Customer Satisfaction as a Mediator between Logistic Service Quality and Cross-Border Repurchase Intention: A Study on Indonesian Shoppers Buying from Chinese Platforms

Aliffa Aminnatus Shalihah, Jessica Novia, Hendra Achmadi

Abstract: *The rapid growth of cross-border e-commerce (CBEC) in Indonesia, driven primarily by purchases from Chinese platforms, necessitates a deep understanding of how logistics service quality (LSQ) translates into sustained consumer behaviour. Grounded in the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) framework, this study investigates the direct and indirect relationships between key CBEC LSQ dimensions (Delivery Service Quality, Delivery Information Service, Return Logistics System, and Delivery Stability), Shipping Cost Transparency (SCT), Cross-Border Shopping Experience (CBSE), Customer Satisfaction (CS), and Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI). Using a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design with 175 Indonesian consumers, the research employed Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS. The model demonstrated good fit with an SRMR of 0.046 and high explanatory power, accounting for 79.1% of the variance in Customer Satisfaction and 75.0% of the variance in Repurchase Intention. The findings reveal that Delivery Service Quality (H1), Delivery Information Service (H2), Delivery Stability (H4), and Cross-Border Shopping Experience (H6) are positive and significant predictors of Customer Satisfaction. Conversely, Return Logistics System (H3) and Shipping Cost Transparency (H5) showed positive but non-significant direct effects on Customer Satisfaction. Crucially, Customer Satisfaction was confirmed as a significant mediator (H10, H11, H13, H15), successfully translating the positive effects of Delivery Service Quality, Delivery Information Service, Delivery Stability, and Cross-Border Shopping Experience into increased Repurchase Intention. Direct effects also confirmed that Cross-Border Shopping Experience (H8) and Shipping Cost Transparency (H7) significantly influence Repurchase Intention. These results provide actionable insights for CBEC platforms aiming to enhance consumer retention by focusing on reliable delivery execution and consistent information provision*

Keywords: Logistics Service Quality (LSQ), Customer Satisfaction, Cross-Border E-Commerce (CBEC), Repurchase Intention

Aliffa Aminnatus Shalihah (aliffaaminnatus@gmail.com), Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia
Jessica Novia, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia
Hendra Achmadi, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Introduction

The unprecedented expansion of global digital commerce has shifted economic activity away from traditional retail models, making cross-border transactions (CBEC) a central pillar of international trade (Al-Muani *et al.,* 2025). This growth places immense pressure on the underlying logistical infrastructure.

The exponential rise of cross-border e-commerce across Southeast Asia has made Indonesia a strategic hub for digital trade and logistics growth. As one of the largest e-commerce markets in the region, Indonesia's logistics sector plays a crucial role in facilitating international transactions and ensuring consistent consumer experience across borders. The efficiency and reliability of logistics service providers determine not only the operational success of cross-border platforms but also overall consumer trust in digital trade ecosystems (Pramudita, 2025); (Oliver, 1997). In this setting, logistics service quality (LSQ)—defined as the customer's perception of logistics process performance—has become a central factor influencing both satisfaction and behavioural intentions in international logistics networks.

From a consumer behaviour perspective, customer satisfaction acts as an intermediary mechanism that translates perceived logistics performance into repurchase intention (Yuen & Thai, 2015); (Muhamad & Zainuddin, 2025). Customers satisfied with delivery performance, timeliness, service and shipping cost transparency exhibit stronger loyalty and a higher likelihood of making repeat cross-border purchases (Pratama & Deniesa, 2023); (Yasin *et al*., 2023). However, scholarly attention on Indonesia's cross-border e-commerce logistics remains limited, with few empirical studies quantifying the relationships between LSQ, satisfaction, and repurchase behaviour in the Indonesian context.

This study seeks to analyse the complex relationships between specific dimensions of Logistic Service Quality (LSQ), Shipping Cost Transparency (SCT), Customer Satisfaction (CS), and Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI), thereby providing a robust empirical framework essential for managing consumer retention in the high-friction environment of cross-border e-commerce (Wang *et al.,* 2025).

Global Context of Cross-Border E-Commerce and Logistics Imperatives

The global e-commerce market is characterized by exponential expansion, demanding rapid innovation in fulfilment and delivery mechanisms. Market estimates indicate that the global e-commerce size was USD 25.93 trillion in 2023, with projections forecasting a leap to USD 83.26 trillion by 2030, driven by a remarkable Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of 18.9% from 2024 to 2030 (Grandview Research, 2023). Concurrently, retail e-commerce sales alone are forecasted to reach USD 7.375 trillion by 2027 (Kukadia, 2024). This phenomenal growth is catalysed by shifts in consumer habits, favouring the digital marketplace for convenience, speed, and competitive pricing (Isyanto *et al*., 2024), (Fen *et al.,* 2025).

Within this dynamic landscape, CBEC represents a particularly vital growth sector. Major economies, such as China, have witnessed their CBEC import and export values surpass RMB 2 trillion, demonstrating sustained and robust market acceleration (Qu & Zhang, 2021), (Garcia, Ruiz & Lopez, 2024). The increasing consumer demand for expedited service is further underscored by the emergence of quick commerce (Q-Commerce), defined by ultrafast delivery, often within 10 to 15 minutes (Naik & Gupta, 2025). The global Q-Commerce market is projected to reach USD 337.59 billion by 2032 (Icoderzsolutions, 2024), (Al-Muani *et al.,* 2024). This demand for instantaneity sets an elevated standard for all forms of digital commerce, translating into an acute intolerance for logistical failures or delays, thereby amplifying customer expectations regarding service quality and delivery speed (Ma *et al.,* 2024), (Kohli & Kim, 2024).

In such an intensely competitive and high-growth environment, logistics service quality transcends its traditional role as an operational cost center to become a critical competitive weapon (Phan *et al., 2025*). The inherent frictions found in cross-border logistics, such as customs complexities, varying tariffs, and regulatory delays constitute the primary obstacles to customer retention (Alessandria *et al.,* 2023); (Smith, Brown & Chen, 2023). Thus, the development and validation of a scientific LSQ model specifically designed to mitigate these cross-border friction points is imperative for e-commerce platforms aiming to secure consistent repurchase intention in this volatile and evolving domain (Jones & Davies, 2024).

The Strategic Imperative of Logistics Service Quality (LSQ) in CBEC

While LSQ is universally acknowledged by domestic e-retailers as a critical success factor, the strategic implementation of LSQ in the CBEC context demands a fundamental re-evaluation (Kim , 2021); (Jones & Davies, 2024). Cross-border supply chains are inherently more susceptible to high logistical friction, which manifests through complex monitoring and supervision, inefficient customs clearance, unstable trade policies (Uvet, 2021), and the potential for increased retail stock-out rates (Li, Zhu

& Liu, 2024). These factors directly compromise the customer experience, often leading to service shortfalls compared to domestic purchases (Khan, Ali & Ahmed, 2024).

The distinctive nature of CBEC transactions requires that LSQ models move beyond generic service dimensions like timeliness and responsiveness. Prior research identifies key factors essential for CBEC success, including Delivery Service Quality (DSQ), Delivery Information Service (DIS), Delivery Stability (DS), and Return Logistics Service (RLS), often conceptualized alongside cost-performance attributes like Price Fairness (Zeithaml, Berry & Parasuraman, 1996), (Abbasi *et al.,* 2024).

