

# The Impact of Influencer Attributes on Behavioral Intention through the Customer Relationship Quality

Chol-hoon Park<sup>1</sup>, Sin-Bok Lee<sup>2</sup>, Do-Eui Kim<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>*AI Convergence Education Major Doctoral Course, Kongju University Graduate School, Korea*

<sup>2</sup>*Assistant Professor, Business Administration, Nazarene University, Korea; Corresponding author*

<sup>3</sup>*Adjunct Professor, Business Administration, Sogang University, Korea*

**Abstracts:** Recently, social networking services have surged in popularity, significantly elevating the influence of influencers engaged in SNS activities. This study investigated the correlation between several variables including influencer attributes, the quality of the relationship between influencer and customer, influencers' intentions to purchase products, and loyalty to them. It was observed that multiple factors considerably impacted these relationships. Nonetheless, establishing a commitment in the relationships between influencers and customers proved to be challenging, often resembling one-to-many connections rather than more intimate one-to-one engagements. Moreover, fostering stability within these relationships was deemed essential. These insights can assist companies in honing their influencer marketing strategies and in developing robust relationship-building approaches.

**Keywords:** Influencer Attributes, Customer Relationship Quality, Behavioral Intention.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the concept of influencer marketing has gained increasing attention from both academia and industry. This is partially due to the rapid growth and widespread adoption of online platforms and social media, which have created new opportunities for individuals to build personal brands and reach highly engaged audiences. As a result of these developments, influencer marketing has become an important element in the marketing mix of many businesses. By partnering with influencers, companies can leverage the trust and credibility that individuals have built with their potential customers to promote their products and services [1-3].

Furthermore, the rise of online platforms has led to the fragmentation of traditional distribution markets, making it increasingly difficult for companies to reach and engage with consumers. In this context, influencer marketing provides a unique and effective means of connecting with consumers [4]. Influencers are able to reach and engage highly targeted and engaged audiences, making them a powerful tool for marketing in the modern era. The widespread adoption of online platforms and social media has created new opportunities for individuals to build personal brands and reach highly engaged audiences, and influencer marketing has become an important component of modern marketing strategies. By partnering with influencers, companies can overcome the challenges of traditional distribution markets and effectively reach and engage with consumers in meaningful ways.

Recent research has shown that influencer marketing is highly effective in generating engagement, brand awareness, and conversions. Consumers are more likely to trust influencer recommendations and are more likely to make purchases based on influencer recommendations than traditional advertising [5]. Some studies have explored the psychological mechanisms underlying the influence of influencers, such as social identity theory and self-congruity theory [6]. Moreover, research has investigated the impact of influencer content on consumers, such as the effects of authenticity, source credibility, and message appeal [7]. Overall, the research trend on influencers suggests that they are a powerful tool for reaching and engaging with consumers, and that their influence can be explained by a variety of psychological and social factors.

However, the influencer marketing industry is constantly evolving, and researchers and practitioners need to stay up-to-date with the latest developments and trends. This includes changes in consumer behavior and

preferences, the development of new technologies and social media platforms, and changes in regulation and governance. Especially, it is not yet clear how the attributes of influencers affect the formation of relationship quality. This study aims to empirically analyze the impact of influencer attributes on purchase intention through the quality of the relationship between influencers and buyers, reflecting recent socio-cultural changes in influencer marketing. The purpose of this study is to provide practical and academic implications that can be useful for both industry and academia.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Influencer Attributes**

An influencer is an individual who has the ability to shape public opinion and behavior through platforms, expertise, and personal branding. They have become increasingly popular in recent years and play a crucial role in shaping consumer behavior and marketing strategies. The theoretical background of influencer attributes dates back to social influence theory, which assumes that individuals are influenced by the beliefs and actions of those around them [8]. In the context of influencer marketing, this theory suggests that consumers are influenced by an influencer's opinions, recommendations, and lifestyle. According to social influence theory, some of the influencer's attributes can affect their ability to influence others. These attributes include expertise, trustworthiness, likability, and reliability.

influencer's attractiveness" refers to the degree to which an influencer is perceived as appealing or desirable to their followers or target audience [5]. This can be based on a range of factors such as the influencer's physical appearance, personality traits, lifestyle, values, or social status.

Expertise refers to an influencer's knowledge and expertise in a particular field, their ability to provide valuable information and insights [8]. This could be in fields such as fashion, beauty, technology, health, or any other niche topic.

influencer's informativeness refers to the extent to which an influencer provides useful and relevant information about a product or service to their followers [9]. This can include sharing their personal experiences with the product, demonstrating its features and benefits, and providing detailed and accurate information about its use and functionality.

In conclusion, influencer attributes play a crucial role in shaping their ability to influence others, and they are formed by factors such as attractiveness, expertise, and informativeness. Understanding the attributes that contribute to an influencer's influence is important for both researchers and practitioners, as it can inform the selection and management of influencer marketing campaigns.

