The Effect Of Electronic Platform Service Usage On Customer Satisfaction And WOM

Yi-Fen Tsai , Shui Lien Chen, Jim Shih-Chiao Chin

Abstract—In this study, using Chunghwa Telecom as a case. The company accounted for the highest proportion of the telecommunications company in Taiwan. First, this paper would like to understand the effect of convenience performance on perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness. Further, the perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness of Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) are adopted as the factors on the company's brand perception. Afterward, the brand perception influence on customer satisfaction, and finally whether producing a good reputation and recommendation are tested. The study participants are people who have used electronic platform service of Chunghwa Telecom. A total of 478 valid questionnaires were used and AMOS 20.0 statistical software programs were adopted to analyze.

Keywords—Technology Acceptance Model, brand association, brand awareness, brand attachment, customer satisfaction, word-of-mouth (WOM)

I. INTRODUCTION

With Wi-Fi (mobile Internet) popularization and diversification of mobile devices, many enterprises are mostly entered Internet world. Company constructed Websites or electronic platform service such as APP to enable customers to keep abreast of the latest information and immediacy services. Enterprises have been invested in the virtual platform which brings convenience performance.

TAM is a now recognized as a well-known model used to verify information system (IS) adoption behavior that company construct Websites or electronic platform service (Davis, Bagozzi & Warshaw, 1989). Many scholars had been studying about subject of TAM. In addition, with globalization, the competition among enterprises has become increasingly intense. Sources of corporate assets transformed from tangible products to intangible services, and even brand. Every year, Interbrand will investigate which Best Global Brands is the definitive list of the world's most valuable brands. As all above mentions, brand evaluation and mobile-devices usage has become one of the most important developments in enterprises.

In the past, there are a lot of literature about various TAM model studies or impact of the brand factors. Little empirical research attempts to understand or measure the relationship

Tsai Author is with the Department of Management Sciences, Tamkang University, Taiwan (e-mail: elite0202@gmail.com)
Chen Author is with the Department of Management Sciences, Tamkang University, Taiwan (e-mail: slchen@mail.tku.edu.tw)
Chin Author is with the Department of Hospitality Management, Taoyuan Innovation Institute of Technology, Taiwan
(e-mail: jimmark_chin@yahoo.com.tw)

concerning TAM model and brand aspects. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to investigate the relative influence of the TAM (perceived usefulness, PU and perceived ease of use, PEU) and brand (association、awareness and attachment) First, we infer from the research literature whether TAM will affect the brand. Second, we construct a research model that explains the relationships. Third, we generate research hypotheses and empirically test them. Finally, this research discusses the practical and theoretical implications of the results.

II. THEORETICAL MODEL AND RESAERCH HYPOTHESE

A. Mobility

The most salient quality of mobile technologies is mobility per se: the ability to access on-the-move services, by way of wireless web and various mobile devices (Au & Kauffman, 2008). The dimensions of mobility, time and location, extend computing capacity and it allow to searching information, accessing communication, and using services anytime and anywhere. We can infer from the context provided above:

H1a: Mobility will positively affect the perceived usefulness.
H1b: Mobility will positively affect the perceived ease of use.

B. Convenience

In current, many wireless communication systems furnish with advanced services that bring about a salient conversion from e-commerce to m-commerce (Awan, 2006). Wireless facilities provide flexibility and accessibility will further allow m-commerce to access in a way which may raise quality of life (Irvine Clarke III, 2008).M-commerce applications, for instance, by mobile devices, consumers go shopping who is not in physical store, deal with daily transactions , or access information etc. This capability, are considered as the most convenient manner of using m-commerce. [Xu and Gutierrez(2006) indicated convenience as the most major factor reflects the characteristic of ubiquitous mobile commerce" According to this characteristic, we recommend that convenience has positive influence both on perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness:

H2a: Convenience will positively affect the perceived usefulness.
H2b: Convenience will positively affect the perceived ease of use.

C.Technology Acceptance Model

TAM proposes two dimensions predominantly that affect the acceptance of new technologies: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use (Francisco et al., 2014).Perceived ease of use is defined as" the degree to which a person believes that adopting the system will be free of effort"; Perceived usefulness is defined as" the degree to which a person perceives that adopting the system will boost his/her job performance"(Kim et al.,2010). Hence, this study use technology acceptance (PU and PEU).And TAM is considerable number of studies have identified PEU as having a significant effect on PU(Francisco et al., 2014).

