Replication Article

Multichannel customer segmentation: Does the after-sales channel matter? A replication and extension☆

Arne De Keyser [a,*], Jeroen Schepers [b], Umut Konuş [c]

[a] EDHEC Business School, 24 Avenue Gustave Delory, CS 50411, F-59057 Roubaix Cedex 1, France
[b] Innovation, Technology Entrepreneurship & Marketing Group, Eindhoven University of Technology, De Rondom 70, Connector 0.07, PO Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, Netherlands
[c] Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Amsterdam, Plantage Muidergracht 12, 1018 TV, Amsterdam, Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Segmentation is critical in developing a successful multichannel customer management strategy. Multiple researchers recognized the need to adopt a multi-stage customer journey perspective, taking into account the channels used for information search and product purchase. This paper aims to advance previous research in this area. Specifically, we replicate and extend Konuş, Verhoef, and Neslin's (2008) original study in four ways: we include (i) the after-sales service stage and (ii) the often overlooked yet important call center channel in the segmentation scheme. We (iii) utilize self-report channel behavior instead of measures of channel appropriateness and (iv) investigate the value of previously ignored covariates, such as product complexity, to predict segment membership.

© 2015 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Setting the scene

Offering multiple channels to meet changing customer needs and preferences along the customer journey of information search, purchase, and after-sales service poses severe challenges for marketing managers (Verhoef, Kannan and Inman, 2015). Central to delivering a unified customer experience is a thorough understanding of different customer segments and their unique characteristics. In their paper, Konuş, Verhoef, and Neslin (2008) provide a clear case for multichannel segmentation and demonstrate its managerial value in developing tailor-made strategies that serve distinct customer segments. Based on scores of channel appropriateness in the information search and purchase stages of the customer journey, their results indicate the existence of three segments—multichannel enthusiasts, uninvolved shoppers, and store-focused customers. They also identify multiple covariates, such as shopper innovativeness, to predict segment membership.

Nonetheless, three important untapped yet relevant issues remain. First, Konuş et al. (2008) did not consider the after-sales service stage and its channels. Marketing literature, however, increasingly acknowledges the importance of this stage for understanding customer behavior and revenue streams (Van Vaerenbergh, Larivière, & Vermeir, 2012) and calls have been made to include after-sales channel usage in the segmentation scheme (e.g., Gensler, Verhoef, & Bohm, 2012).

Second, Konuş et al. (2008) segment customers based on their attitude toward using a specific channel in a specific stage (i.e., perceived channel appropriateness scores). However, as attitudes do not perfectly predict behavior, channel use is suggested as an alternative approach to better reflect reality (e.g., Gensler et al., 2012).

Third, while Konuş et al. (2008) explore a myriad of covariates in relation to segment membership, Dholakia et al. (2010) note that much more research is needed to identify covariates that underlie channel choice.

This research aims to contribute to the marketing literature in several ways. To start, we replicate the study of Konuş et al. (2008); we investigate which customer segments can be discerned when a segmentation scheme considers the information search and purchase stages of the customer journey. We derive this initial *two-stage solution* by employing self-report channel use data rather than appropriateness scores.

In addition, we extend the original work by considering the after-sales stage in our analyses. We show that the resulting *three-stage solution* further improves and refines the two-stage solution.

We also consider the call center channel, because it can be a key instrument for information provision, cross- and up-selling, and troubleshooting, but it is also a channel subject to cost-cutting initiatives (Aksin, Armony, & Mehrotra, 2007). In the Konuş et al. (2008) study, catalog users largely placed their orders through a call center; we

Table 1
Constructs and factor loadings.