### **2.2 Influencer-Customer Relationship Quality**

Existing studies on consumer behavior often focus on evaluating a specific brand in the context of a temporary transaction, and have the problem of emphasizing only cognitive aspects in their evaluation and measurement process [10]. Therefore, companies seeking to build long-term brand assets in overseas markets should approach the concept of brand relationship quality, which involves developing a brand and customer relationship over a long period of time with a broader perspective.

Brand relationship quality refers to the thoughts and feelings that customers have about the product and all activities of the company during and after the purchase and use of the product [11]. Improving brand relationship quality positively affects customer loyalty to the company [12], resulting in increased sales and positive word-of-mouth effects [13], and preventing customer defection.

Fournier [10, 14] defined brand relationship quality in six dimensions: love and passion, self-connection, interdependence, commitment, intimacy, and brand partner quality. On the other hand, other studies have defined

brand relationship quality in more specific terms, such as Abrams and Hogg [15], Algesheimer et al. [16], and McAlexander and Koenig [17]. Algesheimer et al. [15] described brand relationship quality as the perception of consumers as having a satisfactory partner with whom they want to maintain a long-term relationship with the brand, while also perceiving that their own image and the image of the product are similar. In this study, based on the research of Abrams and Hogg [15], Algesheimer et al. [16], and Fournier [14], we aim to understand brand relationship quality as the extent to which customers perceive their own image as being similar to that of the brand or how much importance they place on the brand reflecting their image.

The relationship between influencers and viewers can be seen as closer to the relationship between customers and sellers than to brand relationships. Brand relationship quality refers to the quality of the relationship between a consumer and a specific brand, whereas relationship quality refers to the overall quality of a relationship between two individuals or entities. Brand relationship quality focuses specifically on the customer's perceptions and feelings towards a particular brand, while relationship quality can encompass a wide range of interpersonal relationships.

Johnson et al. [18] approached relationship quality through three dimensions: trust, commitment, and relationship stability. Gustafsson et al. [19] also suggested that commitment could be divided into calculative commitment and affective commitment. This study examines the quality of relationships in terms of trust, commitment, and relationship stability. Specifically, commitment is composed of both calculative and affective aspects.

### **2.3 Behavioral Intention**

Behavioral intention refers to an individual's subjective evaluation of the likelihood of performing a specific behavior in a given situation. It is a central construct in social psychology and is used to understand and predict human behavior. The concept of behavioral intention is based on the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior, which suggest that behavior is the result of a person's intentions, attitudes, and subjective norms [27].

Behavioral intention is influenced by several factors, including an individual's beliefs about the consequences of the behavior, the social norms surrounding the behavior, and the individual's own attitudes toward the behavior. In addition, the perceived control over the behavior, or self-efficacy, can also influence behavioral intention.

Measuring behavioral intention can be done through surveys or questionnaires, where individuals are asked to indicate their level of intention to perform a specific behavior in the future. Understanding an individual's behavioral intention can provide valuable insights into their future behavior and can be used to design interventions or campaigns aimed at promoting positive behaviors or reducing negative ones.

In conclusion, behavioral intention is a crucial concept in social psychology that helps to explain and predict human behavior. Understanding the factors that influence behavioral intention can help individuals and organizations to design effective strategies for promoting positive behaviors and reducing negative ones.

In the field of marketing, customer behavioral intentions can be understood as loyalty, purchase intention, and other related factors. Purchase intention refers to consumers' active efforts to purchase a preferred brand in the near future [16]. Loyalty can be classified into attitudinal loyalty and behavioral loyalty [20], with attitudinal loyalty encompassing cognitive, affective, and intentional elements in the psychological approach to loyalty

## **3. RESEARCH METHOD**

### **3.1 Data Collection**

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between influencer attributes and behavioral intention through the mediating effect of relationship quality with buyers. The survey was conducted on individuals who had purchased products through influencers at least once. Data was collected through an online survey from February

11 to February 28, 2023, where the researcher explained the purpose and content of the study and obtained consent from 400 participants. All 400 survey responses were used for the final analysis.

Based on the previous studies that investigated the relationship between influencer attributes, relationship quality with buyers, and behavioral intention, this study identified the measurement items. The evaluation items were constructed by modifying the items presented in previous studies to fit the situation and were rated on a 7-point Likert scale.

