand’s integrity depends on the company’s credibility, trust, and ability to keep
promises (Kotler et al., 2010; 2016). Credibility develops trust, positively affecting brand impact (Hussain et al., 2020). This trust is the backbone of online shopping and the soul of e-commerce. The impact of eWoM has averred shoppers’ future purchase intentions and decisions, which reflects BIN created by the company (Boateng, 2021). Many shoppers refer to it as “brand credibility” to describe how a company keeps promises to customers. Additionally, integrity reflects the ethics, sincerity, honesty, service, and commitment companies carry out for customers (Hu et al., 2016). Finally, existing literature also reveals that the true success of brands results from the company’s integrity and credibility, which depends on fulfilled promises to the customer (Joshi & Garg, 2020).

2.4. Brand Interaction (BINT)
Access to customers is not a conversation; it is social interaction for brand development. Customers collaborate by delivering their feedback and suggestions to the companies resulting in improved communication, higher-quality product and services, and, more importantly, more robust relationships among stakeholders (Cheung et al., 2021). Brand interaction originates with interactions through social media, attaining customer loyalty (Apaolaza et al., 2015). Technological developments such as the Web 3.0 application have transformed interactions and encouraged all stakeholders to connect and share their views, providing a wide range of improved BINT over social media (Kamboj & Sarmah, 2018). Hollebeek et al. (2014) suggested that brand engagement has a positive cognitive and behavioral approach directly associated with BINT. “Consumers perform three functions while interacting with the brand: consumption, contribution, and creation” (Schivinski et al., 2016).

2.5. Dependent Constructs
2.5.1. Online Customer Experience (OCE)
OCE (Rose et al., 2011) refers to moments of customer participation. OCE allows a company to interact with customers via online platforms using desktop, mobile, and well-tuned dynamic features, such as speed, 24-7 availability, and other technical aspects that have improved the customer experience and purchasing journey (Rose et al., 2012). Customer experience plays a vital role in building good relationships, providing a company with a competitive advantage (Becker & Jaakkola, 2020). The quality of the customer experience directly impacts the related business (Fernandes & Pinto, 2019). In the digital era, customers have many requirements due to the available information; this has caused increased pressure and competition among companies. Companies that invest in OCE reap financial benefits and competitive advantages (Troisi et al., 2020). Finally, companies with communication flowing through various and transparent channels experience reduced negative customer experiences and improved customer retention (Gao et al., 2021).

2.5.2. Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI)
ORPI is a customer’s intention to repeat a purchase from the same company (Zhang et al., 2011). OCE and service marketing may directly or indirectly affect repurchase intentions (Troisi et al., 2020). However, Antwi (2021) stated that customer satisfaction with services and delivery is the primary influencer of repurchase intention. Similarly, Lee (2020) describes how other factors, including consumer satisfaction, social influence, emotional loyalty, and customer habits, directly or indirectly influence repurchase intention. Finally, Aparicio et al. (2021) mentioned that ORPI, shown through online platform sales figures, depends on the vendor’s trust. Most researchers conclude that a company’s perceived trust in and satisfaction with (Rose et al., 2012) significantly influences ORPI.
3. HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In the previous section, we explored the theoretical background of the constructs. As indicated by this study’s proposed research questions, the authors examine the relationship between the four components of Marketing 4.0, OCE, and ORPI, as detailed in this section.

3.1. Brand Identity (BID), Online Customer Experience (OCE), and Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI)

BID is the brand’s projection to customers intended to increase the level of customer interaction (Keller, 2011) in a dynamic and integrated network among the stakeholders (Kornum et al., 2017; Von Wallpach et al., 2017). Researchers have suggested that enhanced brand identity would reach and focus on product uniqueness (Aaker, 2012), wherein customers can choose brands, and the brand selection has prominence before the marketers (Kusi et al., 2021). Similarly, Balmer et al. (2021) discussed the corporate brand orientation framework, mentioning how companies use corporate BID, images, and brand identification to improve prospects, and customers are considered active contributors (Gromark, 2020). Concerning OCE, the experience starts when the customer knows the company’s products/services and seeks services rendered. Therefore, BID is utilized to obtain the optimum level of OCE. Visual attributes play a huge role in influencing the customer’s experience. The customer’s role in decision-making has gained prominence in purchases and repurchases (Kusi et al., 2021) because customers actively search the internet and use various digital platforms to obtain the best quality products and/or services. On the other hand, a repeat purchase intention is a behavioral approach in which a customer intends to repeatedly buy a similar product or service from the same company (Hellier et al., 2003). Therefore, enhanced BID and customers identifying themselves with it create positive eWOM, resulting in a solid reason for ORPI (Graham et al., 2020; Tuškej & Podnar, 2018). Repurchase decisions are mostly based on the visual attributes reflected by brand identity. It can be summarized that BID positively influences both OCE and ORPI. Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H1(a): Brand identity (BID) has a positive impact on the online customer experience (OCE).
H1(b): Brand identity (BID) positively impacts Online repurchase intention (ORPI).