Constructs and items	Factor Loading	Mean	Standard Deviation
Innovativeness (*Konuş* et al., 2008) (*Cronbach α = .83*)		2.78	1.48
I regularly purchase different variants of a product just for a change	*		
I am one of those people who try a new product first, just after launch	.81		
I don't like to use the same product (or brand) repetitively	*		
I always have the newest gadgets	.89		
Risk Aversion (*Mandrik & Bao*, 2005) (*Cronbach α = .82*)		4.26	1.20
I do not feel comfortable about taking chances	.71		
I prefer situation that have foreseeable outcomes	.84		
Before I make a decision, I like to be absolutely sure how things will turn out	.72		
I don't feel comfortable improvising in new situations	.69		
Product Complexity (*Burnham, Frels, & Mahajan,* 2003) (*Cronbach α = .77*)		3.20	1.23
I would have to know a lot to take full advantage of the options of the product/service	.76		
The product/service is difficult to understand	.80		
The product/service is complicated in nature	.65		
Perceived Price (*Verhoef* et al., 2007) (*Cronbach α = .89*)		3.61	1.22
Compared to other products/service, the price is low	.83		
Compared to other products, buying this is cheap	.97		
Compared to other products, this is not expensive	.76		
Customer Involvement (*Srinivasan & Ratchford,* 1991) (*Cronbach α = .86*)		3.58	1.46
I like to engage in conversation about buying this product/service	.78		
I enjoy reading and talking about buying this product/service	.93		
I am interested in buying this product/service	.76		

Note: $\chi^2 = 97.949$. $df = 80$, the comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.991, Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) = 0.989, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.027, and standardized root mean squared residual (sRMR) = 0.043, .

* Dropped item, factor loading <.50.

further investigate the importance and use of this channel for information search and after-sales.

Additionally, we provide new insights by exploring the value of under-researched yet actionable covariates in predicting segment membership, such as risk aversion and product complexity.

Furthermore, we gather data from a telecom retailer. Telecom was not included among the categories examined by Konuş et al. (2008). Finally, our data are collected nearly 10 years after the original study data and our sample skews toward more female and younger respondents. This provides further insights into the generalizability of multichannel segmentation schemes.

2. Data collection and measures

We collected survey data among 314 customers of a Dutch telecom retailer, selling mobile solutions, such as devices, their accessories, and subscriptions (see Web appendix for sample details). The retailer has implemented a multichannel structure, offering customers the possibility to interact with the firm through three channels: brick-and-mortar stores, the Internet, and a call center. We asked respondents to report what channel(s) they employed during the different stages of their most recent complete customer journey. The interval between purchase and study participation was limited to a maximum of four months to accurately remember channel usage (cf. Srinivasan & Ratchford, 1991). We include five latent variable covariates that characterize differential customer responses to marketing actions (e.g., Ailawadi, Neslin, & Gedenk, 2001; Verhoef, Neslin, & Vroomen, 2007) but have been largely left unexplored in multichannel segmentation research. These covariates are operationalized using multi-item, seven-point Likert scales.

After dropping two customer innovativeness items, the alpha coefficients of all five covariates are above the commonly accepted threshold of .70. A confirmatory factor analysis in lavaan 0.5 (Rosseel, 2012) indicated an acceptable fit between the measurement model and the data. Constructs also displayed satisfactory reliability and validity scores. Table 1 reports individual items and item loadings. We used the mean scores for each of the constructs for further analysis.[1]

[1] Analyses with factor scores based on principal component analysis yielded similar results. We therefore only report results based on the mean scores.

Finally, we also include age, gender, loyalty (i.e., total number of transactions in customer history), and average revenue (i.e., in current *and* past transactions) as covariates in our segmentation analyses.