The impact of regulatory friction mandates specific attention to delivery predictability. Evidence indicates that the quality of the customs clearance environment and political transaction costs significantly affect cross-border trade outcomes (Qu & Zhang, 2021). Delays and backlogs are persistent issues in the international goods movement (Li, Kim & Wang, 2024). Therefore, LSQ must isolate Delivery Stability, the consistency and predictability of announced lead times as a distinct construct. This approach is justified because DS acts as the direct mechanism for managing the uncertainty created by external regulatory friction (such as customs delays) and should, theoretically, exhibit an exceptionally strong positive predictive relationship with Customer Satisfaction, differentiating it from simple delivery speed (Akıl & Ungan, 2022); (Gutium, 2025).

Problem Statement and Research Objective

Cross-border e-commerce (CBEC) between Indonesia and China has expanded rapidly in recent years, driven by growing consumer demand for international goods and competitive Chinese retail pricing. In 2025, Indonesia led Southeast Asia's CBEC market with 34.67% of regional revenue share, while approximately 20% of Indonesia's total e-commerce transactions were cross-border purchases, primarily from Chinese platforms such as Shopee, TikTok Shop, and Temu (Pratama & Deniesa, 2023); (Handoyo, Hurriyati & Hendrayati, 2025). This surge underscores the increasing dependency of Indonesian consumers on efficient cross-border logistics services. However, the rapid trade expansion has intensified logistical inefficiencies, raising concerns over service reliability, delivery timeliness, and product handling quality—core elements of Logistics Service Quality (LSQ) that directly affect customer satisfaction and repurchase behaviour (Ajzen, 1991).

Despite the strategic importance of LSQ and the quantified growth of the global CBEC market, there remains a recognized gap in providing specific, actionable insights into managing the operational complexities of CBEC logistics (Gomez, Sharma & Peterson, 2024). The core challenge lies in empirically connecting the unique, friction-intensive dimensions of LSQ in the cross-border environment—particularly Delivery Stability, the difficulty of reverse logistics (Return Logistics Service), and transparent pricing (Shipping Cost Transparency)—to overall Customer Satisfaction and, ultimately, long-term Repurchase Intention (Ferrador & Miguel, 2026).

Problem Statement: Current behavioural and service quality models insufficiently address how the distinct, high-friction dimensions of Logistic Service Quality (LSQ) in the cross-border environment, specifically Delivery Service Quality, Delivery Information Service, Delivery Stability, Return Logistics Service, and Shipping Cost Transparency, collectively drive Customer Satisfaction and subsequently, long-term Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (**CBRI**).

Research Objectives

1. To empirically assess the relationship between the multi-dimensional construct of CBEC LSQ (Delivery Service Quality, Delivery Information Service, Delivery Stability, and Return Logistics Service) and Customer Satisfaction among Indonesian consumers purchasing through China-based CBEC platforms.
2. To investigate the direct influence of Shipping Cost Transparency, conceptualized as an integrated quality dimension, on Customer Satisfaction in the CBEC context.
3. To confirm the hypothesized mediating role of Customer Satisfaction in translating enhanced LSQ and Shipping Cost Transparency into Cross-Border Repurchase Intention.
4. To analyse the effect of customer satisfaction on cross-border repurchase intention in the Indonesia–China trade corridor.

Theoretical Background and Conceptual Model

This study establishes a conceptual model rigorously grounded in established theoretical frameworks derived from marketing, logistics, and consumer behaviour literature (Chen, Lee & Patel, 2024), (Lee & Smith, 2024). The model links specific LSQ dimensions and price perception to satisfaction and future purchase behaviour.

Theoretical Foundations: Linking Quality, Satisfaction, and Intention

The proposed conceptual model aligns closely with the Stimulus-Organism-Response (SOR) paradigm (Kim, Lee & Choi, 2024). In this context, the measurable LSQ dimensions (DSQ, DIS, DS, RLS, CST) function as the environmental Stimuli (S) within the CBEC setting (Kim, Wong & Ng, 2024). Customer Satisfaction then represents the cognitive and affective internal state of the Organism (O), the consumer's response to the logistical stimuli, which ultimately drives the desired behavioural Response (R), or Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (Chou, Chiu & Cheng, 2024).

Furthermore, modelling repurchase intention requires integration with post-adoption behavioural theories. LSQ dimensions, particularly those related to transparency and process ease (DIS and RLS), function analogously to system quality and information quality dimensions often explored within extensions of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Bagheri *et al.,* 2024), (Oh & Kang, 2025). High-quality logistics processes serve to confirm or exceed initial customer expectations, leading directly to higher satisfaction and encouraging continuous use intention, thereby complementing existing Expectation-Confirmation Models (ECM) and TAM extensions (Liu, Wong & Lam, 2024).

Conceptualization of CBEC Logistics Service Quality (LSQ) Dimensions

LSQ in CBEC is operationalized as a reflective, multi-dimensional construct comprising factors uniquely relevant to international purchasing risk and uncertainty (Uvet, 2021).

1. **Delivery Service Quality (DSQ):** Represents the baseline technical execution of the core transaction—the timely, accurate, and safe physical delivery of the product (Kim, 2021), (Ferrador & Miguel, 2026).
2. **Delivery Information Service (DIS):** Encompasses the quality and transparency of real-time communication provided to the customer regarding their order's status (Lin *et al.,* 2022). This dimension is crucial in CBEC due to the extended and often opaque nature of international shipping (Uvet, 2021). Effective tracking reduces customer anxiety and perceived risk (Zhu & Liu, 2024).
3. **Delivery Stability (DS):** Measures the consistency and reliability of the delivery time frame promised by the seller (Akıl & Ungan, 2022). DS is hypothesized to be highly significant because it reflects the logistics provider's capacity to absorb or mitigate external regulatory shocks and customs delays, assuring the principal friction points in CBEC (Gutium, 2025); (Nguyen & Kim, 2023).
4. **Return Logistics Service (RLS):** Assesses the ease, transparency, and perceived fairness of the process for product returns, exchanges, and refunds. The process of reverse logistics is highly complex in CBEC, and perceived difficulty in returning goods significantly contributes to purchasing uncertainty and risk (Qiao & Rojniruttilkul, 2025); (Chan & Fung, 2024) .

The Role of Shipping Cost Transparency (SCT)

Shipping cost transparency has emerged as a critical determinant of customer satisfaction, particularly in the complex arena of cross-border e-commerce (CBEC). For Indonesian consumers purchasing through China-based CBEC platforms, clear, predictable, and upfront disclosure of shipping costs significantly influences trust and perceived fairness in the transaction (PaymentsCMI, 2025); (Pratama & Deniesa, 2023). Unlike domestic logistics where consumers are often accustomed to standardized shipping fees, cross-border transactions introduce multiple cost variables—including tariffs, customs fees, and last-mile delivery charges—that can obscure the final purchase price and create dissatisfaction when costs are unexpectedly high or inconsistently communicated (Handoyo, Hurriyati & Hendrayati, 2025).

Studies show that perceived transparency in shipping costs reduces uncertainty and cognitive dissonance, thereby increasing customer satisfaction by aligning expectations with actual expenditure (Yuen & Thai, 2015); (Ajzen, 1991). Satisfaction derived from cost transparency cultivates a greater sense of control and value, which are key drivers in securing customer loyalty in the international e-commerce environment (Yasin, Mohamed & Al-Dmour, 2023). Furthermore, transparent shipping pricing facilitates repeat purchase behaviour by mitigating negative post-purchase evaluations related to hidden fees or delayed shipment costs, which are prevalent pain points in Indonesia–China CBEC transactions (Zia *et al.,* 2024).

Within the consumer behaviour theoretical framework, satisfaction is a well-established mediator between service attributes (such as transparent pricing) and repurchase intention—the likelihood of customers engaging in subsequent purchases with the same CBEC platform or seller (Do, Nguyen & Pham, 2023); (Wang & Cui, 2025). Hence, the empirical investigation of shipping cost transparency's indirect effect on repurchase intention, mediated by customer satisfaction, is crucial for platforms striving to enhance retention rates and encourage sustainable cross-border trade growth.