3.2. Brand Image (BIM), Online Customer Experience (OCE), and Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI)

Balmer et al. (2021) stated that BIM and internal corporate identity image are prerequisites for corporate brand orientation. Moreover, developing a BIM is a critical strategy for companies to win customer trust, commitment, and satisfaction (Antwi, 2021). However, since interactions between customers and companies occur on various platforms, reviews establish BIM (Mitra et al., 2020). Furthermore, fair use of technology has improved eWOM and empowered customers. Companies that have understood this have relied increasingly on examining their customers’ experiences through various online tools and platforms (Yu et al., 2021). Finally, the improved BIM resulting from eWOM and improved interaction enhances OCE. In addition, BIM is an acquired experience from past purchases. Customers with a positive perception of brand image are likely to possess ORPI. BIM reduces the fear of risks associated with online purchases, improving trust and boosting repurchase intention (Aghekyan-Simonian et al., 2012). BIM positively impacts satisfaction and purchase intention (Dash et al., 2021). Both are antecedents of OCE and ORPI. Therefore, BIM, linked with customer trust, commitment, satisfaction, and price level, will positively impact ORPI. It can be summarized that BIM positively influences both OCE and ORPI. Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed:
H2(a): Brand image (BIM) positively impacts Online customer experience (OCE).
H2(b): Brand image (BIM) has a positive impact on Online repurchase intention (ORPI).

3.3. Brand Integrity (BIN), Online Customer Experience (OCE), and Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI)
BIN is also known as brand credibility, which comes from consumers’ perceptions of the brand or company based on its presented offerings (Kotler et al., 2010). The success of a company’s brand relies on the company’s integrity and credibility, which results from fulfilling promises made to the customer (Joshi & Garg, 2020). BIN is the consumer’s expectations, perceptions, and trust in the company to fulfill promises. It also improves a customer’s behavioral intention regarding the brand’s product (Cambier et al., 2020). Over time, technology has driven new modes of interaction for buying and selling over the internet. Advancements in information technology and IT-enabled services have significantly impacted customers, bringing OCE to the forefront. (Hoyer et al., 2020). Trust, transparency, and credibility go a long way in enhancing customer experience in an online environment. Many describe the customer experience as a multidimensional approach based on emotional, behavioral, and cognitive responses that customers learn while seeking the products and services rendered by the company (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016). So, a company may achieve customer trust, confidence, word of mouth (WOM), and repurchase intention (Rose et al., 2012). Technology enormously changed customers’ experiences of a company, establishing trust, gaining confidence, and motivating eWOM, directly affecting desired repurchase intention (Rose et al., 2012). It is also observed that the upgraded form of eWOM, with proper use of technology, has increased ORPI with the same company. This is because WOM reflects BIN created by the company (Boateng, 2021). In addition, when customers habitually participate in the online community or other online social interactions, they display higher repurchase interactions with the company (Schivinski & Dabrowski, 2016). The participation goes up with higher BIN. It can be summarized that BIN positively influences both OCE and ORPI. Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H3(a): Brand integrity (BIN) positively impacts Online customer experience (OCE).
H3(b): Brand integrity (BIN) positively impacts Online repurchase intention (ORPI).

3.4. Brand Interaction (BINT), Online Customer Experience (OCE), and Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI)
The previously discussed elements, identity, image and integrity, help companies retain and satisfy customers. Kotler et al. (2010) discussed collaborative marketing in which customers are more active in directly or indirectly interacting with companies to praise or criticize products or services. Motta-Filho (2021) emphasized that the customer-centric approach to branding, realized from continuous customer interactions with the company and its offerings, enhances the customer experience(s). In digital business, where Web 3.0 applications, social media, and other interactive technology have dramatically transformed BINT, all the stakeholders share a single platform in which companies and customers exchange views on products and services (Kamboj & Sarmah, 2018). Due to digital technology, this interaction has created a suitable environment for business and placed BINT, which combines customers’ experiences with the brand and plays a vital role in this digital era (Dash et al., 2021). This digital BINT creates a congenial environment for business, and positive eWOM will eventually achieve OCE (De Matos & Rossi, 2008). Furthermore, good communication leads to a better customer experience, whereas poor communication leads to negative interactions and customer service. Therefore, increased positive interactions in the digital era will enhance trust and improve collaboration. In their model, Cheung et al. (2021) discussed customer-brand engagement dimensions, elaborating on how cognitive engagement positively impacts consumers’ behavior,
improving communication and quality of products or services, and, more importantly, strengthening the relationship among stakeholders. Ho et al. (2020) concluded that this digital age achieves plausible customer engagement, mobile apps, brand equity, and further repurchase intention. It can be summarized that BINT positively influences both OCE and ORPI. Hence, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H4(a): Brand interaction (BINT) positively impacts Online customer experience (OCE).
H4(b): Brand interaction (BINT) positively impacts Online repurchase intention (ORPI).