**Table 1. List of measurement**

| Variables              | Measurement Items   | References |
|------------------------|---|------------|
| Attractiveness         | In live streaming, attractive influencers can capture my attention and engage me in their broadcasts.         | [5]        |
|                        | Influencers' voices in live streaming can effectively convey product information.                             |            |
|                        | Influencers' unique styles in live streaming can facilitate my purchasing decisions.                          |            |
| Expertise              | In live streaming, influencers can effectively and energetically introduce products to me.                    | [8]        |
|                        | In live streaming, influencers can provide expert answers to my questions.                                    |            |
|                        | In live streaming, influencers can offer personalized opinions as I desire.                                   |            |
| Informativeness        | In live streaming, influencers appear to provide helpful information to assist in my decision-making process. | [9]        |
|                        | In live streaming, influencers seem to provide timely and relevant information that is useful to me.          |            |
|                        | In live streaming, influencers offer valuable information to me.  |            |
| Trust                  | In live streaming, I believe this influencer is completely honest and truthful.                               | [18]       |
|                        | In live streaming, I feel that I can completely trust this influencer.  |            |
|                        | In live streaming, I believe this influencer possesses a high level of integrity.                             |            |
| Affective Commitment   | I have developed a close relationship with this influencer.   | [19]       |
|                        | My relationship with this influencer is something I genuinely care about.                                     |            |
|                        | My relationship with this influencer is highly important to me.   |            |
| Calculative Commitment | I tend to receive faster service than many other customers.   | [19]       |
|                        | I tend to receive better pricing than many other customers.   |            |
|                        | I often receive services that many other customers do not receive.  |            |
| Relationship Stability | I feel that there is good communication between myself and this influencer in our relationship.               | [18]       |
|                        | We often give each other positive feedback on our actions in our interactions.                                |            |
|                        | I perceive a sense of mutual support in our relationship with this influencer.                                |            |
| Loyalty                | I intend to recommend the product/service of this influencer.   | [16]       |
|                        | I hold a positive perception of this influencer's product/service.  |            |
|                        | Overall, my evaluation of this influencer's product/service is positive.                                      |            |
| Purchase Intention     | I would like to purchase the product introduced by this influencer.   | [20]       |
|                        | I have a willingness to purchase the product introduced by this influencer                                    |            |
|                        | I have the intention to purchase the product introduced by this influencer.                                   |            |

### 3.2 Analysis Method

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationships between various latent variables and their impact on specific outcomes. To achieve this goal, covariance structural analysis was performed, which provides a powerful tool to analyze the complex causal relationships between latent variables including the measured values, without relying on individually analyzing the relationships between each variable.

For the analysis, widely used statistical software packages SPSS and AMOS were employed. SPSS provides a

range of techniques and inferential statistical analysis tools for data analysis. Additionally, AMOS is a structural equation modeling software that offers advanced modeling and analysis features, including covariance structural analysis.

Through the use of covariance structural analysis and the selected software tools, the relationships between latent variables and their impact on research outcomes were comprehensively investigated. This approach rigorously tested the research hypotheses and provided valuable insights into the complex causal relationships between latent variables.

### **3.3 Hypotheses**

#### **3.3.1. The relationship between the attributes of influencer and the quality of the relationship**

Online trust in B2C transactions is defined by scholars as a general belief in the trading partner, including trustworthiness, integrity, and benevolence, which reduces perceived risk and increases behavioral intention [21]. Online trust dimensions emphasize the partner's competence and problem-solving abilities. The main difference between offline and online trust is the emphasis on the partner's competence in online transactions due to the lack of emotional connection [22]. The various attributes of influencers can help customers to develop trust in the online environment.

Hypothesis 1-1: The attractiveness of influencers will have a positive effect on trust.

Hypothesis 1-2: The expertise of influencers will have a positive effect on trust.

Hypothesis 1-3: The informativeness of influencers will have a positive effect on trust.

Affective commitment refers to the extent to which members of a group have positive emotions and feelings towards the organization, such as positive feelings towards influencers or a sense of identification with the community, and is related to factors such as customer loyalty [22]. Calculative commitment is a type of commitment based on rational calculation of the expected rewards and costs of maintaining a relationship, rather than emotional ties [22]. If customers perceive that they benefit from the expertise or information provided by an influencer, they may have a higher level of calculative commitment towards the influencer.

Hypothesis 2-1: The attractiveness of influencers will have a positive effect on affective commitment.

Hypothesis 2-2: The expertise of influencers will have a positive effect on affective commitment.

Hypothesis 2-3: The informativeness of influencers will have a positive effect on affective commitment.

Hypothesis 3-1: The attractiveness of influencers will have a positive effect on calculative commitment.

Hypothesis 3-2: The expertise of influencers will have a positive effect on calculative commitment.

Hypothesis 3-3: The informativeness of influencers will have a positive effect on calculative commitment.

Relation stability refers to the degree to which a relationship between two or more parties is durable, predictable, and enduring over time[18]. It involves the ability of the parties to maintain a consistent and mutually beneficial pattern of interactions and to resolve conflicts and challenges that may arise in the course of the relationship. Factors that contribute to relation stability include effective communication, mutual trust and respect, shared values and goals, and a willingness to adapt to changing circumstances. Involvement with an influencer can not only reduce customer uncertainty but also increase the likelihood of long-term commitment due to the high switching cost associated with finding alternative involvement targets.

Hypothesis 4-1: The attractiveness of influencers will have a positive effect on relationship stability.