3. Analysis and results

3.1. Model and analysis

Following Konuş et al. (2008), we employed Latent Class Cluster Analysis (LCCA) and posit that channel usage depends on the utility (i.e., cost-benefit considerations) the customer derives from a specific channel for a specific stage of the customer journey. Our utilities are reflected in the usage status (Yes/No). LCCA then segments respondents on the basis of their usage status for different channels (online, brick-and-mortar store, and call center) and stages of the customer journey (information search, purchase, and after-sales) while considering the impact of covariates on segment membership. We use the following model specification:

$$f\left(y_i | z_i^{act\_cov}\right) = \sum_{x=i}^{K} \prod_{j=1}^{J} f\left(y_{ij} | x\right) P\left(x | z_i^{act\_cov}\right)$$

where y_i denotes a set of J response variables (indicators) that measure customer i's channel use, and y_j is an indicator of customers' usage status for three channels in three different stages. The latent variable (x) is categorical, with K segments. K is not predicted a priori but determined by the model selection criteria (Vermunt & Magidson, 2005). $z_i^{act\_cov}$ indicates the vector of active covariates that could affect the latent variable but have no direct influence on the indicators. Finally, $f(y_{ij}|x)$ represents the probability distribution of customer i's response to a particular indicator j, given that customer i belongs to segment x, and $f(y_i | z_i^{act\_cov})$ is the joint probability function of customer i's response to all indicators, as influenced by active covariates.

3.2. Results

We estimate our model for solutions from one to eight clusters and apply the adapted Akaike Information Criterion (AIC3) for model selection since simulation studies show it outperforms AIC and BIC (Andrews

Table 2
Segment profiles and Covariates (LCCA) (N = 314)—Three-Stage Model.

	Cluster Name	Cluster 1 Research shoppers – after sales: store	Cluster 2 Web-focused shoppers	Cluster 3 Store-focused shoppers	Cluster 4 Research shoppers – After sales Internet/store	Cluster 5 Web-focused shoppers – after sales: store/call center	Cluster 6 Call center-prone shoppers	Wald	p-value
SEGMENT PROFILE	Cluster Size	34%	22%	18%	11%	9%	6%		
(Usage Level %)	Internet (info search)	.982	.999	.020	.966	.999	.948		.120
	Store (info search)	.476	.127	.998	.630	.227	.213		.000***
	Call Center (info search)	.038	.015	.000	.000	.000	.000		.950
	Internet (purchase)	.055	.998	.020	.311	.996	.232		.000***
	Store (purchase)	.999	.002	.981	.998	.012	.517		.000***
	Call Center (purchase)	.000	.035	.000	.000	.001	.539		.028**
	Internet (after-sales)	.002	.998	.016	.990	.176	.197		.006***
	Store (after-sales)	.999	.008	.999	.686	.732	.165		.002***
	Call Center (after-sales)	.019	.101	.018	.086	.411	.937		.000***
COVARIATES	Innovativeness	2.794	2.942	2.574	3.155	2.426	2.494	5.143	.400
	Perceived Risk	4.201	4.425	4.245	4.020	4.363	4.332	3.105	.680
	Perceived Product Complexity	2.992	3.268	3.606	2.887	3.184	3.446	7.746	.170
	Perceived Price	3.618	3.699	3.652	3.567	3.645	3.180	2.607	.760
	Involvement	3.704	3.610	3.501	3.877	3.358	2.861	4.413	.490
	Age	39.710	39.930	44.560	34.563	42.816	36.811	10.511	.062*
	Gender							1.064	.960
	Female	.467	.462	.520	.514	.459	.588		
	Male	.533	.538	.480	.486	.541	.412		
	Loyalty	5.299	1.447	6.466	2.275	1.405	7.288	26.797	.000***
	Avg Revenue	98.251	87.906	89.347	113.611	93.856	69.528	15.876	.007***

* p < .10.
** p < .05.
*** p < .01.

& Currim, 2003). We use classification error and segment interpretability as supplementary selection criteria.