3.5. Online Customer Experience (OCE) and Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI)

In this digital era, customers have many requirements due to the available information. The digital era has increased pressure and competition among companies; those investing in OCE receive financial rewards and attain competitive advantage (Troisi et al., 2020). Technology has improved eWOM and empowered customers. Companies that understand it have relied increasingly on analyzing their customers’ experiences on various online tools and platforms (Dash et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2021). On the other hand, repurchase intention is purchasing products or services from the same company after a previous experience with the company’s product and quality services (Filieri & Lin, 2017). Improved customer engagement from mobile apps and other technology platforms has dramatically impacted ORPI (Ho et al., 2020). A lack of good customer service, pricing, and brand acceptance leads to a negative overall customer experience, affecting repurchase intention (Yasri et al., 2020). Therefore, companies should try to improve the customer experience so that repurchase intentions occur. Finally, in their model, Tyrväinen et al. (2020) mentioned that an easy, fun, and enjoyable shopping experience leads to higher repurchase intention. Based on the above, it can be hypothesized that:

H5: Online customer experience (OCE) has a positive impact on Online repurchase intention (ORPI).

3.6. Mediating Role of Online Customer Experience (OCE)

Various technological aspects of the digital age have improved customer experience during their buying journeys (Rose et al., 2012); companies are also attempting to observe trends and shape consumer behavior. Furthermore, Antwi (2021) elaborated that customers’ trust, commitment, and satisfaction, which enhance OCE, correlate directly to repurchase intention. Hence, OCE mediates the relationship between BID and ORPI. Customer experience is crucial for business as it affects ORPI, so it is crucial to analyze OCE (Dabrynin & Zhang, 2019). Aparicio et al. (2021) reported that more than 50% of ORPI results from enhanced BIM and trust in vendors, which shows the amount of buying over the online platforms. However, BIM also enhances the customer’s experience, boosting repurchase intention. Chopdar (2020) discussed the stimulus-organism-response (S-O-R), an approach focusing on the satisfying experience that enhances repurchase intention. Therefore, experience is an essential factor between them. BINT creates a congenial environment for business and enhances OCE, influencing repurchase decisions (De Matos & Rossi, 2008). Moreover, improved eWOM influences e-trust and e-loyalty, and the outcome of e-trust and e-loyalty are ORPI (Bulut & Karabulut, 2018). These positive eWOM are generated by BIM and BIN. Based on the above, it can be hypothesized that:

H6: Online customer experience (OCE) mediates the relationship between Marketing 4.0 and Online repurchase intention (ORPI). (BID, BIM, BIN, BINT, and ORPI) (a, b, c, d)

Figure 1 depicts the integrated structural model that includes all the hypotheses.
4. METHOD

4.1. Setting, Sample, and Data

Although it is always preferable to have online and offline data collection modes, the current pandemic forced us to work primarily online. However, we gathered nearly 10% of the data offline (Robson, 2011; Hair et al., 2010; Malhotra et al., 2006). We took all the items (in original form and modified) from previous studies using purposive-cum-stratified sampling (Malhotra et al., 2006). As the concepts demanded a thorough knowledge of every aspect, we focused on professors, teaching/research associates, and students of advanced levels (business administration). In addition, the study included four universities/B-schools from India and Saudi Arabia. We chose India and Saudi Arabia because both are emerging economies and have substantial online branded apparel markets. Online purchases boomed in both countries during the pandemic. The final sample included only those participants who had purchased branded apparel online in the last three months.

We used a well-drafted structured questionnaire with multiple sections, including all the measurement items (Table 2) and a few socioeconomic questions. The questionnaire had three sections. Section A contained demographic and socioeconomic questions. Section B contained all the items used in the study under all the constructs. Section C concluded with open-ended questions, such as suggestions or comments. Section B used a seven-point scale (strongly disagree=1 and strongly agree=7). Participants then learned the purpose of the survey. We emailed the form to small groups (to avoid messages filtering to spam) and, a week later, followed with a gentle reminder to complete the survey.