Hypothesis 4-2: The expertise of influencers will have a positive effect on relationship stability.

Hypothesis 4-3: The informativeness of influencers will have a positive effect on relationship stability.

### **3.3.2. The relationship between the quality of the relationship and behavioral intention**

The quality of the buyer-seller relationship can directly affect the buyer's behavioral intentions [18]. When the relationship quality is high, the buyer can more easily obtain information related to the product and form a relationship with a trustworthy influencer, which increases their behavioral intentions. Conversely, when the relationship quality is low, the buyer may have difficulty obtaining information about the product and may form a relationship with an untrustworthy influencer, which decreases their behavioral intentions. Therefore, relationship quality affects behavioral intentions, and this study aims to understand behavioral intentions in terms of loyalty and purchase intention.

The relationship between trust and behavioral intention in the buyer's relationship quality is very close. The more a buyer trusts an influencer, the higher their purchasing intention and loyalty toward influencer's product will be [22]. Conversely, the buyer's purchasing intentions decrease when dealing with an influencer who is not trusted, as the buyer becomes suspicious of the influencer's recommendations.

As commitment represents a willingness to engage in long-term transactions with a trading partner, it is highly relevant to loyalty and purchase intention [19]. If the buyer obtains good or economically or emotionally advantageous results while using the product, commitment can increase their loyalty or purchase intention on influencer's product.

Finally, relationship stability is a measure of the continuity and sustainability of the relationship, and the higher the continuity and sustainability of the relationship, the more likely the buyer is to continue the relationship and exhibit loyal behavior. Therefore, it is important to maintain a stable relationship with the buyer. Thus, the following hypotheses were proposed.

Hypothesis 5-1: Trust will have a positive effect on influencer's product loyalty.

Hypothesis 5-2: Affective commitment will have a positive effect on influencer's product loyalty.

Hypothesis 5-3: Calculative commitment within the buyer-seller relationship will have a positive effect on influencer's product loyalty.

Hypothesis 5-4: Relational stability will have a positive effect on influencer's product loyalty.

Hypothesis 6-1: Trust will have a positive effect on influencer's product purchase intention.

Hypothesis 6-2: Affective commitment will have a positive effect on influencer's product purchase intention.

Hypothesis 6-3: Calculative commitment will have a positive effect on influencer's product purchase intention.

Hypothesis 6-4: Relational stability will have a positive effect on influencer's product purchase intention.

## **4. The Result of Analysis**

### **4.1 The Characteristics of Samples**

The sample used in this study had the following demographic characteristics. In terms of gender, 237 participants (59.3%) were male and 163 participants (40.8%) were female. In terms of age, 145 participants (36.3%)

were in their 20s, 73 participants (18.3%) were in their 30s, 90 participants (22.5%) were in their 40s, 62 participants (15.5%) were in their 50s, and 30 participants (7.5%) were 60 years or older. Regarding marital status, 175 participants (43.8%) were unmarried and 225 participants (56.3%) were married. With regard to educational level, 91 participants (22.8%) had a high school diploma or less, 116 participants (29.0%) were enrolled in college, 155 participants (38.8%) had a college degree, 8 participants (2.0%) were enrolled in graduate school, and 30 participants (7.5%) had a graduate degree. In terms of occupation, 154 participants (38.5%) were students or preparing for employment, 83 participants (20.8%) worked in clerical jobs, 5 participants (1.3%) were in professional/technical occupations, 50 participants (12.5%) were self-employed, 40 participants (10.0%) worked in sales/service positions, 48 participants (12.0%) were homemakers, and 20 participants (5.0%) had other occupations. Finally, in terms of monthly income or allowance, 54 participants (13.5%) earned less than 500,000 won, 84 participants (21.0%) earned between 500,000 and 1,000,000 won, 77 participants (19.3%) earned between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 won, 60 participants (15.0%) earned between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 won, and 125 participants (31.2%) earned more than 3,000,000 won.

#### 4.2 Reliability and Validity of the Measurement Items

In this study, the validity of the measurement model was assessed using two common methods: reliability and validity tests. Reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which is widely used in social science research and is recommended to be above 0.7 [23]. Additionally, confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS was conducted to examine the convergent validity of the measurement items, and factor loading values greater than  $\pm 0.4$  were considered significant [24].

Discriminant validity, which assesses the extent to which similar concepts are distinct, was evaluated using the average variance extracted (AVE) and Pearson correlation coefficient analysis, as suggested by Fornell and Larcker [25]. Discriminant validity was confirmed if the square root of AVE for a given construct exceeded the correlation coefficient with other constructs [26].

Table 2 shows the results of the reliability and validity tests for the variables used in this study. No items were found to compromise the reliability of the measurement, and Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.884 to 0.946, exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.7, indicating adequate reliability of the measurement items [23]. Moreover, factor loading values used to assess convergent validity were also found to be above the established threshold, indicating no validity issues with the measurement items. Finally, the results of the AVE-based discriminant validity analysis showed that there were no issues with discriminant validity, confirming the validity of the measurement items [24].