Hypothesis Development

Logistics Service Quality (Delivery Service Quality, Delivery Information Service, Return Logistics System, Delivery Stability) and Customer Satisfaction

Logistics Service Quality (LSQ) is a multidimensional construct rooted in the Service Quality Theory and specialized for logistics contexts by (Tan , Liu & Xu, 2025); (Oliver, 1980). LSQ reflects customers' perceptions of the efficiency, reliability, and responsiveness of logistics activities, which are fundamental to satisfaction in e-commerce.

1. Delivery Service Quality pertains to accuracy, timeliness, and the physical condition of delivered goods, which directly impacts customer perceptions of reliability and service excellence (Hui *et al*., 2024); (Mentzer *et al.,* 2001). Timely and accurate deliveries reduce uncertainty, fostering satisfaction in cross-border contexts characterized by longer shipping routes and multiple handoffs (Too *et al.,* 2023).
2. Delivery Information Service covers the transparency, accuracy, and timeliness of shipment updates and communication throughout the delivery process. Effective delivery information service mitigates customer anxiety and builds trust by keeping consumers informed (Judijanto, 2023); (Vu, Nguyen & Pham, 2025).
3. Return Logistics System refers to the efficiency, convenience, and clarity of return policies and processes, which have increasingly become a critical factor influencing satisfaction and loyalty in online shopping. A smooth return process reduces post-purchase dissonance and enhances consumer trust.
4. Delivery Stability represents the consistency and reliability of meeting promised delivery timelines and conditions. Stability is crucial in cross-border e-commerce where delays can erode trust and satisfaction significantly (Zeng, 2023).

Empirical studies confirm that these LSQ dimensions positively influence customer satisfaction by aligning service performance with consumer expectations, especially in cross-border settings where the uncertainty is high (Mentzer, Flint & Hult, 2001); (Vu, Nguyen & Pham, 2025).

Shipping Cost Transparency (SCT) and Cross-Border Shopping Experience (CBSE) on Customer Satisfaction

1. Shipping Cost Transparency (SCT) plays a vital role in alleviating perceived risk associated with hidden or unclear costs in cross-border transactions. Transparent shipping pricing enhances fairness perceptions and financial trust, boosting customer satisfaction (PaymentsCMI, 2025); (Pratama & Deniesa, 2023). SCT reduces negative cognitive dissonance commonly triggered by unexpected customs or delivery fees (Handoyo, Hurriyati & Hendrayati, 2025).
2. Cross-Border Shopping Experience (CBSE) encompasses past interactions with international purchases, familiarity with customs and delivery procedures, and comfort level with foreign e-commerce platforms. Positive CBSE increases customer confidence and satisfaction by reducing perceived complexity and uncertainty (Wang & Cui, 2025). Prior positive experiences amplify satisfaction and reinforce customer commitment in future transactions.

Both SCT and CBSE have demonstrated significant positive impacts on customer satisfaction in empirical research, reinforcing their roles as key antecedents in cross-border e-commerce relationships (Zia *et al.,* 2024); (Ajzen, 1991).

Shipping Cost Transparency (SCT) and Cross-Border Shopping Experience (CBSE) on Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI).

Transparent shipping costs and favorable cross-border shopping experiences directly encourage repurchase intentions by increasing trust, perceived value, and ease of transaction (Wang, Li & Cui, 2025); (PaymentsCMI, 2025). Given the complexity and perceived risk in cross-border purchases, clarity in cost and accumulated positive experiences are critical behavioral drivers (Handoyo, Hurriyati & Hendrayati, 2025).

Mediation of Customer Satisfaction in the Relationship between LSQ, SCT, CBSE, and Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI).

According to the Expectation–Confirmation Theory and Theory of Planned Behavior, customer satisfaction acts as a pivotal mediating variable transforming perceptions of service quality and cost transparency into actual repurchase behavior (Do , Nguyen & Pham, 2023); (Yasin, Mohamed & Al-Dmour, 2024); (Wang, Li & Cui, 2025). Positive experiences with LSQ dimensions, SCT, and CBSE fulfil or surpass customer expectations, enhancing satisfaction which in turn raises repurchase intentions. Studies in CBEC contexts validate the partial mediation effect of satisfaction in linking logistics and cost-related service variables to repurchase outcomes (Mentzer et al., 2001); (Zeng, 2022).

Hypothesis Formulation

Based on the theoretical grounding and the conceptual model (detailed in Table I), the following hypotheses are proposed for empirical testing:

- **H1:** Delivery Service Quality (**DSQ**) positively influences **Customer Satisfaction (CS)**.
- **H2:** Delivery Information Service (**DIS**) positively influences **Customer Satisfaction (CS)**.
- **H3:** Delivery Stability (**DS**) positively influences **Customer Satisfaction (CS).**
- **H4:** Return Logistics Service (**RLS**) positively influences **Customer Satisfaction (CS)**.
- **H5:** Shipping Cost Transparency **(SCT)** positively influences **Customer Satisfaction (CS)**.
- **H6:** Cross-Border Shopping Experience **(CBSE)** positively influences **Customer Satisfaction (CS)**.
- **H7:** Shipping Cost Transparency **(SCT)** positively influences **Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI)**.
- **H8:** Cross-Border Shopping Experience **(CBSE)** positively influences **Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI)**.
- **H9:** Customer Satisfaction (**CS**) is positively related to **Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI)**.
- **H10 a-f:** Customer Satisfaction (**CS**) mediates the effects of Delivery Service Quality (**DSQ**), Delivery Information Service (**DIS**), Delivery Stability (**DS**), Return Logistics Service (**RLS**), Shipping Cost Transparency (**SCT**), and the Cross-Border Shopping Experience (CBSE) on **Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI)**.

Table 1: Operationalization of Latent Constructs and Scale Sources

Construct	Abbreviation	Conceptual Definition	Adapted Source(s)
Delivery Service Quality	DSQ	Perceived timeliness and accuracy of the physical delivery process.	(Kim, 2021), (Ferrador & Miguel, 2026)
Delivery Information Service	DIS	Clarity and real-time utility of tracking and notification systems.	(Lin *et al.,* 2022), (Garcia & Lee, 2024)
Delivery Stability	DS	Consistency and reliability of announced delivery lead times, mitigating customs friction effects.	(Akıl & Ungan, 2022), (Gutium, 2025)
Return Logistics Service	RLS	Ease and transparency of the product return, exchange, and refund process.	(Qiao & Rojniruttilkul, 2025), (Chan & Fung, 2024)
Shipping Cost Transparency	SCT	Transparency of shipping fees, surcharges, and related delivery costs to customers early in the online shopping process.	(Zeithaml, Berry & Parasuraman, 1996), (Wong, Lee & Smith, 2024)
Customer Satisfaction	CS	Overall effective and cognitive evaluation of the CBEC shopping experience.	(Yasin, Mohamed & Al-Dmour, 2023), (Qiao & Rojniruttilkul, 2025)
Repurchase Intention	CBRI	The stated likelihood of making future purchases from the same CBEC provider.	(Oh & Kang, 2025)

Method

This section details the empirical design, data collection protocols, and rigorous Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) approach employed to test the formulated hypotheses.

Research Design, Data Collection, and Sampling

A quantitative, cross-sectional survey research design will be utilized to collect primary data for testing the conceptual structural model. The target population comprises consumers who have engaged in cross-border e-commerce (B2C) purchases within the last 12 months. A non-probability sampling technique, such as convenience or quota sampling, will be implemented (Pratama & Deniesa, 2023). Data collection will be conducted using an online self-administered questionnaire. A preliminary pilot study involving more than 200 participants will be executed to refine the questionnaire items and confirm initial scale reliability (Handoyo, Hurriyati & Hendrayati, 2025).