We collected data between May 2021 and September 2021, contacting 1,000 potential respondents for the survey. We received more than 600 responses. However, we did not consider many responses because of missing data and lack of involvement (Dash & Paul, 2021; Hair et al., 2017; Malhotra et al., 2006). In this study, we considered India as Sample 1 and Saudi Arabia as Sample 2. We obtained 327 responses from Sample 1 and 201 responses from Sample 2 for further analysis. We conducted a pilot study with twenty marketing domain professors to refine the scales, and accordingly, it was updated. A few items lacked the needed thresholds, but we retained them for the final study to reassess them. Details of the respondents are provided in Table 1.
4.2. Constructs and Variables

As proposed in the conceptual framework (Figure 1), the study included six constructs. The Marketing 4.0 scale consists of four constructs: BID, BIM, BIN, and BINT. BID (3 items) (signage, sophistication, and reputation) (Aaker, 1997; Dash et al., 2021; Rajagopal, 2008; Tsaur et al., 2016) (bid1, bid2, bid3); BIM (3 items) (mystery, sensuality, and intimacy) (Cho, 2011; Dash et al., 2021; Roberts, 2004) (bim1, bim2, bim3); BIN (4 items) (trust, expertise, sincerity, and transparency) (Campelo et al., 2011; Dash et al., 2021; Erdem & Swait, 2004) (bin1, bin2, bin3, and bin4) and BINT (4 items) (consumption, contribution, creation, and distribution) (Dash et al., 2021; Huh et al., 2009; Schivinski et al., 2016) (bint1, bint2, bint3, and bint4) (bint2 dropped). We have taken two dependent measures: OCE and ORPI. In addition, OCE plays the mediator between Marketing 4.0 and ORPI. OCE has four items: interface, privacy, e-CRM, and customization (oce1, oce2, oce3, and oce4) (oce4 dropped) (Bhattacharya et al., 2019; Chen & Yang, 2021; Yang et al., 2020). ORPI has four items: future intention, additional services, long-term bonding, and online payment options (orpi1, orpi2, orpi3, and orpi4) (orpi3 dropped) (Chen & Yang, 2021; Chiu et al., 2009; Lin & Lekhawipat, 2014; Tandon et al., 2017). All items under the six measures are provided in Table 2.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Measurement Model Assessment

All the items were provided in a pool format. First, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to generate the factors using IBM SPSS 25. Three items had to be removed because of very low factor loadings. EFA provided six factors with 82% variance extracted. Next, we ran a confirmatory
factor analysis for individual samples of the two countries (IBM SPSS AMOS 24) to revalidate the EFA. We used both samples (India and Saudi Arabia) to do the same. For both the samples, factor loadings were more than 0.7, indicating good validity of the measures (Dash & Paul, 2021; Hair et al., 2010; Malhotra et al., 2006) (See Table 2).

Furthermore, for both the samples, reliability, normality, convergent, and discriminant validity were conducted (See Table 3 and Table 4). Skewness and Kurtosis were found to be within limits. Cronbach’s alpha (reliability) (Dash & Paul, 2021; Hair et al., 2010, 2017; Malhotra et al., 2006), composite reliability (reliability) (Chakraborty et al., 2021; Dash & Paul, 2021; Henseler et al., 2015; Urbach & Ahlemann, 2010), average variance extracted (AVE) (convergent validity and discriminant validity) (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), Fornell-Larcker criterion (discriminant validity), and heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) (discriminant validity) (Ameen et al., 2021; Henseler et al., 2015) were used to