These results statistically demonstrate the internal consistency and validity of the survey items. Table 2 shows the reliability and validity test results of the measurement model, and Table 3 shows that the square root of the extracted variance values on the diagonal was greater than the correlation coefficient between each construct, indicating that discriminant validity between the constructs was established.

| Variables       | Measurement Items | Factor Loadings | Measurement Errors | Cronbach's $\alpha$ | C.R   | AVE   |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|
| Attractiveness  | ATTR1             | 0.833           | 0.422              | 0.896               | 0.873 | 0.696 |
|                 | ATTR2             | 0.899           | 0.239              |                     |       |       |
|                 | ATTR3             | 0.859           | 0.318              |                     |       |       |
| Expertise       | EXPE1             | 0.926           | 0.387              | 0.921               | 0.818 | 0.602 |
|                 | EXPE2             | 0.945           | 0.282              |                     |       |       |
|                 | EXPE3             | 0.809           | 0.924              |                     |       |       |
| Informativeness | INFO1             | 0.819           | 0.696              | 0.909               | 0.828 | 0.617 |

|                        |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| s                      | INFO2 | 0.931 | 0.273 |       |       |       |
|                        | INFO3 | 0.889 | 0.476 |       |       |       |
| Trust                  | TRUS1 | 0.823 | 0.571 | 0.888 | 0.829 | 0.618 |
|                        | TRUS2 | 0.866 | 0.39  |       |       |       |
|                        | TRUS3 | 0.868 | 0.386 |       |       |       |
| Affective Commitment   | AFFE1 | 0.939 | 0.291 | 0.946 | 0.879 | 0.708 |
|                        | AFFE2 | 0.94  | 0.287 |       |       |       |
|                        | AFFE3 | 0.894 | 0.482 |       |       |       |
| Calculative Commitment | CALC1 | 0.908 | 0.431 | 0.908 | 0.811 | 0.590 |
|                        | CALC2 | 0.949 | 0.23  |       |       |       |
|                        | CALC3 | 0.775 | 0.953 |       |       |       |
| Relationship Stability | RELS1 | 0.867 | 0.502 | 0.925 | 0.857 | 0.667 |
|                        | RELS2 | 0.914 | 0.382 |       |       |       |
|                        | RELS3 | 0.914 | 0.328 |       |       |       |
| Loyalty                | LOYA1 | 0.897 | 0.408 | 0.884 | 0.787 | 0.553 |
|                        | LOYA2 | 0.844 | 0.565 |       |       |       |
|                        | LOYA3 | 0.801 | 0.776 |       |       |       |
| Purchase Intention     | PURC1 | 0.863 | 0.501 | 0.91  | 0.846 | 0.647 |
|                        | PURC2 | 0.892 | 0.362 |       |       |       |
|                        | PURC3 | 0.881 | 0.402 |       |       |       |

**Table 3. Correlations among constructs**

| Variables              | Correlation coefficients between variables |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
|------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                        | 1  | 2            | 3            | 4            | 5            | 6            | 7            | 8            | 9            |
| Attractiveness         | <b>0.834</b>                               |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| Expertise              | .242**                                     | <b>0.776</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| Informativeness        | .584**                                     | .411**       | <b>0.785</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| Trust                  | .361**                                     | .202**       | .330**       | <b>0.786</b> |              |              |              |              |              |
| Affective Commitment   | -.206**                                    | .082         | -.142**      | -.286**      | <b>0.841</b> |              |              |              |              |
| Calculative Commitment | .161**                                     | .520**       | .143**       | .235**       | .100*        | <b>0.768</b> |              |              |              |
| Relationship Stability | .283**                                     | .211**       | .295**       | .535**       | -.280**      | .346**       | <b>0.817</b> |              |              |
| Loyalty                | .254**                                     | .105*        | .197**       | .328**       | -.129*       | .149**       | .471**       | <b>0.743</b> |              |
| Purchase Intention     | .242**                                     | .213**       | .232**       | .472**       | -.212**      | .392**       | .733**       | .444**       | <b>0.804</b> |
| Average                | 5.523                                      | 4.104        | 5.060        | 5.274        | 3.146        | 4.140        | 4.923        | 5.225        | 4.727        |
| Std. Dev.              | 1.031                                      | 1.521        | 1.348        | 1.155        | 1.489        | 1.421        | 1.357        | 1.298        | 1.251        |

\*\* p<0.01 number at the diagonal line is average variance extracted (AVE).