H3: PEU will positively affect PU.

In recent two decades studies, brand equity is one of the most important business intangible assets. Enterprise brand equity enhances cash flow of business (Simon and Sullivan 1993) such as Apple、Google and Coca-Cola et al. On the other hand, it pointed out that the customer's perspective marketing decision-making value-added customer brand equity (Kim & An, 2003). There are two main development of brand equity.

Aaker (1991) maintains brand equity in five different dimensions that brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, perceived quality and other proprietary assets. Keller (1993) argues that brand knowledge consists of brand image and brand awareness. And brand image is set of associations linking to the brand that consumers hold in memory. In this study will focus on evaluating the roles of various brand equity constructs (including brand association, brand awareness).

Chang and Chieng (2006) said brand equity is a major superiority of competitiveness online, internet that provided customers co-creators of brand value. Managing a brand is too complicated than ever before due to the advanced technology (e.g., businesses operating online) (Abratt & Kleyn, 2012). Hitherto, some scholar has been studied towards brand equity in an e-business environment. Page and Lepkowska-White (2002) indicated few factors, which drive "web equity" by awareness and image and other characteristics. Online experience is can change user' awareness of brand, so it considerably impact on an equity of company (Muller and Chandon 2004).

Hamzah et al(2014) explained corporate brand equity (e.g. firm image, brand loyalty) rely on a satisfied with the product (functional/performance values of goods), and through firms values(corporate brand values) In the past, researching company brand experience enhances a firm's identity, visibility, cognition and fame (Gylling & Lindberg-Repo, 2006).Furthermore, Koufaris(2002) shows that customers are more familiar with operating relate-firm technology(about product or service).It could increase users' confidence to participate an online brand. Researchers maintained that perceived ease of use significantly affects online loyalty (Caruana and Ewing, 2010).In addition, satisfaction drives loyalty and then brand equity influences satisfaction. Therefore, this paper assumes that PU and PEU both will influence brand

association and awareness.

H4a: PU will positively affect brand association.
H4b; PU will positively affect brand awareness.
H5a: PEU will positively affect brand association.
H5b: PEU will positively affect brand awareness.

According to TAM principles, believing that electronic platform service technology is easy to use will significantly impact customer' attitude use (Davis et al., 1989).If users feel that the company's services platform technology easy to use and useful, they may increase degree of customers' attachment in this company. It was known that customers' emotional attachment to aim, including brands and goods (Thomson et al., 2005). therefore, likely to have an nice PU and PEU impact brand attachment, so there hypothesis：

H4c: PU will positively affect brand attachment.
H5c: PEU will positively affect brand attachment.

D.Brand awareness、Brand association、Brand attachment

Brand awareness positive affect brand satisfaction that can be originated from brand familiarity and the effects of recall on attitude (Alba & Hutchinson, 1987).Adding brand familiarity may generate a good information structure in a customer's mind (Campbell & Keller, 2003) and leading to positive brand valuation (Sen & Johnson, 1997) and brand equity (MacKay, 2001).

Thus, this study infers that brand awareness can increase brand satisfaction by brand familiarity. And brand association is a key influencer in brand equity that can impact customer satisfaction. Some scholars have considered that customer satisfaction is likely to have emotional attachment to the brand (Thomson et al., 2005).

H6: Brand association will positively affect customer satisfaction.
H7 Brand awareness will positively affect customer satisfaction.
H8: Brand attachment will positively affect customer satisfaction.

E. Customer satisfaction

Oliver (1980) defines that customer satisfaction involves customers' judgment of products or services regarding their needs and expectations. In contrast, other scholars indicated that customer satisfaction was an emotional situation or feeling in response to confirmation/disconfirmation with their precedent expectations (Cadotte et al., 1987). Namely, comprehensive satisfaction responds customers' overall impression of the company's service/product performance or total satisfaction associated with various aspects of the company (Srivastava& Mala, 2014). In addition, a brand with positive consumer based brand equity might cause consumers to return, spread favorable word-of-mouth (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 2003).

H9:Customer satisfaction will positively affect WOM.