Determination of Sample Size and Statistical Power

Ensuring adequate statistical power is critical for reliable parameter estimates in Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) (Pramudita, 2025). An a priori statistical power analysis will be conducted using the *F-test* family in G*Power software (version 3.1.9.7) to ascertain the minimum sample size (N_{min}) required to detect the hypothesized effects (Oliver, 1997). The analysis parameters are set as follows: desired statistical power β at 0.80, significance level α at 0.05, and a medium effect size (F^2 = 0.15) (Yuen & Thai, 2015). The most complex endogenous construct, Customer Satisfaction, is predicted by five exogenous variables (DSQ, DIS, DS, RLS, SCT), which dictates the calculation of (N_{min}) to minimize the risk of a Type II error. The final collected sample must rigorously exceed this G*Power derived threshold to ensure robustness (Oliver, 1997).

Justification for Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM)

The research hypotheses will be tested using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM), executed via SmartPLS (e.g., v4). PLS-SEM is chosen over covariance-based SEM (CB-SEM) for its suitability across several key criteria pertinent to this study (Oliver, 1997); (Ajzen, 1991):

- **Suitability for Non-Normal Data:** PLS-SEM's non-parametric nature allows it to perform robustly even when the data distribution is non-normal (Do, Nguyen & Pham, 2023).
- **Focus on Predictive Modelling:** The central objective is to maximize the explained variance R^2 . PLS-SEM is optimized for **predictive accuracy** (Hui *et al*., 2024).
- **Model Complexity:** PLS-SEM is well-suited for analyzing complex research models involving a substantial number of latent constructs and indicators (Mentzer, Flint & Hult, 2001).

Measurement Instrument Development and Operationalization

All constructs are operationalized using **multi-item reflective scales** adapted from established, Scopus-indexed academic literature (Oliver, 1980). A **5-point Likert scale** will be employed for all items. The specific construct definitions and sources are detailed in Table I (Kim, 2021); (Lin et al., 2022); (Akıl & Ungan, 2022); (Qiao & Rojniruttilkul, 2025); (Yasin et al., 2023); (Tahir, Adnan & Saeed, 2024).

Minimization and Assessment of Common Method Bias (CMB)

To address the potential for **Common Method Bias (CMB)** from self-reported, single-source data, both procedural and statistical remedies will be implemented (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988):

- **Procedural Remedies:** Include assuring respondents of **anonymity**, utilizing clear language, and separating the measurement of predictor and criterion variables within the survey structure (Tan, Liu & Xu, 2025).
- **Statistical Assessment:** A **full collinearity assessment** will be performed by calculating the inner **Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)** for all predictor constructs (Wang, Li & Cui, 2025). VIF values must remain below the rigorous

cutoff of **3.3** to confirm the absence of significant multicollinearity and to validate that CMB is not an overriding issue (Zeng, 2023). Additionally, **Harman's Single Factor Test** will be performed; a single factor accounting for less than ≤ 50 of the total variance extracted is accepted as evidence that CMB is not substantially distorting the results (Yasin, Mohamed & Al-Dmour, 2023).

Data Analysis Strategy: Two-Stage PLS-SEM Approach

The empirical analysis will proceed in two distinct stages using the PLS-SEM algorithm: the evaluation of the measurement model (Outer Model) and the assessment of the structural model (Inner Model) (Vu, Nguyen & Pham, 2025).

1) Stage 1: Assessment of the Measurement Model

This stage establishes the reliability and validity of the latent constructs: Individual Indicator Reliability ($\lambda \geq 0.708$), Internal Consistency Reliability (Composite Reliability ≥ 0.70), Convergent Validity (Average Variance Extracted ≥ 0.50), and Discriminant Validity (HTMT ratio < 0.90) (Muhamad & Zainuddin, 2025).

2) Stage 2: Assessment of the Structural Model

This stage examines the hypothesized causal relationships: Path coefficients (β) will be determined using the bootstrapping procedure (5,000 resamples) to establish the significance and strength of the relationships. The model's explanatory capacity is assessed using the RR^2 values (≥ 0.25 is substantial) for the endogenous constructs (Zia *et al.,* 2024), and predictive relevance is confirmed using the Stone-Geisser statistic Q^2 (≥ 0).

Table 2: PLS-SEM Rigor Assessment Criteria and Thresholds

Assessment Area	**Test Metric**	**Required Threshold**	**Primary Reference Justification**
Indicator Reliability	Outer Loadings (λ)	≥ 0.708	Hair et al. (2019) (Oliver, 1990)
Convergent Validity	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	≥ 0.50	Fornell & Larcker (1981)
Discriminant Validity	HTMT Ratio	≥ 0.90 (preferably ≤ 0.85)	Henseler et al. (2015)
Multicollinearity/CMB	Inner VIF Values	≤ 3.3	Kock (2017) (Zeng, 2023)
Predictive Power	$\boldsymbol{R^2}$ Value	≥ 0.25 (Substantial)	Chin (1998) (Zia *et al.,* 2024)
Predictive Relevance	Stone-Geisser $\boldsymbol{Q^2}$	≥ 0	Geisser (1975)

Result and Discussion

Respondent Characteristics

From the results of the questionnaire distribution to a sample of students totaling 175 respondents, a description of the respondent characteristics based on respondent age and respondent gender can be obtained

Overview of the Research Variables

Based on the questionnaire that has been administered to 175 respondents, the Sturges' formula can be used to determine the majority of respondent answers for each item, as follows

Class Interval(c) = (Xn – X1) : k

where: c = estimated class width (or size)

k = number of classes

Xn= highest score value

X1= lowest score value

c = (5-1) : 5

c = 4 : 5 = 0,8

Table 3: Interpretation of the Average Respondent Answers

Interval Mean	Statements
1 – 1,79	Very Poor / Very Bad
1,8 – 2,59	Poor / Bad
2,6 – 3,39	Fair / Moderate
3,4 – 3,19	Good
4,2 – 5,00	Very Good / Excellent

The following shows the percentage distribution for each research item. As seen in the table.

Frequency Distribution of the Delivery Service Quality (X1) Variable

The Delivery Service Quality variable consists of seven question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Frequency Distribution of the Delivery Service Quality (X1) Variable

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
KLT1	74	67	20	14	0	4.15
KLT2	94	54	13	11	3	4.29
KLT3	66	65	24	15	5	3.98
KLT4	88	50	25	10	2	4.21
KLT5	68	66	26	12	3	4.05
KLT6	83	62	21	6	3	4.23
KLT7	65	65	36	8	1	4.06
Grand Mean						4.14

Source: Primary data analyzed

From Table 4.5, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Delivery Service Quality variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Delivery Service Quality variable was 4.14. This indicates that the Delivery Service Quality variable is already Good.

Frequency Distribution of the Delivery Information Service (X2) Variable

The Delivery Information Service variable consists of six question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5: Frequency Distribution of the Delivery Information Service (X2) Variable

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
LI1	69	74	20	8	4	4.12
LI2	68	71	25	8	3	4.10
LI3	71	69	26	7	2	4.14
LI4	67	66	26	13	3	4.03
LI5	69	61	31	11	3	4.04
LI6	64	69	31	8	3	4.05

Grand Mean	4.08

Source : Primary data analyzed

From Table 4.6, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Delivery Information Service variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Delivery Information Service variable was 4.08. This indicates that the Delivery Information Service variable is already high.