### 4.3 The Fit test of Measurement Model

After conducting reliability and validity tests on a measurement model, a goodness-of-fit test was conducted



using AMOS to determine if the collected data was appropriate for the research model. The initial measurement model included a total of 30 measurement items. The goodness-of-fit test utilized commonly used indices in previous studies, such as a Goodness-of-fit Index (GFI) of 0.9 or higher, a Normed Fit Index (NFI) of 0.9 or higher, a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of 0.05 or lower, and a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) of 0.9 or higher with a p-value of 0.05 or greater.

The results of the goodness-of-fit test indicated a suitability value of  $\chi^2=526.113$  (df=288),  $p=0.000$ , CMIN/DF=1.827, GFI=0.910, NFI =0.944, CFI =0.973, RMSEA =0.046, AGFI =0.882, TLI =0.968, IFI(Delta2) =0.974, with all indices exceeding the recommended values. This suggests that there were no issues with the goodness-of-fit and that the collected data was appropriate for the research model [23].

#### 4.4 Verification Results of Research Hypotheses

After validating the reliability and validity of the measurement model with 400 data points, structural equation modeling (SEM) was conducted using AMOS to examine the relationships between variables proposed in the research model. Through the SEM analysis, two important results were obtained. The first result is the fitness of the structural model. When examining the fitness for the research model, the following indices were obtained:  $\chi^2 =719.932$  (df=301),  $p=0.000$ , CMIN/DF=2.392, RMSEA =0.059, NFI =0.923, CFI =0.953, GFI =0.880, AGFI =0.849, TLI =0.946, IFI(Delta2) =0.954. These indices indicate that the overall fitness of the research model is satisfactory, as they meet the fit indices proposed by Hong [23], such as CFI, TLI, and RMSEA.

The results of hypothesis testing are as follows. First, attractiveness, informativeness among influencer attributes positively influences trust in the buyer-seller relationship ( $\beta=0.351$ ,  $\beta=0.131$ ), supporting hypothesis 1-1, 1-3. However, expertise do not have any significant influence on trust, leading to the rejection of hypotheses 1-2. Second, attractiveness negatively influences affective commitment in the buyer-seller relationship ( $\beta=-0.330$ ), supporting hypothesis 2-1. Expertise positively influences affective commitment ( $\beta=0.192$ ), supporting hypothesis 2-2. However, as shown by  $\beta=-0.125$ , informativeness did not have significant impact on affective commitment, therefore hypotheses 2-3 were rejected. Thirdly, among the attributes of influencers, attractiveness was shown to have a positive effect on calculative commitment in buyer relationship quality, with a  $\beta=0.185$ , and thus hypothesis 3-1 was supported. Moreover, expertise was shown to have a positive effect on calculative commitment with a  $\beta=0.467$ , and thus hypothesis 3-2 was supported. Additionally, informativeness had a negative effect on calculative commitment with a  $\beta=-0.188$ , and thus hypothesis 3-4 was supported reversely. Fourthly, among the attributes of influencers, attractiveness was shown to have a positive effect on relationship stability in buyer relationship quality, with a  $\beta=0.258$ , and thus hypothesis 4-1 was supported. Furthermore, similarly to attractiveness, expertise and informativeness had a positive effect on relationship stability, with a  $\beta=0.086$  and  $\beta=0.152$  respectively, and thus hypotheses 4-2 and 4-3 were supported. Fifthly, the study aimed to examine the effect of buyer relationship quality on loyalty among behavioral intentions. Among buyer relationship quality, trust had a positive effect on loyalty, with a  $\beta=0.142$ , and thus hypothesis 5-1 was supported. However, affective commitment had no significant impact on loyalty, with a  $\beta=0.032$ , and thus hypothesis 5-2 was rejected. Similarly, calculative commitment had no significant impact on loyalty, with a  $\beta=-0.058$ , and thus hypothesis 5-3 was rejected. Nonetheless, relationship stability had a positive effect on loyalty, with a  $\beta=0.478$ , and thus hypothesis 5-4 was supported. Lastly, the study aimed to examine the effect of buyer relationship quality on purchase intention (influencer recommended product) among behavioral intentions. Among buyer relationship quality, trust had a positive effect on purchase intention, with a  $\beta=0.111$ , and thus hypothesis 6-1 was supported. However, emotional commitment had no significant impact on purchase intention, with a  $\beta=-0.028$ , and thus hypothesis 6-2 was rejected. However, similarly to trust, both calculative commitment and relationship stability had a positive effect on purchase intention, with a  $\beta=0.164$  and  $\beta=0.644$  respectively, and thus hypotheses 6-3 and 6-4 were supported.