III. Mythology

This study collected data from online questionnaires by the people ever used the company's electronic platform service. 535 data returned, of which 57 invalid. A total of 478 valid questionnaires were used as the final analyzed data for the current research. All the construct items were derived from previously literature and generated items of 32 in total. Each item responses about questions used a Likert scale from 1 to 7(1=strongly disagree to7=strongly agree). SPSS 20.0 and AMOS 20.0 statistical software programs were adopted to analyze the data of this study. The fitness of model structure was tested by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA).The framework fitness was clarified by structural equation modeling (SEM).

IV. Data Analysis and Result

A. Respondent Profiles

From the 381 valid questionnaires, 152 are males (39.9%), whereas 229 are females (60.1%). Among the valid respondents, 19 people were 19 years old below (5.0%), 175 people were between 20 and 30 years of age (45.9%), 136 people were between 31 and 40 years of age (45.9%), 12 people were between 51 and 60 years of age (3.1%), and 6 people were 61 years old above (1.6%). According to education, approximately more than half of respondents held a college/ university degree 274 (71.9%), 64 (16.8%) of respondents held a graduate school degree. Related to occupation of respondents, 67 people (17.6%) worked in the information technology industry, 63 people (17.6%) were in students, and 60 people (15.7%) were in the public service industry. Recent a month, frequency of use of the company's electronic platform, 180 people (47.2%) used twice whereas others 142 people (37.3%) used once. Table Ⅰ shows the detailed descriptive statistics of respondent profiles.

TABLE Ⅰ
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF THE PARTICIPANTS' PROFILES

Gender	Freq.	%	Education	Freq.	%
Male	152	39.9	<=Junior high school	4	1.0
Female	229	60.1	Senior high school	35	9.2
Age	Freq.	%	College/University	274	71.9
<=19	19	5.0	Graduate school	64	16.8
20-30	175	45.9	Doctor	4	1.0
31-40	136	35.7	Industry	Freq.	%
41-50	33	8.7	Student	63	16.5
51-60	12	3.1	Information technology	67	17.6
>=61	6	1.6	Manufacturing	53	13.9
Use	Freq.	%	Business Services	36	9.4
<=1	142	37.3	Livelihood Services	60	15.7
2-5	180	47.2	Education	43	11.3
6-10	38	10.0	Wholesale and Retail Trade	25	6.6
11-15	9	2.4	other	34	8.9
>=16	12	3.1			

B. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

Overall model validity refers to a model of reasonable fit and accuracy. Several assessments of model measurement examine the model fit. The criteria for CFA test the fitness of the model structure. The criteria are as follows: chi-square/df should be less than five, meaning that the model fit is good; the Goodness of Fit index (GFI) should be greater than 0.8 (Bollen,1989). The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) should be less than 0.08 as in Hair et al. (2010). The adjusted Normed Fit Index (NFI), Relative Fit Index (RFI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) should be greater than 0.9, as suggested by Hair et al. (2010). And the Standard Root mean square residual (SRMR) should be less than 0.08(Hu & Bentler, 1999). The Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) should be greater than 0.8 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). In this study, all values of the model fit are acceptable (Chi-square /df = 1.340, CFI = 0.983, GFI = 0.903, AGFI = 0.885, NFI = 0.937, IFI = 0.983, RMSEA = 0.03, RFI=0.929, SRMR=0.0381). Therefore, the fit of the model structure is good (see Table Ⅱ).

TABLE Ⅱ
ANALYSIS OF MEASUREMENT ACCURACY

Measure	Scale Value	Criterion Value	Indicator
Chi-square/df	1.340	<5	Hair et al.(2010)
GFI	0.903	>0.8	Bollen,(1989)
RMSEA	0.030	<0.08	Hair et al.(2010)
SRMR	0.0381	<0.08	Hu & Bentler, 1999
AGFI	0.885	>0.8	Bagozzi & Yi (1988)
NFI	0.937	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)
RFI	0.929	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)
IFI	0.983	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)
CFI	0.983	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)

C. Reliability and Validity

This study uses three methods to verify the reliability of the data, including Cronbach's coefficient alpha composite reliabilities (CR) and factor loadings. If the value of the coefficient alpha is greater than 0.7, the items have construct reliability and consistency (Nunnally, 1978). According to (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988), the CR value should exceed 0.6, meaning that the potential questionnaire items have consistency. All alpha and CR values range from a low 0.791 for "BAt" to a high 0.9216 for "WOM" (see Table Ⅲ). Factor loadings are used to examine individual reliability of each construct. Factor loadings greater than 0.5 signify the existence of construct reliability (Hair et al., 2010). In Table Ⅲ, all measurement items have factor loadings above 0.725. Therefore, the results show evidence of reliability.