---

**Table 2. Measurement model summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Factor</th>
<th>Items/ Statements (Finally Used)</th>
<th>Factor Loading (Sample 1)</th>
<th>Factor Loading (Sample 2)</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Identity (BID)</strong></td>
<td>bid1: The brand’s signage seems okay.</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>Dash et al., 2021; Tsaur et al., 2016; Rajagopal, 2008; Aaker, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bid2: The brand seems sophisticated to me.</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bid3: The brand has a good reputation.</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Image (BIM)</strong></td>
<td>bim1: I find the brand has some mystery elements. (Mystery draws together stories, metaphors, dreams, and symbols.)</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>Dash et al., 2021; Cho, 2011; Roberts, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bim2: I find the brand sensuality irresistible. (Sensuality keeps the five senses on constant alert and influences).</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bim3: The intimacy of the brand connects with my emotion and instinct. (Intimacy means empathy, commitment, and passion.)</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Integrity (BIN)</strong></td>
<td>bin1: Trust (in a brand) is essential for me.</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>Dash et al., 2021; Campelo et al., 2011; Erdem &amp; Swait, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bin2: The brand offers expertise in the relevant domain.</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bin3: Sincerity (of a brand) is crucial for me.</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bin4: Transparency is a must for any brand.</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Interaction (BINT)</strong></td>
<td>bint1: I think brand consumption (rather than product consumption) strengthens my relationship with the brand.</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>Dash et al., 2021; Schivinski et al., 2016; Huh et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bint3: Co-creation (with the consumer) is a must for any brand in today’s world.</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bint4: Participation in the distribution enhances my interaction with the brand.</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Customer Experience (OCE)</strong></td>
<td>oce1: The website/app interface is easy to use.</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>Chen &amp; Yang, 2021; Yang et al., 2020; Bhattacharya et al., 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oce2: The website/app protects my privacy and seems secure to me.</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oce3: CRM on the website/app is good.</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Repurchase Intention (ORPI)</strong></td>
<td>orpi1: I intend to buy products from this brand online in the future.</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>Chen &amp; Yang, 2021; Tandon et al., 2017; Lin &amp; Lekhawipat, 2014; Chiu et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orpi2: In the future, I will buy additional services from this brand and its partners.</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>orpi4: Online payment options influence my repurchase decision.</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CMIN/DF:** 2.26, Goodness-of-fit index (GFI): 0.92, Adjusted goodness-of-fit Index (AGFI): 0.9, Standardized Root mean square residual (SRMR): 0.04, Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA): 0.04, Tucker – Lewis index (TLI): 0.95, Normed fit index (NFI): 0.93, Comparative fit index (CFI): 0.96.
assess the measurement model. AVE values were more than 0.5 for all the constructs. CR values were more than 0.8, and Cronbach’s alpha values were more than 0.8 (Table 3). Table 4 shows that the maximum value was 0.63, proving the discriminant validity of the selected measures. All these assessments strongly supported the measures’ discriminant and convergent validity (See Table 3 and Table 4). We have also tested various Goodness-of-fit measures of the CFA: CMIN/DF: 2.26, Goodness-of-fit index (GFI): 0.92, Adjusted goodness-of-fit Index (AGFI): 0.9, Standardized Root mean square residual (SRMR): 0.04, Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA): 0.04, Tucker – Lewis index (TLI): 0.95, Normed fit index (NFI): 0.93, Comparative fit index (CFI): 0.96 (See Table 2).

### 5.2. Structural Model Assessment and Hypothesis Testing

We validated the measurement model in the previous section and conducted further analysis. First, we assessed the conceptual model derived from the literature (Figure 1). There were nine direct hypotheses: H1 (a): H5, and four mediation relationships: H6 (a): H6 (d). Next, we evaluated the
model with the following tools: standardized regression (path) coefficients ($\beta$); t-values and p-values for significance level; and $R^2$ and adjusted $R^2$ values for the model for predictability assessment (Dash & Paul, 2021; Hair et al., 2010, 2017; Malhotra et al., 2006). Bootstrapping with 5,000 iterations was used at 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Hair et al., 2010; Malhotra et al., 2006).

First, we assessed all the direct hypotheses for the combined sample (Table 5 and Figure 2). Second, we evaluated them for each sample: sample 1 (India) and sample 2 (Saudi Arabia) (Table 6). We have also tested various Goodness-of-fit measures of the model: $\text{CMIN}/DF$: 2.89, Goodness-of-fit index (GFI): 0.92, Adjusted goodness-of-fit Index (AGFI): 0.88, Standardized Root mean square

Figure 2. Results of the path analysis

Table 5. Direct effects: Whole sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesized Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Accepted/Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 (a)</td>
<td>BID $\rightarrow$ OCE</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 (b)</td>
<td>BID $\rightarrow$ ORPI</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 (a)</td>
<td>BIM $\rightarrow$ OCE</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 (b)</td>
<td>BIM $\rightarrow$ ORPI</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 (a)</td>
<td>BIN $\rightarrow$ OCE</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 (b)</td>
<td>BIN $\rightarrow$ ORPI</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 (a)</td>
<td>BINT $\rightarrow$ OCE</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 (b)</td>
<td>BINT $\rightarrow$ ORPI</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>OCE $\rightarrow$ ORPI</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at 5%; **significant at 1%
residual (SRMR): 0.05, Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA): 0.05, Tucker – Lewis index (TLI): 0.93, Normed fit index (NFI): 0.93, Comparative fit index (CFI): 0.95. All the direct hypotheses were accepted for the whole and individual samples, except H4 (a). The impact of BINT on OCE was insignificant across the groups. Further, we assessed the predictive power of ORPI (R²). For the entire sample, it was 0.52. For sample-1 (India), it was 0.49; for sample-2 (Saudi Arabia) was 0.54. Therefore, it can be concluded that the findings are similar across the samples. However, in the next section, we completed a cross-national assessment to assess the differences between the two groups for each direct hypothesis.