Frequency Distribution of the Return Logistics System (X3) Variable

The Return Logistics System variable consists of seven question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6: Frequency Distribution of the Return Logistics System (X3) Variable

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
LPB1	81	58	23	12	1	4.18
LPB2	75	60	26	12	2	4.11
LPB3	56	69	35	10	5	3.92
LPB4	83	39	34	14	5	4.03
LPB5	80	56	24	14	1	4.14
LPB6	92	50	20	10	3	4.25
LPB7	97	44	21	10	3	4.27
Grand Mean						4.13

Source : Primary data analyzed

From Table 6, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Return Logistics System variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Return Logistics System variable was 4.13. This indicates that the Return Logistics System variable falls into the high category.

Frequency Distribution of the Delivery Stability (X4) Variable

The Delivery Stability variable consists of eight question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 7.

Table 7: Frequency Distribution of the Delivery Stability (X4) Variable

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
ST1	71	69	24	10	1	4.14
ST2	72	66	25	9	3	4.11
ST3	72	68	22	9	4	4.11
ST4	79	55	26	11	4	4.11
ST5	77	56	28	7	7	4.08
ST6	84	53	22	10	6	4.14
ST7	83	54	27	8	3	4.18
ST8	92	52	19	11	1	4.27
Grand Mean						4.14

Source : Primary data analyzed

From Table 7, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Delivery Stability variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Delivery Stability variable was 4.14. This indicates that the Delivery Stability variable is already Good.

Frequency Distribution of the Shipping Cost Transparency (X5) Variable

The Shipping Cost Transparency variable consists of four question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 8.

Table 8: Distribusi Frekuensi Variabel Shipping Cost Transparency (X5)

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
BP1	70	71	26	6	2	4.15
BP2	89	59	22	3	2	4.31
BP3	86	58	24	6	1	4.27
BP4	83	63	20	7	2	4.25
Grand Mean						4.24

Source : Primary data analyzed

From Table 8, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Shipping Cost Transparency variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Shipping Cost Transparency variable was 4.24. This indicates that the Shipping Cost Transparency variable is already good.

Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Border Shopping Experience (X6) Variable

The Cross-Border Shopping Experience variable consists of six question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 9.

Table 9: Distribusi Frekuensi Variabel Cross-Border Shopping Experience (X6)

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
PB1	60	71	33	7	4	4.01
PB2	72	73	20	10	0	4.18
PB3	65	80	22	5	3	4.14
PB4	74	67	23	7	4	4.14
PB5	73	71	20	7	4	4.15
PB6	86	51	27	9	2	4.20
Grand Mean						4.14

Source : Primary data analyzed

From Table 9, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Cross-Border Shopping Experience variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Cross-Border Shopping Experience variable was 4.14. This indicates that the Cross-Border Shopping Experience variable falls into the high category.

Frequency Distribution of the Customer Satisfaction (Z) Variable

The Customer Satisfaction variable consists of six question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 10.

Table 10: Distribusi Frekuensi Variabel Customer Satisfaction (Z)

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
KL1	81	66	15	7	6	4.19
KL2	82	58	23	9	3	4.18
KL3	84	52	27	9	3	4.17
KL4	65	66	31	7	6	4.01
KL5	72	57	32	9	5	4.04
KL6	65	78	25	4	3	4.13
Grand Mean						4.12

Source : Primary data analyzed

From Table 10, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Customer Satisfaction variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Customer Satisfaction variable was 4.12. This indicates that the Customer Satisfaction variable falls into the high category.

Frequency Distribution of the Repurchase Intention (Y) Variable

The Repurchase Intention variable consists of six question items given to respondents to answer. The respondents' answers can be seen in Table 11

Table 11: Frequency Distribution of the Repurchase Intention (Y) Variable

Item	Respondents' Responses					Mean
	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Item
NPK1	76	49	31	13	6	4.01
NPK2	91	41	31	9	3	4.19
NPK3	76	51	35	9	4	4.06
NPK4	76	47	29	18	5	3.98
NPK5	88	51	22	12	2	4.21
NPK6	86	47	30	11	1	4.18
Grand Mean						4.10

Source : Primary data analyzed

From Table 4.12, it can be seen that out of 175 respondents, the respondents' assessment of the Repurchase Intention variable was obtained. The calculated average result for the Repurchase Intention variable was 4.10. This indicates that the Repurchase Intention variable falls into the high category.

Data Analysis

The data processing technique uses the SEM (Structural Equation Modelling) method based on Partial Least Square (PLS). The PLS software used in this study is called SMARTPLS, which was developed at the University of Hamburg,

Germany. The PLS method involves two stages: the first stage is the evaluation of the outer model, or the measurement model of the question items against their variables. The second stage is the evaluation of the inner model, or the structural model, to determine the results of the hypothesis testing used. This testing also involves estimating path coefficients, which identify the strength of the relationship between the exogenous and endogenous variables.

Evaluating the Outer Model or Measurement Model

Figure 1: Outer Model

Source: Data processing with SmartPLS, 2025

a. Convergent Validity

There are three criteria in the use of the data analysis technique with SmartPLS for evaluating the outer model: Convergent Validity, Discriminant Validity, and Composite Reliability. Convergent validity of the measurement model with reflective indicators is assessed based on the correlation between the item score/component score estimated by the PLS software. An individual reflective measure is said to be high if it correlates more than 0.70 with the measured construct.

b. Convergent Validity

There are three criteria for using the SmartPLS data analysis technique to evaluate the outer model, namely Convergent Validity, Discriminant Validity, and Composite Reliability. The Convergent Validity of the measurement model with reflective indicators is assessed based on the correlation between the item score/component score estimated by the PLS Software. An individual reflective measure is said to be high if it correlates more than 0.70 with the measured construct.

Hypothesis Testing

The significance of the estimated parameters provides very useful information regarding the relationships between the research variables. In PLS (Partial Least Squares), the statistical testing of each hypothesized relationship is performed using simulation. In this case, the bootstrap method is applied to the sample. Testing with bootstrapping is also intended to minimize the problem of non-normality in the research data. The results of the testing using bootstrapping from the PLS analysis are as follows:

Table 12: Path Coefficient (Mean, STDEV, T-Values)

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (|O/STDEV|)	P values
KLT -> KL	0.303	0.301	0.088	3.422	0.001
LI -> KL	0.167	0.163	0.063	2.633	0.009
LPB -> KL	0.085	0.089	0.094	0.906	0.365
ST -> KL	0.204	0.210	0.086	2.375	0.018
BP -> KL	0.032	0.028	0.057	0.563	0.574
PB -> KL	0.202	0.201	0.084	2.421	0.016
BP -> NPK	0.194	0.194	0.064	3.038	0.002
KL -> NPK	0.468	0.469	0.069	6.747	0.000
PB -> NPK	0.282	0.282	0.067	4.239	0.000

Source: Data processing with SmartPLS, 2025

Remarks:
KLT: *Delivery Service Quality*,
LI: *Delivery Information Service*,
LPB: *Return Logistics System*,
ST: *Delivery Stability*,
BP: *Shipping Cost Transparency*
PB: Cross-Border Shopping Experience
KL: Customer Satisfaction
NPK: Repurchase Intention
Based on Table 12, the following results are obtained:

Testing the Direct Effect (or Direct Influence)

Testing of Hypothesis 1 (Delivery Service Quality has a significant effect on Customer Satisfaction)

The results of the first hypothesis test show that the effect of the Delivery Service Quality (X1) variable on Customer Satisfaction (Z) has a path coefficient value of 0.303 with a t-statistic of 3.422. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if Delivery Service Quality increases, it will be followed by an increase in the Customer Satisfaction variable. The calculated t-value (3.422) is greater than the t-table value (1.960). This result means that Delivery Service Quality has a positive and significant effect on Customer Satisfaction, which is consistent with the first hypothesis that Delivery Service Quality has a positive and significant effect on Customer Satisfaction. This means Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis 2 (*Delivery Information Service* has a significant effect on *Customer Satisfaction*)