Construct	Items	Factor losding	t-value	Cronbach's alpha	CR	AVE
Mob	Mob1	0.844***	20.033	0.909	0.9106	0.719
	Mob2	0.915***	22.838			
	Mob3	0.874***	21.162			
	Mob4	0.75***	16.809			
Con	Con1	0.74***	16.507	0.899	0.9028	0.7004
	Con2	0.889***	21.836			
	Con3	0.911***	22.733			
	Con4	0.796***	18.335			
PEU	PEU1	0.881***	21.702	0.947	0.8161	0.9466
	PEU2	0.922***	23.418			
	PEU3	0.904***	22.66			
	PEU4	0.906***	22.737			
PU	PU1	0.81***	18.689	0.891	0.8922	0.6749
	PU2	0.745***	16.535			
	PU3	0.88***	21.247			
	PU4	0.845***	19.94			
BAs	BAs1	0.868***	20.697	0.872	0.8739	0.6349
	BAs2	0.738***	16.245			
	BAs3	0.813***	18.718			
	BAs4	0.762***	17.012			
BAw	BAw1	0.803***	18.559	0.919	0.9196	0.696
	BAw2	0.865***	20.846			
	BAw3	0.871***	21.077			
	BAw4	0.811***	18.826			
	BAw5	0.819***	19.129			
BAt	BAt1	0.763***	16.918	0.879	0.791	0.593
	BAt2	0.75***	16.536			
	BAt3	0.794***	17.93			
	BAt4	0.815***	18.657			
	BAt5	0.725***	15.77			
CS	CS1	0.881***	21.428	0.913	0.9144	0.7808
	CS2	0.912***	22.679			
	CS3	0.857***	20.511			
WOM	WOM1	0.846***	20.126	0.921	0.9216	0.7968
	WOM2	0.902***	22.296			
	WOM3	0.928***	23.413			

Significance level:*p<0.05;**p<0.01;***p<0.001
Mob means mobility, Con means convenience, PEU means perceived ease of use, PU means perceived usefulness, BAs means brand association, BAw means brand awareness, BAt means brand attachment, CS means customer satisfaction, WOM means Word-of-mouth.

D. Convergent Validity

This study tests two types of validity: convergent validity and discriminant validity. For convergent validity, the t value of factor loadings should exceed 1.96 with significance and AVEs should be above 0.50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). As shown in Table III, the values of AVEs on all constructs exceed 0.50, t values of the lowest are 15.77, and the highest is 23.42, with significance at p < .001, meaning that the constructs of this study have convergent validity.

E. Discriminant Validity

For discriminant validity, this study uses three evidences, including chi-square difference, comparison of AVEs and the squared correlations, and the confidence interval test. First, discriminant validity was proven by the factors with significance, reducing the fit reported in the baseline CFA (i.e., $\Delta\chi2 > 3.84$, p < .05; Hightower & Brady, 2002). The test

evaluates two estimated dimensions by compelling the estimated correlation parameter between 1.0, and uses the Chi-Square test on the model with the constrained and unconstrained types. The difference between the smallest chi-square values is 209.34 ($\Delta\chi2$ =209.34, df =1), meaning that each construct has discriminant validity (see Table IV). A second method for checking discriminant validity is to examine AVEs and the squared correlations (see Table IV). Thus, this result shows that each construct has discriminant validity.

	Mob	Con	PEU	PU	BAs	BAw	BAt	CS	WOM
Mob	0.72	329.63	727.64	589.13	553.58	781.48	833.99	636.89	809.76
Con		0.70	379.04	367.32	430.58	669.87	774.91	501.20	737.63
PEU			0.95	362.49	418.89	902.43	749.59	488.20	728.57
PU				0.67	374.04	654.35	507.34	379.23	647.06
BAs					0.64	209.34	443.87	378.39	525.10
BAw						0.70	741.57	573.21	761.09
BAt							0.59	424.30	355.07
CS								0.78	421.09
WOM									0.80

The diagonal is AVE.
Difference of Chi-square is above the diagonal

The third method for examining discriminant validity is by using the Confidence Interval Test, which is used to test the discriminant validity around the correlations of two constructs (± two standard errors). If the confidence interval does not include 1.0, the correlations of these two constructs have a significance of difference and discriminant validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In this study, all confidence intervals do not contain 1 (see Table V), meaning that all discriminant validity indicators fell within acceptable ranges.