5.3. Multi-Group Analysis

Although both the samples provided similar findings related to the direct hypotheses, they were further subjected to PLS-MGA (partial least squares-multi-group analysis) using Smart PLS 3.3.3. Existing literature suggests a p-value below 0.05 indicates significant differences between the groups regarding the subjected path coefficients (Ameen et al., 2021; Hair et al., 2017; Henseler et al., 2015). Table 6 provided direct effects for sample-1 and sample-2 with the differences. There was no significant difference between the two countries for all the direct hypotheses, except H4 (b): BINT→ORPI (0.03*). Although the impact was significant for both countries, it was more potent for Saudi Arabia than India.

5.4. Online Customer Experience (OCE) as the Mediator

In this study, we have taken OCE as a mediator between Marketing 4.0 elements and ORPI because the existing literature suggested the same. We used bootstrapping with 5,000 iterations at 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (Byrne, 2013; Dash & Paul, 2021). Cheung and Lau (2008) divided mediation effects into three types: full/total, partial, and zero. If the indirect effect is significant but not direct, it is a full mediation. If the indirect effect is insignificant, it is a zero-mediation case. If both effects are significant, then it is partial. Table 7 and Table 8 provide the mediation effects for both samples. All the proposed mediation hypotheses are accepted for both samples, except H6 (d): BINT→OCE→ORPI. For both countries, the indirect effect is not significant. Hence, we concluded that OCE was not a good mediator between BINT and ORPI. Overall, OCE was found to be a good mediator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesized Relationship</th>
<th>Sample 1</th>
<th>Sample 2</th>
<th>Group Differences (p-Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Accepted/Rejected</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 (a)</td>
<td>BID → OCE</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 (b)</td>
<td>BID → ORPI</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 (a)</td>
<td>BIM → OCE</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 (b)</td>
<td>BIM → ORPI</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 (a)</td>
<td>BIN → OCE</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 (b)</td>
<td>BIN → ORPI</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 (a)</td>
<td>BINT → OCE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 (b)</td>
<td>BINT → ORPI</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>OCE → ORPI</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at 5%; **significant at 1%
This study assessed the four components of Marketing 4.0: BID, BIM, BIN, and BINT in detail. The results showed that the Marketing 4.0 scale with four components had passed all the validation assessments. Only one item was dropped (bint2), and all others have shown excellent loadings in EFA and CFA. The result was the same with both samples, further validating the scale.

Moreover, we assessed AVE, CR, and Cronbach Alpha for both samples. All values were much higher than the recommended levels across the two samples. In addition, we assessed the HTMT criterion for both samples, and the results were the same for both. All these measurement model assessments strongly validated our adapted scale. It proves the Marketing 4.0 scale’s robustness and future universal replications.

We proposed eight direct hypotheses between the four components of Marketing 4.0 with OCE and ORPI. In addition, we proposed another direct hypothesis between OCE and ORPI. Almost all direct hypotheses were accepted in both samples, except for the proposed BINT and OCE relationship. Although the relationship was insignificant, it was positive and almost the same for both samples. All other hypotheses were significant for both samples.