| Table 4. The result of research model |    |                        |           |       |        |       |                    |
|---------------------------------------|----|------------------------|-----------|-------|--------|-------|--------------------|
|                                       |    |                        | Estimate  | S.E.  | C.R.   | P     | Adoption/Rejection |
| Attractiveness                        | -> | Trust                  | 0.351***  | 0.079 | 4.423  | ***   | Adoption           |
| Expertise                             | -> | Trust                  | 0.046     | 0.04  | 1.141  | 0.254 | Rejection          |
| Informativeness                       | -> | Trust                  | 0.131     | 0.068 | 1.91   | 0.056 | Adoption           |
| Attractiveness                        | -> | Affective Commitment   | -0.33***  | 0.108 | -3.04  | 0.002 | Adoption(-)        |
| Expertise                             | -> | Affective Commitment   | 0.192***  | 0.056 | 3.437  | ***   | Adoption           |
| Informativeness                       | -> | Affective Commitment   | -0.125    | 0.095 | -1.318 | 0.188 | Rejection          |
| Attractiveness                        | -> | Calculative Commitment | 0.185**   | 0.078 | 2.378  | 0.017 | Adoption           |
| Expertise                             | -> | Calculative Commitment | 0.467***  | 0.045 | 10.364 | ***   | Adoption           |
| Informativeness                       | -> | Calculative Commitment | -0.188*** | 0.069 | -2.732 | 0.006 | Adoption(-)        |
| Attractiveness                        | -> | Relationship Stability | 0.258***  | 0.088 | 2.923  | 0.003 | Adoption           |
| Expertise                             | -> | Relationship Stability | 0.086*    | 0.045 | 1.904  | 0.057 | Adoption           |
| Informativeness                       | -> | Relationship Stability | 0.152**   | 0.077 | 1.963  | 0.05  | Adoption           |
| Trust                                 | -> | Loyalty                | 0.142**   | 0.055 | 2.596  | 0.009 | Adoption           |
| Affective Commitment                  | -> | Loyalty                | 0.032     | 0.038 | 0.845  | 0.398 | Rejection          |
| Calculative Commitment                | -> | Loyalty                | -0.058    | 0.048 | -1.219 | 0.223 | Rejection          |
| Relationship Stability                | -> | Loyalty                | 0.478***  | 0.052 | 9.227  | ***   | Adoption           |
| Trust                                 | -> | Purchase Intention     | 0.111***  | 0.041 | 2.719  | 0.007 | Adoption           |
| Affective Commitment                  | -> | Purchase Intention     | -0.028    | 0.028 | -0.983 | 0.326 | Rejection          |
| Calculative Commitment                | -> | Purchase Intention     | 0.164***  | 0.037 | 4.496  | ***   | Adoption           |
| Relationship Stability                | -> | Purchase Intention     | 0.644***  | 0.043 | 15.045 | ***   | Adoption           |

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

## CONCLUSION

With the increasing number of influencers active on social networking services such as YouTube, Twitch, TikTok, there is also a growing desire to utilize them for marketing purposes. Initially, commercial activities of influencers were not explicitly disclosed, but now it has become very important to determine whether an influencer's activity is a paid promotional activity or a voluntary activity. This study investigated the impact of various influencer attributes on different aspects of the buyer-seller relationship, as well as the effect of buyer relationship quality on behavioral intentions such as loyalty and purchase intention.

First, it was found that the factors that significantly impact customer trust in influencers are their attractiveness and informativeness, with attractiveness having a greater influence than informativeness. Surprisingly, expertise was not found to have a significant impact on trust. These findings suggest that customers tend to trust more attractive influencers and that relationship quality is formed through them.

Second, the factors that influence affective attachment were found to be the influencer's attractiveness and expertise. However, it was found that the influencer's attractiveness has a reverse effect on affective attachment,

which is a very unique finding. This may be due to the fact that the relationship between influencers and viewers is more of a one-to-many relationship rather than a one-to-one relationship. While influencers may be attractive to many, forming a close relationship that leads to emotional attachment is more likely to occur in a one-to-one relationship rather than a one-to-many relationship. This phenomenon is also evident in the comment section used by influencers, which suggests that the results are valid.

Third, the factors that significantly affect calculative commitment were found to be the attractiveness, expertise, and informativeness of the influencer. Interestingly, informativeness had a negative impact on calculative commitment. Calculative commitment refers to a long-term relationship formed between a customer and a seller for mutual benefit, and is a factor that is more likely to be influenced by one-on-one relationships rather than one-to-many relationships, which is likely why these results were observed.

Fourth, the factors that affect relationship stability were attractiveness, expertise, and informativeness of the influencer, with attractiveness having the greatest impact. It is noteworthy that the expertise of the influencer was the only factor that significantly affected not only affective and calculative commitment but also relationship stability.

Fifth, the factors influencing loyalty are trust and relationship stability, with relationship stability having the greatest impact. The factors that significantly affect purchase intention are trust, calculative commitment, and relationship stability, with relationship stability having the greatest impact. The significance of these results is that customers' purchase decisions through influencers are triggered by relationship stability. Relationship stability appears to be the most important factor for customers who purchase products through influencers, and it is formed through the influencer's attractiveness.