Construct	Correlation	Standard error	2Standard error	Confident interval	Discriminant validity
CS-WOM	0.697	0.031	0.062	0.635-0.759	Yes
BAt-WOM	0.714	0.031	0.062	0.652-0.776	Yes
BAw-WOM	0.387	0.048	0.096	0.291-0.483	Yes
BAs-WOM	0.528	0.042	0.084	0.444-0.612	Yes
PU-WOM	0.527	0.042	0.084	0.443-0.611	Yes
PEU-WOM	0.462	0.044	0.088	0.374-0.55	Yes
Con-WOM	0.423	0.046	0.092	0.331-0.515	Yes
Mob-WOM	0.282	0.051	0.102	0.18-0.384	Yes
BAtt-CS	0.649	0.036	0.072	0.577-0.721	Yes
BAw-CS	0.558	0.04	0.08	0.478-0.638	Yes
BAs-CS	0.649	0.036	0.072	0.577-0.721	Yes
PU-CS	0.697	0.032	0.064	0.633-0.761	Yes
PEU-CS	0.66	0.033	0.066	0.594-0.726	Yes
Con-CS	0.62	0.036	0.072	0.548-0.692	Yes
Mob-CS	0.482	0.044	0.088	0.394-0.57	Yes
BAw-BAt	0.398	0.049	0.098	0.3-0.496	Yes
BAs-BAt	0.573	0.042	0.084	0.489-0.657	Yes
PU-BAt	0.568	0.041	0.082	0.486-0.65	Yes
PEU-BAt	0.407	0.048	0.096	0.311-0.503	Yes
Con-BAt	0.413	0.048	0.096	0.317-0.509	Yes
Mob-BAt	0.272	0.053	0.106	0.166-0.378	Yes
BAs-BAw	0.797	0.025	0.05	0.747-0.847	Yes
PU-BAw	0.5	0.044	0.088	0.412-0.588	Yes
PEU-BAw	0.556	0.039	0.078	0.478-0.634	Yes
Con-BAw	0.554	0.04	0.08	0.474-0.634	Yes
Mob-BAw	0.51	0.042	0.084	0.426-0.594	Yes
PU-BAs	0.641	0.037	0.074	0.567-0.715	Yes
PEU-BAs	0.645	0.035	0.07	0.575-0.715	Yes
Con-BAs	0.607	0.038	0.076	0.531-0.683	Yes
Mob-BAs	0.491	0.045	0.09	0.401-0.581	Yes
PEU-PU	0.752	0.027	0.054	0.698-0.806	Yes
Con-PU	0.712	0.031	0.062	0.65-0.774	Yes
Mob-PU	0.561	0.04	0.08	0.481-0.641	Yes
Con-PEU	0.761	0.025	0.05	0.711-0.811	Yes
Mob-PEU	0.572	0.038	0.076	0.496-0.648	Yes
Mob-Con	0.772	0.025	0.05	0.722-0.822	Yes

F. Overall Model Validation

SEM is used to examine the path interrelationship between constructs in the conceptual model and overall model validation. Before evaluating the structural model of measurement, the overall model fit is tested to ensure model fitness to the data. According to the statistics of absolute, incremental, and parsimonious fit measures, each standard index is acceptable for the structural model. The measures are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI
ANALYSIS OF DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY

Measure	Scale Value	Criterion Value	Indicator
Chi-square/*df*	1.8420	<5	Hair et al.(2010)
GFI	0.862	>0.8	Bollen(1989)
RMSEA	0.047	<0.08	Hair et al.(2010)
SRMR	0.079	<0.08	Hu & Bentler(1999)
AGFI	0.8410	>0.8	Bagozzi & Yi (1988)
NFI	0.910	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)
RFI	0.902	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)
IFI	0.957	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)
CFI	0.9570	>0.9	Hair et al.(2010)