The first set of hypotheses discussed the impact of BID on OCE and ORPI. Across the two samples, the result was almost the same. BID significantly influences customers’ online experience and their ORPI. It is unsurprising since it is in sync with the existing literature (Dash et al., 2021; Graham et al., 2020; Ho et al., 2020; Kusi et al., 2021; Rajagopal, 2008; Tsaur et al., 2016; Tuškej & Podnar, 2018). The second set of hypotheses discussed the impact of BIM on OCE and ORPI. Again, for both samples, the impact was significant. However, the impact of BIM on ORPI (double) was much higher for Saudi Arabia than for India. It speaks volumes about the Saudi customers’ BIM consciousness. Being a luxury apparel market and considering the high net worth of the customers, the finding holds. This finding aligns with existing literature (Balmer et al., 2021; Cho, 2011; Mitra et al., 2020; Roberts, 2004). The third set of hypotheses focused on the impact of BIN. Again, across the two samples, the impact was significant. However, the impact of BIN on ORPI (almost double) was much higher for
India than for Saudi Arabia. The reasons might be attributed to newfound lower levels of corruption (especially in the last decade), the improved ethical practices of young customers, and the resultant expectations. However, the impact is not very high for Saudi customers because integrity is typical in daily life. The finding aligns with existing studies (Campelo et al., 2011; Erdem & Swait, 2004; Hoyer et al., 2020; Joshi & Garg, 2020; Kotler et al., 2010; Rose et al., 2012; Schivinski & Dabrowski, 2016). In the fourth set of hypotheses, we assessed the impact of BINT on OCE and ORPI. It was found that BINT has no significant influence on OCE. Across the samples, the result was the same. However, it was positive for both countries. A possible reason might be due to the sample limitations that give us a future research area. Moreover, the impact of BINT on ORPI gave us a whole new dimension. In the case of sample 2, the impact was robust compared to sample 1 (India). Although both were significant, it was solid for the Saudi customers. The multi-group analysis provided a significant p-value, suggesting both have enormous differences. It can be attributed to heavy online exposure to the brands and consistent interaction on online platforms in Saudi Arabia. The findings align with the existing studies (Dash et al., 2021; Huh et al., 2009; Motta-Filho, 2021; Schivinski et al., 2016). Finally, the last direct hypothesis explored the impact of OCE on ORPI. It was almost the same for both samples, as expected. A customer’s online experience plays a decisive role in their repurchase intentions. Hence, the experience must be improved to cause the customer to revisit the brand and repurchase. This finding agrees with almost all the existing literature (Bhattacharyya et al., 2019; Chen & Yang, 2021; Filieri & Lin, 2017; Xiaolei et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2020).

We have studied OCE as a mediator between Marketing 4.0 and ORPI. The first hypothesis investigated the mediation of OCE between BID and ORPI. Our findings indicate that OCE partially mediates the relationship between BID and ORPI in both samples. The results are valid, as most customers review BID and previous experiences before repurchasing the product. In addition, the outcome is consistent with the earlier studies (Dabrynin & Zhang, 2019; Dash et al., 2021). In the second hypothesis, we proposed to study the mediation of OCE between BIM and ORPI. Again, the results confirmed that OCE partially mediated BIM and ORPI in both samples. BIM is what the customers perceive about the brand, impacting OCE. However, OCE intermediates BIM and ORPI while customers repurchase the product. It may be because when customers have an idea of the product and are interested in buying it, they read information online about its features, price, and return policy before repurchasing. Companies continuously change their product features, prices, and return policies, proving that OCE mediates the relationship between BIM and ORPI. In this case, our result is consistent with the results reported by previous studies (Aparicio et al., 2021, Yasri et al., 2020).

The third hypothesis studied OCE mediation between BIN and ORPI. Again, the results indicated that OCE partially mediates the relationship between BIN and ORPI. It confirms that customers expect honesty, transparency, trust, and sincerity from brands. Customers purchase from those brands whose actions meet these expectations. Many marketers now report their company’s information regarding honesty, transparency, trust, and sincerity on their websites and social media platforms. This information influences OCE and ORPI. Our findings are consistent with past studies (De Matos & Rossi, 2008).

The last hypothesis studied OCE mediation between BINT and ORPI. We could not accept this hypothesis because both samples’ indirect effect is insignificant. It may be because online shopping has spread throughout the market, and customer expectations have shifted. Now the customer expects brand interaction as a basic need and believes that the brand will interact and share information with customers. So, brand interaction does not excite customers. Hence, it is insignificant in the direct hypothesis and OCE mediation. However, our findings are inconsistent with the existing literature (De Matos & Rossi, 2008). A plausible explanation may be that online presence is a dynamic phenomenon. Due to these dynamics, customers and brands change their online presence and behavior. In addition, technology continuously makes significant advancements. Therefore, the consumer’s use of new technology advancements has also changed. Hence, this inconsistency could be attributed to technological advances and changes in consumer expectations caused by these advancements.
Furthermore, our work extends the existing theorization and highlights the merits of using online experience as a mediator. The previous literature has indicated the association of online experience with repurchase intention (Dabrynin & Zhang, 2019; Rose et al., 2012). However, most of these studies have considered the direct effect on OCE. Conversely, our work shows that OCE mediates the relationship between BID, BIM, BIN, and ORPI. Overall, OCE mediates the association of all the independent variables except BINT. Therefore, this study extends the work of previous studies by indicating the role of OCE as a mediator.

7. IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

7.1. Implications for Theory

This study has contributed to the theory and literature in many ways. First, it progresses the contribution of Marketing 4.0 literature in marketing. The research has proposed and tested a conceptual model of Marketing 4.0 and established its relationship with OCE and ORPI by using OCE as a mediator. The model used Marketing 4.0 (Kotler et al., 2016) to refine and validate its constructs. It used OCE as a mediator to better understand OCE in the apparel category. Hence, our research extends Marketing 4.0 to a specific industry, i.e., the apparel category, and contributes to marketing literature on OCE and ORPI. The existing studies have either used OCE or ORPI as single dependent variables. The study also contributes to the current literature gap on using OCE as a mediator.

Further, our work extends the nascent empirical investigations to the global context by proposing and assessing the mediating role of OCE on the relationship with Marketing 4.0 constructs (BID, BIM, BIN, and BINT) and ORPI in two emerging economies. As discussed in the previous section, the robustness of the Marketing 4.0 scale filled a massive gap in existing theory, and validation with multiple samples made this study’s implications universal. Although Marketing 4.0 as a theory is not used widely, it is used as a framework combining four dimensions of the brand. Our study adds value to the framework and encourages researchers to use it in other sectors.

7.2. Implications for Practice

Our findings help online retailers understand the impact of Marketing 4.0 on OCE and ORPI. Due to COVID-19, the focus on online selling has increased. Knowledge of OCE and ORPI will help online retailers design more effective marketing strategies to satisfy customers. The increased focus on digital transformation and digital marketing applications has paved the way for Marketing 4.0. Online retailers should use Marketing 4.0 (BID, BIM, BIN, and BINT) to establish their online presence. Our results indicate a significant impact of Marketing 4.0 on OCE and ORPI. Hence, online retailers can improve customer experience and increase ORPI by managing BID, BIM, BIN, and BINT. Therefore, online retailers can gain a better customer experience and improve ORPI by effectively using Marketing 4.0. The focus on identity, image, and integrity to manage brands online will help online retailers improve OCE and ORPI. Customers distinguish brands with distinct identities. BID and BIM will allow them to think about it. BIN will help build trust, positively impacting OCE and ORPI. So, online retail managers should design marketing strategies to improve OCE and ORPI by utilizing the brand’s identity, image, and integrity. The findings suggest that OCE mediates the relationship between BID, BIM, BIN, and ORPI. To enhance the influence of this trigger, online managers should also focus on OCE. Online systems, such as websites or interfaces, should work properly, and customers’ data should be protected and secure. To build OCE, online retailers should not underestimate the power of data privacy in enhancing the customer experience. Online managers should create proper procedures to safeguard consumers’ data during and after any online interaction with the brand.
7.3. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Although this study has provided numerous contributions to the existing literature, it has limitations. First, we have not considered socio-demographic variables as control variables, except nationality. Thus, this leaves the field open for future researchers to explore the possibilities of these variables as controls or moderators. For example, researchers could assess the impact of age and gender on the tested hypotheses. Second, our study was limited to samples from two emerging Asian economies. More samples can be used for the validation of future refinements. For instance, scholars should include more samples from developed economies. Third, we have adopted a purely quantitative approach. We encourage future scholars to test the scale with qualitative methods too. For example, focus groups, sensitivity analysis, and in-depth interviews may help. We also plan and encourage others to use a mixed-method approach to assess the scale and the gaps. Fourth, although the Marketing 4.0 scale dropped only one item, we still believe more items can be added to the existing scale, and proper validation can be done. Finally, Marketing 5.0 is already here (Kotler et al., 2021), opening an avenue to extend the research in this domain. Technology provides massive scope for further research and scale developments. The Marketing 4.0 scale integrates four branding components that marketers must clearly understand in this digitized consumer universe.

8. CONCLUSION

The fundamental objective of the study was to assess the Marketing 4.0 scale in a cross-national context. Therefore, we focused on five research questions to test the proposed hypotheses. First, we validated the Marketing 4.0 scale with all the measurement assessments. Second, we assessed the impact of Marketing 4.0 on OCE and ORPI. Third, we assessed the impact of OCE on ORPI. Fourth, we evaluated the role of OCE as a mediator. For the same, we proposed five direct hypotheses and two mediation hypotheses. The Marketing 4.0 scale was strongly validated across the two samples without significant differences. These outcomes provide tremendous new insights into the universal application of the Marketing 4.0 scale. They also offer new insights into the impact of this scale on existing constructs such as OCE and ORPI. The results have noticeable implications for researchers and practitioners looking to extend the findings. Finally, it also helps them to manage and avoid negative consequences. Life returns to normal post-pandemic, but in a different form; new holistic strategies are needed to address the same (Chakraborty & Dash, 2022).
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