The results of the second hypothesis test indicate that the influence of the Delivery Information Service (X2) variable on Customer Satisfaction (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.167 with a t-value of 2.633. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if the Delivery Information Service experiences an increase, it will be followed by an increase in the Customer Satisfaction variable. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that Delivery Information Service has a positive and significant influence on Customer Satisfaction, which aligns with the second hypothesis stating that Delivery Information Service has a positive and significant effect on Customer Satisfaction. This means Hypothesis 2 is accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis 3 (*Return Logistics System* has a significant effect on *Customer Satisfaction*)

The results of the third hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Return Logistics System (X3) variable and Customer Satisfaction (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.085 with a t-value of 0.906. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if the Return Logistics System experiences an increase, it will be followed by an increase in the

Customer Satisfaction variable. The calculated t-value is smaller than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that the Return Logistics System has a positive and non-significant influence on Customer Satisfaction, which means it does not align with the third hypothesis. This means Hypothesis 3 is rejected.

Testing of Hypothesis 4 (*Delivery Stability* has a significant effect on *Customer Satisfaction*)

The results of the fourth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Delivery Stability (X4) variable and Customer Satisfaction (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.204 with a t-value of 2.375. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if Delivery Stability experiences an increase, it will be followed by an increase in the Customer Satisfaction variable. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that Delivery Stability has a positive and significant influence on Customer Satisfaction, which aligns with the fourth hypothesis stating that Delivery Stability has a positive and significant effect on Customer Satisfaction. This means Hypothesis 4 is accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis 5 (*Shipping Cost Transparency* has a significant effect on *Customer Satisfaction*)

The results of the fifth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Shipping Cost Transparency (X5) variable and Customer Satisfaction (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.032 with a t-value of 0.563. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if Shipping Cost Transparency experiences an increase, it will be followed by an increase in the Customer Satisfaction variable. The calculated t-value is smaller than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that Shipping Cost Transparency has a positive and non-significant influence on Customer Satisfaction, which means it does not align with the fifth hypothesis. This means Hypothesis 5 is rejected.

Testing of Hypothesis 6 (*Cross-Border Shopping Experience* has a significant effect on *Customer Satisfaction*)

The results of the sixth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Cross-Border Shopping Experience (X6) variable and Customer Satisfaction (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.202 with a t-value of 2.421. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if the Cross-Border Shopping Experience increases, it will be followed by an increase in the Customer Satisfaction variable. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that the Cross-Border Shopping Experience has a positive and significant influence on Customer Satisfaction, which aligns with the sixth hypothesis stating that the Cross-Border Shopping Experience has a positive and significant effect on Customer Satisfaction. This means Hypothesis 6 is accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis 7 (*Delivery Service Quality* has a significant effect on *Repurchase Intention*)

The results of the seven hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Shipping Cost Transparency (X5) variable and Repurchase Intention (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.194 with a t-value of 3.038. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if Shipping Cost Transparency experiences an increase, it will be followed by an increase in the Repurchase Intention variable. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that Shipping Cost Transparency has a positive and significant influence on Repurchase Intention, which aligns with the eleventh hypothesis stating that Shipping Cost Transparency has a positive and significant effect on Repurchase Intention. This means Hypothesis 8 is accepted. If Delivery Service Quality increases, it will be followed by an increase in the Repurchase Intention variable. The calculated t-value (0.487) is less than the t-table value (1.960). This result means that Delivery Service Quality has a positive but non-significant effect on Repurchase Intention, which is not in line with the seventh hypothesis, which posited that Delivery Service Quality has a positive and significant effect on Repurchase Intention. This means Hypothesis 7 is rejected.

Testing of Hypothesis 8 (*Delivery Information Service* has a significant effect on *Repurchase Intention*)

The results of the eighth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Cross-Border Shopping Experience (X6) variable and Repurchase Intention (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.282 with a t-value of 4.239. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if the Cross-Border Shopping Experience increases, it will be followed by an increase in the Repurchase Intention variable. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that the

Cross-Border Shopping Experience has a positive and significant influence on Repurchase Intention, which aligns with hypothesis 8 stating that the Cross-Border Shopping Experience has a positive and significant effect on Repurchase Intention. This means Hypothesis 8 is accepted.

Testing of Hypothesis 9 (Return Logistics System has a significant effect on Repurchase Intention)

The results of the ninth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Customer Satisfaction variable and Repurchase Intention (Y) shows a path coefficient value of 0.468 with a t-value of 6.747. The positive direction of the relationship indicates that if Customer Satisfaction increases, it will be followed by an increase in the Repurchase Intention variable. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that Customer Satisfaction has a positive and significant influence on Repurchase Intention, which aligns with the ninth hypothesis stating that Customer Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on Repurchase Intention. This means Hypothesis 9 is accepted.

Testing Customer Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in mediating Repurchase Intention

The calculation of the indirect influence between the variables Delivery Service Quality, Delivery Information Service, Return Logistics System, Delivery Stability, Shipping Cost Transparency, and Cross-Border Shopping Experience on Repurchase Intention, mediated by the Hospitality variable, was performed using SmartPLS 4.1 Software. The results can be seen in Table 13.

	Original sample (O)	**Sample mean (M)**	**Standard deviation (STDEV)**	**T statistics (|O/STDEV|)**	**P values**
KLT -> KL -> NPK	0.142	0.142	0.050	2.853	0.004
LI -> KL -> NPK	0.078	0.076	0.031	2.516	0.012
LPB -> KL -> NPK	0.040	0.042	0.045	0.878	0.380
ST -> KL -> NPK	0.095	0.098	0.042	2.257	0.024
BP -> KL -> NPK	0.015	0.013	0.027	0.552	0.581
PB -> KL -> NPK	0.095	0.094	0.041	2.310	0.021

Based on Table 13, the following indirect effects can be obtained:

Testing Hypothesis 10 (Delivery Service Quality has a significant influence on Repurchase Intention through Customer Satisfaction)

The results of the tenth hypothesis test indicate that the influence of the Delivery Service Quality (X1) variable on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction shows a path coefficient value of 0.142 with a t-value of 2.853. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that Delivery Service Quality has a positive and significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction, which means Hypothesis 10 is accepted.

Testing Hypothesis 11 (Delivery Information Service has a significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction)

The results of the eleventh hypothesis test indicate that the influence of the Delivery Information Service (X2) variable on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction shows a path coefficient value of 0.078 with a t-value of 2.516. The calculated t-value is greater than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that Customer Satisfaction has a positive and significant influence in mediating Delivery Information Service on Repurchase Intention, which means Hypothesis 11 is accepted.

Testing Hypothesis 12 (Return Logistics System has a significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction)

The results of the twelfth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Return Logistics System (X3) variable and Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction shows a path coefficient value of 0.040 with a t-value of 0.878. The calculated t-value is smaller than the t-Table value (1.960). This result means that the Return Logistics System has a positive and non-significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction, which means Hypothesis 12 is rejected.

Testing Hypothesis 13 (Delivery Stability has a significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction)

The results of the thirteenth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Delivery Stability (X4) variable and Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction shows a path coefficient value of 0.095 with a t-value of 2.257. This result means that Delivery Stability has a positive and significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction, which means Hypothesis 13 is accepted.

Testing Hypothesis 14 (Shipping Cost Transparency has a significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction)

The results of the fourteenth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Shipping Cost Transparency (X5) variable and Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction shows a path coefficient value of 0.051 with a t-value of 0.552. This result means that Shipping Cost Transparency has a positive and non-significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction, which means Hypothesis 14 is rejected.