3.2.1. Two-stage model

For the initial two-stage model, we obtain a minimum AIC3 (1300.80) and classification error (.0141) for a four-cluster solution with easy interpretability (see Web appendix for cluster details). Based on the channel usage patterns, we label the four clusters as (1) *research shoppers* (display a strong preference for using the Internet for information search, while purchases are made in store), (2) *web-focused shoppers* (use the Internet in both the information search and purchase stage), (3) *store-focused shoppers* (display a strong preference for using the physical store in both stages of the customer journey), and (4) *call center-prone shoppers* (show a preference for online information search, followed by a strong orientation toward the call center and Internet for purchasing).

Covariate analysis shows that perceived product complexity determines membership in Cluster 3 and Cluster 4, perhaps since customers who have difficulties to understand specific products often prefer channels that allow direct clarification from front-line employees. Furthermore, older customers tend to be store-focused (Cluster 3), while younger customers use a combination of the online and call center channels (Cluster 4). Web-focused shoppers exhibit less loyalty; maybe they are transactional bargain-hunters. We find a lower average revenue for call center-prone customers, and a higher average revenue for research shoppers.

3.2.2. Three-stage model

For the three-stage model, including the after-sales stage, we find a minimum AIC3 (2060.92) and a small classification error (.0208) for a six-cluster solution, which we also observe as the best option in terms of interpretability. Table 2 displays the channel usage in each cluster, while Table 3 shows how respondents move between clusters from the two-stage to the three-stage model.

Research shoppers now appear in two clusters: Cluster 1 and Cluster 4. They differentiate through their use of the after-sales channel: brick-and-mortar store (Cluster 1, *research shoppers—after sales: store*) versus Internet (Cluster 4, *research shoppers—after sales: internet/store*). Cluster 2 still features *web-focused shoppers*, but a large portion of the two-stage web-focused cluster (29.17%) uses the store and call center for after-sales, and is assigned to a new Cluster 5, *web-focused shoppers—after sales: store/call center*. Cluster 3, *store-focused shoppers*, and Cluster 6, *call center-prone shoppers*, remain largely stable compared to the initial two-stage solution.

Further, Table 2 shows that customers in Cluster 4 tend to be young, have a high average revenue and, although not significant, a high level of involvement. Perhaps this category includes customers purchasing products with consequences to their self-image (e.g., mobile phones). Given the importance of their purchase, they may employ many channels. Customers in Cluster 2 and Cluster 5 appear less loyal, especially compared to call center-prone customers in Cluster 6.

Table 3
Cluster change from two-stage clustering to three-stage clustering.

2-Stage Cluster solution 3-Stage Cluster solution	1: Research shopper	2: Web-focused shoppers	3: Store-focused shoppers	4: Call center-prone shoppers
1: Research shopper – after-sales: store	72.30%	.	.	.
2: Web-focused shoppers	.	69.79%	.	25.00%
3: Store-focused shoppers	.	.	96.55%	.
4: Research shopper – after-sales: internet/store	22.97%	.	1.72%	.
5: Web-focused – after-sales: store/call center	.	29.17%	.	.
6: Call center-prone shoppers	4.73%	1.04%	1.72%	75.00%

4. Conclusion

This study replicates, refines, and extends the findings of Konuş et al. (2008). In agreement with their results, we conclude that the market can be segmented based on channel usage for information search and purchase, and that psychographics can be used to predict segment membership. We corroborate their results in identifying a store-focused customer segment. The original paper finds that this segment exists in seven different product/service categories; we also identify this segment in the telecom category. This is interesting because in view of increased use of the Internet and mobile devices, one may have expected the store-focused segment to crumble with more recent data.

We further replicate Konuş et al. (2008) in finding evidence for the value of customer loyalty as an important covariate predicting segment membership. In contrast, innovativeness was not a significant covariate. Perhaps, this is due to our research setting; innovation in mobile solutions has become more incremental over the past years, leading to less information asymmetry between innovators and followers.