The limitations of this study can be summarized as follows. It is disappointing that factors related to commitment had little effect on loyalty and purchase intention. This shows the limits of marketing through influencers. Therefore, it is necessary to combine various technologies and marketing methods to build more one-on-one relationships in the future.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bharadwaj, N., Ballings, M., Naik, P. A., Moore, M., & Arat, M. M. (2022). A new livestream retail analytics framework to assess the sales impact of emotional displays. *Journal of Marketing*, 86(1), 27-47.
- [2] Breves, P. L., Liebers, N., Abt, M., & Kunze, A. (2019). The perceived fit between Instagram influencers and the endorsed brand: How influencer-brand fit affects source credibility and persuasive effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 59(4), 440-454.
- [3] De Veirman, M., & Hudders, L. (2020). Disclosing sponsored Instagram posts: the role of material connection with the brand and message-sidedness when disclosing covert advertising. *International journal of advertising*, 39(1), 94-130.
- [4] Leung, F. F., Gu, F. F., & Palmatier, R. W. (2022). Online influencer marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 1-26.
- [5] Lou, C., & Yuan, S. (2019). Influencer marketing: How message value and credibility affect consumer trust of branded content on social media. *Journal of interactive advertising*, 19(1), 58-73.
- [6] Lanz, A., Goldenberg, J., Shapira, D., & Stahl, F. (2019). Climb or jump: Status-based seeding in user-generated content networks. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 56(3), 361-378.
- [7] Nunes, J. C., Ordanini, A., & Giambastiani, G. (2021). The concept of authenticity: What it means to consumers. *Journal of Marketing*, 85(4), 1-20.
- [8] Hughes, C., Swaminathan, V., & Brooks, G. (2019). Driving brand engagement through online social influencers: An empirical investigation of sponsored blogging campaigns. *Journal of marketing*, 83(5), 78-96.
- [9] Pei, A., & Mayzlin, D. (2021). Influencing the influencers. Available at SSRN 3376904.
- [10] Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of consumer research*, 24(4), 343-373.
- [11] Farooq, A. J., Akhtar, S., Hijazi, S. T., & Khan, M. B. (2010). Impact of advertisement on children behavior: Evidence from Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(4), 663-670.
- [12] Ryu, K.S., Jang, J.M., & Lee, H. G. (2004). The Impact of CRM Programs on Word-of-Mouth Behavior: The Mediating Role of Consumer-Brand Relationship Quality. *Journal of Consumer Studies*, 15(3), 87-109.
- [13] Schlesinger, L. A., & Heskett, J. L. (1991). Breaking the cycle of failure in services. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 32(3), 17.
- [14] Reichheld, F.F. (1996), *The Loyalty Effect*, Bain and Company, Harvard Business School Press.
- [15] Fournier, S. M. (1994). A consumer-brand relationship framework for strategic brand management. University of Florida.
- [16] Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1988). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. *European journal of social psychology*, 18(4), 317-334.

- [17] Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U. M., & Herrmann, A. (2005). The social influence of brand community: Evidence from European car clubs. *Journal of marketing*, 69(3), 19-34.
- [18] McAlexander, J. H., Schouten, J. W., & Koenig, H. F. (2002). Building brand community. *Journal of marketing*, 66(1), 38-54.
- [19] Johnson, J. L., Sohi, R. S., & Grewal, R. (2004). The role of relational knowledge stores in interfirm partnering. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(3), 21-36.
- [20] Gustafsson, A., Johnson, M. D., & Roos, I. (2005). The effects of customer satisfaction, relationship commitment dimensions, and triggers on customer retention. *Journal of marketing*, 69(4), 210-218.
- [21] J. S.-. Gyo, "An Examination of the Perceived Countermeasure of Breath Alcohol Ignition Interlock Device and Behavioral Intention of Drunk Driving in South Korea: An Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior", *ijmst*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 128-134, Jun. 2023.
- [22] Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. *Journal of marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
- [23] Jarvenpaa, S. L., Tractinsky, N., & Saarinen, L. (1999). Consumer trust in an Internet store: A cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 5(2), JCMC526.
- [24] Yoo, I., & Choi, H.R. (2003). Factors influencing the consumer trust and mediating roles of trust on purchasing intention in B2C electronic commerce. *Asia pacific journal of information systems*, 13(4), 49-72.
- [25] Hong, S. H. (2000). The criteria for selecting appropriate fit indices in structural equation modeling and their rationales. *Korean Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 19(1), 161-177.
- [26] Kang, H. (2013). A guide on the use of factor analysis in the assessment of construct validity. *Journal of Korean Academy of Nursing*, 43(5), 587-594.
- [27] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics.
- [28] Kim, G. S. (2007). The model development of 6 sigma and understanding of process quality in the service industry: Using the structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Korean society for Quality Management*, 35(2), 84-98.
- [29] Park, C., Lee, S-B., & Kim, D-E. (2023). A Study on Strategies to Improve the Effectiveness of Influencer Advertising. *International Journal of Advanced Smart Convergence*. 12(2), 1-16.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i4.1873>

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.