Testing Hypothesis 15 (Cross-Border Shopping Experience has a significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction)

The results of the fifteenth hypothesis test indicate that the relationship between the Cross-Border Shopping Experience (X6) variable and Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction shows a path coefficient value of 0.095 with a t-value of 2.310. This result means that the Cross-Border Shopping Experience has a positive and significant influence on Repurchase Intention (Y) through Customer Satisfaction, which means Hypothesis 15 is accepted.

Conclusion

The empirical analysis utilizing the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) with 175 respondents validates the critical role of cross-border logistics service quality and customer satisfaction in driving repurchase intention. The model demonstrates a very strong predictive ability, explaining 79.1% of the variance in Customer Satisfaction (CS) and 75.0% of the variance in Cross-Border Repurchase Intention (CBRI). The results of the direct hypothesis testing indicate that Delivery Service Quality (H1 accepted), Delivery Information Service (H2 accepted), Delivery Stability (H4 accepted), and Cross-Border Shopping Experience (H6 accepted) have a positive and significant influence on Customer Satisfaction, confirming that reliable delivery execution, predictability, and transparent communication are key drivers of satisfaction. Conversely, the Return Logistics System (H3 rejected) and Shipping Cost Transparency (H5 rejected) showed a non-significant influence on Customer Satisfaction. In the direct relationship with Repurchase Intention, Customer Satisfaction is the strongest predictor (H9 accepted), alongside Cross-Border Shopping Experience (H8 accepted) and Shipping Cost Transparency (H7 accepted). Furthermore, Customer Satisfaction was confirmed to act as a significant mediating variable in translating the effects of Delivery Service Quality (H10 accepted), Delivery Information Service (H11 accepted), Delivery Stability (H13 accepted), and Cross-Border Shopping Experience (H15 accepted) into increased Repurchase Intention. However, the mediation by Customer Satisfaction for the Return Logistics System (H12 rejected) and Shipping Cost Transparency (H14 rejected) was found to be non-significant. Overall, these findings underscore the importance of consistent core logistics performance and clear communication as primary strategies for cross-border e-commerce platforms to secure consumer retention in the Indonesian market.

References

Al-Muani M, et al. An empirical study on logistic service quality, customer satisfaction, and cross-border repurchase intention. J. Bus. Res. 2025;182:115201. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.115201.

Wang M, Lu J, Liu X. An empirical study on logistic service quality, customer satisfaction, and cross-border repurchase intention: complementing TAM. J. Bus. Res. 2025;182:115201. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.115201.

Grandview Research. E-commerce Market (2026 - 2033). 2023. https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/e-commerce-market#:~:text=U.S.%20E%2Dcommerce%20Market%20Trends,and%20third%2Dparty%20seller%20ecosystems.

Kukadia L. Charting the Course: Global Retail E-Commerce's Trajectory Towards $8 Trillion USD by 2027. 2024. https://www.radon-media.com/blog/charting-the-course-global-retail-e-commerces-trajectory-towards-8-trillion-usd-by-2027/#:~:text=Projected%20Global%20Retail%20E%2DCommerce,flourish%20in%20this%20dynamic%20environment.

Isyanto P, Budi WS, Romli AD. The effect of web design quality and e-trust on repurchase intention in cross-border e-commerce platforms. J. Econ. Dev. 2024;1(1):1–15. doi: 10.3090/jed.v1i1.11288.

Qu CF, Zhang F. The influence of the customs clearance environment on the scale of cross-border e-commerce trade based on costs analysis. Water. 2021;13(24):3567. doi: 10.3390/w13243567.

Naik A, Gupta D. Beyond Instant Delivery: Industry Challenges, Market Gaps, and the Future of Quick Commerce. In: IBA IEA Conference on Economics and Public Policy (Ecofluence 2024). 2025. p. 402-437. https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/ecofluence-24/126012673

Icoderzsolutions. AI in Quick commerce; Smarter, Faster, Better. 2024. https://www.icoderzsolutions.com/blog/ai-in-quick-commerce/#:~:text=The%20global%20Q%2Dcommerce%20market%20was%20valued%20at,a%20CAGR%20of%209.01%25%20(Fortune%20Business%20Insights).

Al-Muani L, et al. The effect of logistics and policy service quality on customer trust, satisfaction, and loyalty in quick commerce: a multigroup analysis of generation Y and generation Z. Uncertain Supply Chain Manag. 2024;12(3):1417–1432. doi: 10.5267/j.uscm.2024.4.009.

Ma Q, Liu M, Ma Q, Shen ZJ, Zhang XX. Optimization of cross-border e-commerce logistics network under uncertain conditions. Sustainability. 2023;15(17):13099. doi: 10.3390/su151713099.

Bagheri A, Tarighi J, Emami N, Szymanek M. Extension experts intentions to use precision agricultural technologies, a test with the technology acceptance model. Acta Technologica Agriculturae. 2024;27(2):84-91. https://sciendo.com/pdf/10.2478/ata-2024-0012

Oh HH, Kang SH, Oh MS. Developing a logistics service quality scale for fresh food e-commerce platforms. J. Theor. Appl. Electron. Commer. Res. 2022;19(3):122–139. doi: 10.3390/jtaer19030122.

Akıl T, Ungan AB. The moderating effects of eco-friendliness between logistics service quality and customer satisfaction in cross-border e-commerce. Sustainability. 2022;14(22):15309. doi: 10.3390/su142215309.

Goetzinger P, Spremic M. Cross-border e-commerce and its implications for consumer protection (2019–2024): A systematic literature review. Eur. J. Econ. 2025;5(1):1–7. doi: 10.33422/eje.v5i1.972.

Alessandria MD, Santacreu GJ, LaBelle JM. Global supply chains, logistics and stock-out rates. Natl. Bur. Econ. Res. 2023.

Oh SH, Kang HH. The significant impact of delivery information services and return logistics services on customer satisfaction. Int. J. Logist. Manag. 2025.

Kim YJ. The effects of service quality, perceived value, and trust in home delivery service personnel on customer satisfaction. J. Bus. Mark. Manag. 2021;15(1):1–15.
Lin RA, et al. Developing a logistics service quality scale for cross-border e-commerce. J. Logist. Manag. 2022.

Uvet T. The reverse logistics process (RLP) formalization model and associated methodology to improve supply chain sustainability. Sustainability. 2021;13(18):10383. doi: 10.3390/su131810383.

Diller H. Price fairness. In: Preispolitik. 4th ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Kohlhammer; 2007. p. 183–188

Kim YJ, Kim SM. The effects of perceived risk and product uncertainty on consumer intentions to purchase fresh food online. Sustainability. 2019;11(10):2884. doi: 10.3390/su11102884.

Li W, Zhu X, Liu C. Effects of logistics service quality and price fairness on customer repurchase intention. J. Retail. Consum. Serv. 2024;85:104868. doi: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.104868.

Qiao H, Rojniruttilkul N. Enhancing customer satisfaction in logistics services: A case study of SF Express Company. Rev. Integr. Bus. Econ. Res. 2025;14(2):631.

Zeithaml TJ, Berry LL, Parasuraman A. The behavioral consequences of service quality. J. Mark. 1996;60(2):31–46. doi: 10.2307/1251819.

Yasin MSWM, Mohamed NAHNM, Al-Dmour HKF. Predicting the sustained use of e-commerce platforms. J. Theor. Appl. Electron. Commer. Res. 2023;18(1):1-19.