G. Structural Equation Model Evaluate Hypothesis Test

Acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses can be identified in the structural model from the path coefficient between constructs. The path coefficient from mobility to perceived usefulness was 0.043 (p=0.517), ,the path coefficient from mobility to perceived ease of use was -0.03(p=0.659)the path coefficient from convenience to perceived usefulness was .318(p<0.001),the path coefficient from convenience to perceived ease of use was 0.788(p<0.001), the path coefficient from perceived ease of use affect the perceived usefulness was 0.485(p<0.001), the path coefficient PU affect brand association was 0.430(p<0.001), the path coefficient PU affect brand awareness was 0.263(p<0.001), the path coefficient PU affect brand attachment was 0.64(p<0.001),the path coefficient PEU affect brand association Was 0.355 (p<0.001), the path coefficient PEU affect brand awareness was 0.379(p<0.001), the path coefficient PEU affect brand attachment was -0.045(p=0.576),the path coefficient from brand association affect customer satisfaction was 0.332(p=0.001), the path coefficient from brand awareness affect customer satisfaction was 0.169(p=0.001), the path coefficient from brand attachment affect customer satisfaction was 0.474(p=0.001), and the path coefficient from customer satisfaction affect word-of-mouth was 0.71(p=0.001).Consequently, H2a, H2b, H3,H4a, H4b, H4c,H5a, H5b, H6,H7,H8 and H9 are all positively supported. However, H1a, H1b and H5c are unsupported. The measures are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII
HYPOTHESIS TEST ANALYSIS

Causal Relationship	path coefficient	p-Value
PEU-Mob	-0.03	0.659
PEU-Con	0.788	***
PU-Mob	0.043	0.517
PU-Con	0.318	***
PU-PEU	0.485	***
BAs-PU	0.43	***
BAw-PU	0.263	***
BAt-PU	0.64	***
BAt-PEU	-0.045	0.576
BAw-PEU	0.379	***
BAs-PEU	0.355	***
CS-BAt	0.474	***
CS-BAw	0.169	***
CS-BAs	0.332	***
WOM-CS	0.71	***

Significance level:*p<0.05;**p<0.01;***p<0.001

V. Conclusion

With Wi-Fi (mobile Internet) and the diversification and popularity of mobile devices, providing people regardless of location and time constraints, quickly sending and receiving information. In the society of progress, mobility characteristics in the wireless network (mobile Internet) and possessed of ubiquitous mobile devices. Many SMEs have constructed their own electronic service platform for customer use. When customer's use the platform, it affect the degree of technology acceptance model .And whether it will affect customers to the company's brand opinion.

The major contributions of this study are as follows. First, the mobile device can bring convenience, which means that customers use the electronic platform (website or APP) of the Chunghwa Telecom Company is not restricted by time or place. The convenience is crucial factor that impact Technology Acceptance Model (perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness). Perceived usefulness has a significant impact on the brand association, brand awareness and brand attachment. This means, when customers use the company's electronic platform usefully, it will increase the company's brand. In the perceived ease of use, it affects significantly the brand association and brand awareness. It also shows that a company's electronic platform is approachable for consumers to use and will affect the user's perception of the company's brand. Brand association, brand awareness and brand attachment will affect customer satisfaction. Indicates that when customers think the company, company's characteristics come to their mind quickly, consumers can recognize this company among other competing brands as well as the attachment of brand, will affect customer satisfaction. In addition, customer satisfaction and word-of-mouth have a significant influence. This means that when the customers feel whole satisfaction, they will share the advantages of the company and recommend this company's services or products to friends or family.

Another found that mobility is no significant effect to technology acceptance model. This may be wireless Internet (mobile Internet) in Taiwan and mobile devices had become mature, so people don't think that the mobility and technology acceptance model is relevant. Perceived ease of use no significant impact on the brand attachment. This represents that users in operating the electronic platform feel ease of use, it doesn't affect the consumer to attachment of company. Consumers might think that platform is designed for consumers, is supposed to be easy to use.

The contribution of this study that technology acceptance model have a general impact brand. Because the universal wireless network (mobile internet) that mobility doesn't affect technology acceptance model. There is some different from previous study. Consequently, section hypotheses in this study were supported.

References

[1] Aaker, D.a.(1991). Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name.

[2] Abimbola, T., Trueman, M., Iglesias, O., Abratt, R., & Kleyn, N. (2012). Corporate identity, corporate branding and corporate reputations: Reconciliation and integration. European Journal of Marketing, 46(7/8), 1048-1063.

[3] Alba, J. W., & Hutchinson, J. W. (1987). Dimensions of consumer expertise. Journal of Consumer Research, , 411-454.