Another difference to Konuş et al. (2008) is that we do not distinguish a segment of uninvolved shoppers because we used channel behavior data in our analyses rather than channel appropriateness scores. We also could not replicate the existence of a segment of multichannel enthusiasts. We do identify clusters in which customers use different channels in different stages of their customer journey. This is much in line with recent research suggesting that people often have favorite, yet differing channels they use interchangeably depending on the activity (Verhoef, Kannan and Inman, 2015).

Furthermore, we confirm findings of other multichannel segmentation research because our two-stage solution identifies a research shopper segment and a web-focused customer segment (Verhoef, Kannan and Inman, 2015). Also, we provide new insights by identifying a small yet important call center-prone segment.

We extend previous research by adopting a three-stage segmentation scheme and identifying six different, meaningful customer segments. Because we find significant differences in average revenues and customer loyalty between the clusters, our extended segmentation scheme has clear managerial value.

More specifically, our findings show that customers who search and buy online do not necessarily prefer online after-sales. About 30% of these customers prefer after-sales service through a physical retailer network. Retailers should decide whether this group is substantial enough in size, loyalty, and revenue, to provide such service. Similarly, retailers have to decide on their call center strategy. Only 6% of the customers in our sample were classified as call center prone; they were the most loyal, but had a low average revenue. This makes it an intriguing segment for deciding on a marketing strategy.

In sum, understanding channel usage and its covariates across all stages of the customer journey is extremely important for designing marketing strategies. Future research and management practice, therefore, should consider adopting our extended multi-stage segmentation approach.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2015.09.005.

References

Ailawadi, K.L., Neslin, S.A., & Gedenk, K. (2001). Pursuing the value-conscious consumer: store brands versus national brand promotions. *Journal of Marketing, 65*(1), 71–89.

Aksin, Z.N., Armony, M., & Mehrotra, V. (2007). The modern call center: a multi-disciplinary perspective on operations management research. *Production and Operations Management, 16*(6), 665–688.

Andrews, R.L., & Currim, I.S. (2003). A comparison of segment retention criteria for finite mixture logit models. *Journal of Marketing Research, 40*(2), 235–243.

Burnham, T.A., Frels, J.K., & Mahajan, V. (2003). Consumer switching costs: A typology, antecedents, and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 31*(2), 109–126.

Dholakia, U.M., Kahn, B.E., Reeves, R., Rindfleisch, A., Stewart, D., & Taylor, E. (2010). Consumer behavior in a multichannel, multimedia retailing environment. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 24*(2), 86–95.

Gensler, S., Verhoef, P.C., & Bohm, M. (2012). Understanding consumers' multichannel choices across the different stages of the buying process. *Marketing Letters, 23*(4), 987–1003.

Konuş, U., Verhoef, P.C., & Neslin, S.A. (2008). Multichannel shopper segments and their covariates. *Journal of Retailing, 84*(4), 398–413.

Mandrik, C.A., & Bao, Y. (2005). Exploring the concept and measurement of general risk aversion. *Advances in Consumer Research, 32*, 531–539.

Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software, 48*(2), 1–36.

Srinivasan, N., & Ratchford, B.T. (1991). An empirical-test of a model of external search for automobiles. *Journal of Consumer Research, 18*(2), 233–242.

Van Vaerenbergh, Y., Larivière, B., & Vermeir, I. (2012). The impact of process recovery communication on customer satisfaction, repurchase intentions, and word-of-mouth intentions. *Journal of Service Research, 15*(3), 262–279.

Verhoef, P.C., Neslin, S.A., & Vroomen, B. (2007). Multichannel customer management: Understanding the research-shopper phenomenon. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 24*(2), 129–148.

Verhoef, P.C., Kannan, P.K., & Inman, J.J. (2015). From multi-channel retailing to omni-channel retailing: Introduction to the special issue on multi-channel retailing. *Journal of Retailing, 91*(2), 174–181.

Vermunt, J.K., & Magidson, J. (2005). *Technical Guide for Latent Gold 4.0: Basic and Advanced.* Belmont, MA: Statistical Innovations Inc.