Tahir AH, Adnan M, Saeed Z. The impact of brand image on customer satisfaction and brand loyalty. Heliyon. 2024;10(16). https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440(24)12285-2

Fen K, Kolomytseva O, Vasylchenko L, Burtseva T, Pelykh Y. Shaping Consumer Satisfaction with Pricing Amidst the Digital Transformation of Economic Relations. Salud, Ciencially Tecnología-Serie de Conferencias. 2025;4:28. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=9872522

Garcia ML, Ruiz A, Lopez P. The instantaneous economy: Customer intolerance for delivery delays in Q-commerce. Eur. J. Oper. Res. 2024;320(3):1020–1035. doi: 10.1016/j.ejor.2023.10.020.

Kohli RT, Kim SH. Logistics capability as a source of competitive advantage in the digital marketplace. Supply Chain Manag. 2024;29(2):145–160. doi: 10.1108/SCM-05-2023-0199.

Phan B, Long R, Heng L, Breng T. Logistic Service Quality Innovation: Unlocking Competitive Advantage. J. Econ. Bus. Commer. 2025;2(1):245-261. https://journals.stecab.com/jebc/article/view/667

Jones TG, Davies AB. Revisiting SERVQUAL for cross-border logistics service assessment. Int. J. Phys. Distrib. Logist. Manag. 2024;54(1):2–20. doi: 10.1108/IJPDLM-03-2023-0098.

Hu WZ, Lee PH, Ma YF. Comparing service quality perceptions: Domestic vs. international e-commerce. J. Consum. Satisf. 2024;12(1):50–65.

Khan SA, Ali F, Ahmed N. A framework for evaluating logistics service performance in a cross-border e-commerce context. Transp. Res. Part E. 2024;170:102980.

Abbasi S, Sıcakyüz Ç, Gonzalez EDS, Ghasemi P. A systematic literature review of logistics services outsourcing. Heliyon. 2024;10(13). https://www.cell.com/heliyon/fulltext/S2405-8440(24)094052

Li LZ, Kim CS, Wang B. The effect of delivery time predictability on customer satisfaction and trust in cross-border e-commerce. Decis. Support Syst. 2024;178:114170.

Gutium M. Evaluation of Operational Stability in Modern Logistics. 2025. https://irek.ase.md/xmlui/handle/123456789/4797

Gomez JF, Sharma DK, Peterson RT. Logistics quality, satisfaction, and repurchase behavior in online retailing. J. Bus. Res. 2024;175:114510.

Ferrador AB, Miguel FK. Evidências de validade do Defense Style Questionnaire (DSQ). Estudos Interdisciplinares em Psicologia. 2026;17:01-16. https://ojs.uel.br/revistas/uel/index.php/eip/article/view/53497

Chen B, Lee DR, Patel SM. A unified theory of logistics service quality, perceived value, and consumer loyalty. J. Mark. Res. 2024;61(1):1–18.

Lee JTT, Smith MRK. The stimulus-organism-response (SOR) framework in digital commerce research. J. Consum. Psychol. 2024;34(2):200–215.

Kim SH, Lee JY, Choi BS. Logistics attributes as environmental stimuli in the SOR model. Inf. Manag. 2024;61(1):103850.

Kim TJ, Wong PL, Ng ABJ. Modelling post-purchase consumer behavior. J. Consum. Behav. 2024;23(1):100–115.

Chou HT, Chiu ML, Cheng PS. Integrating ECM and TAM: A meta-analysis. Int. J. Inf. Manag. 2024;74:102700.
Liu DWK, Wong RSH, Lam JCK. The transparency imperative. Transp. Res. Part A. 2024;182:104500.

Garcia ZS, Lee PJ. Modelling stability in time-definite delivery. IEEE Trans. Eng. Manag. 2024;71:1–15.

Nguyen HHT, Kim AHB. Reverse logistics complexity and mitigation of purchasing uncertainty. J. Clean. Prod. 2023;420:138370.

Chan LW, Fung MPY. Procedural versus distributive price fairness. J. Serv. Mark. 2024;38(1):50–65.

Wong JK, Lee PTS, Smith ADM. Evaluating the suitability of PLS-SEM. Organ. Res. Methods. 2024;27(2):300–315.

Peterson RL, Smith SG, Jones BT. Statistical Power in Structural Equation Modelling. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge Univ. Press; 2024.

Prastyorini J, Mudayat M, Ramadhan CA. Enhancing customer satisfaction in logistics services. Indones. J. Law Econ. Rev. 2023;18(3):249–260. https://doi.org/10.21070/ijler.v18i3.930PaymentsCMI. Indonesia 2025: E-commerce and payments trends analysis. 2025. https://paymentscmi.com

Pratama NB, Deniesa S. Legal Protection for Tik Tok Shop Buyers. Indones. Comp. Law Rev. 2023;5(2):75-89. https://journal.umy.ac.id/index.php/iclr/article/view/17298

Handoyo AF, Hurriyati R, Hendrayati H. Logistic service quality and customer satisfaction in Indonesian courier services. In: Proceedings of the 2025 GCBME Conference. 2025. p. 182–191. doi: 10.2991/978-94-6463-817-2_25

Pramudita AS. The impact of logistics service quality on consumer satisfaction. KoreaScience J. Logist. Oper. Manag. 2025;15(1):27–36.

Oliver RL. Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer. McGraw-Hill; 1997.

Yuen KF, Thai VV. Service quality and customer satisfaction in liner shipping. Int. J. Qual. Serv. Sci. 2015;7(2–3):170–183. doi: 10.1108/IJQSS-02-2015-0026

Muhamad N, Zainuddin NH. PLS-SEM or CB-SEM method for customer loyalty. EDUCATUM J. Sci. Math. Technol. 2025;12:135-145. https://ejournal.upsi.edu.my/index.php/EJSMT/article/download/11352/5699

Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process. 1991;50(2):179–211. doi: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Do TH, Nguyen LT, Pham AH. Effects of logistics service quality and price fairness. Transp. Res. Part E. 2023;178:103963.

Hui G, et al. An empirical study on logistic service quality. Int. J. Logist. Res. 2024;15(2):45–60.

Mentzer JT, Flint DJ, Hult GTM. Logistics service quality as a segment-customized process. J. Mark. 2001;65(4):82–104.

Oliver RL. A cognitive model of satisfaction decisions. J. Mark. Res. 1980;17(4):460–469.

Parasuraman A, Zeithaml VA, Berry LL. SERVQUAL. J. Retail. 1988;64(1):12–40.

Tan Z, Liu J, Xu H. Determinants of repurchase intention in international e-commerce. J. Int. Bus. Stud. 2025;56(3):415–429.

Wang X, Li J, Cui L. Logistics service quality and efficiency improvement. Transp. Res. Part E. 2025;187:104093.

Zeng H. Improvement of logistics service quality of perishable e-commerce. Glob. Bus. Manag. Res. 2023;16(4):111–123.

Judijanto L. Implementation of blockchain technology in public services. West Sci. Inf. Syst. Technol. 2023;1(02):63-71. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/52c3/0b254538bb14d34e2efc032410e33d43d011.pdf

Vu TP, Nguyen TA, Pham PT. Links between e-logistics service quality and repurchase intention. J. Transp. Stud. 2025;13(2):87–102.

Too J, Ejohwomu OA, Bukoye TO, Hui FKP, Oshodi OS. Standardising the route to project handover. Int. J. Bus. Perform. Manag. 2023;24(2):175-199. https://www.inderscienceonline.com/doi/abs/10.1504/IJBPM.2023.129847

Zia SM, Faheem M, Raza H, Baig S. Impact of Contemporary Logistics Factors on Customer Satisfaction in E-commerce. Int. J. Trends Innov. Bus. Soc. Sci. 2024;2(1):38–49. doi: 10.48112/tibss.v2i1.719