[4] Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. Psychological Bulletin, 103(3), 411.

[5] Au, Y. A., & Kauffman, R. J. (2008). The economics of mobile payments: Understanding stakeholder issues for an emerging financial technology application. Electronic Commerce Research and Applications, 7(2), 141-164.

[6] Awan, I. (2006). Mobility management for m-commerce requests in wireless cellular networks. Information Systems Frontiers, 8(4), 285-295.

[7] Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16(1), 74-94.

[8] Bollen.K.A. (1989). Structural Equations with Latent Variable. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons

[9] Cadotte, E. R., Woodruff, R. B., & Jenkins, R. L. (1987). Expectations and norms in models of consumer satisfaction. Journal of Marketing Research, , 305-314.

[10] Campbell, M. C., & Keller, K. L. (2003). Brand familiarity and advertising repetition effects. Journal of Consumer Research, 30(2), 292-304.

[11] Caruana, A., & Ewing, M. T. (2010). How corporate reputation, quality, and value influence online loyalty. Journal of Business Research, 63(9), 1103-1110.

[12] Chang, P., & Chieng, M. (2006). Building consumer–brand relationship: A cross-cultural experiential view. Psychology & Marketing, 23(11), 927-959.

[13] Clarke, I.,III. (2008). Emerging value propositions for M-commerce. Journal of Business Strategies, 25(2), 41-57.

[14] Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. Management Science, 35(8), 982-1003.

[15] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, , 39-50.

[16] Gylling, C., & Lindberg-Repo, K. (2006). Investigating the links between a corporate brand and a customer brand. The Journal of Brand Management, 13(4-5), 257-267.

[17] Hair, J.Black, WC, babin, BJ, & anderson, RE (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis.

[18] Hamzah, Z. L., Alwi, S. F. S., & Othman, M. N. (2014). Designing corporate brand experience in an online context: A qualitative insight. Journal of Business Research, 67(11), 2299-2310.

[19] Hightower, R., Brady, M. K., & Baker, T. L. (2002). Investigating the role of the physical environment in hedonic service consumption: An exploratory study of sporting events. Journal of Business Research, 55(9), 697-707.

[20] Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6(1), 1-55.

[21] Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. The Journal of Marketing, 1-22.

[22] Kim, H., Gon Kim, W., & An, J. A. (2003). The effect of consumer-based brand equity on firms' financial performance. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 20(4), 335-351.

[23] Kim, C., Mirusmonov, M., & Lee, I. (2010). An empirical examination of factors influencing the intention to use mobile payment. Computers in Human Behavior, 26(3), 310-322. Human Behavior, 26(3), 310-322.

[24] Koufaris, M. (2002). Applying the technology acceptance model and flow theory to online consumer behavior. Information Systems Research, 13(2), 205-223.

[25] Liébana-Cabanillas, F., Sánchez-Fernández, J., & Muñoz-Leiva, F. (2014). Antecedents of the adoption of the new mobile payment systems: The moderating effect of age. Computers in Human Behavior, 35, 464-478.

[26] Maio Mackay, M. (2001). Evaluation of brand equity measures: Further empirical results. Journal of Product & Brand Management, 10(1), 38-51.

[27] Müller, B., & Chandon, J. (2004). The impact of a world wide web site visit on brand image in the motor vehicle and mobile telephone industries. Journal of Marketing Communications, 10(2), 153-165.

[28] Nunnally, J. (1978). C.(1978). psychometric theory.

[29] Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. Journal of Marketing Research, , 460-469.

[30] Page, C., & Lepkowska-White, E. (2002). Web equity: A framework for building consumer value in online companies. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 19(3), 231-248.

[31] Sen, S., & Johnson, E. J. (1997). Mere-possession effects without possession in consumer choice. Journal of Consumer Research, 24(1), 105-117.

[32] Simon, C. J., & Sullivan, M. W. (1993). The measurement and determinants of brand equity: A financial approach. Marketing Science, 12(1), 28-52.

[33] Srivastava, M., & Kaul, D. (2014). Social interaction, convenience and customer satisfaction: The mediating effect of customer experience. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services.

[34] Thomson, M., MacInnis, D. J., & Park, C. W. (2005). The ties that bind: Measuring the strength of consumers' emotional attachments to brands. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 15(1), 77-91.

[35] Xu, G., & Gutiérrez, J. A. (2006). An exploratory study of killer applications and critical success factors.