main venues regarding cross-channel integration because a consistent experience across channels is critical for effective customer engagement. Customers become more engaged when they value the content and process consistency across channels (Hollebeek 2011) which enables marketers to provide a valued exchange to customers (Lee et al. 2019). Therefore, for omnichannel marketers, customers' social media use should be associated with CEBs.

H4: Customers' social media use is positively associated with customer engagement behaviors in the omnichannel context.

2.2.3   Email Receptivity

Email is a useful promotion channel that allows marketers to acquire potential customers, retain current customers, and provide information about offerings (Tran and Strutton 2020). Permission-based email is trusted and highly relevant to recipients (i.e., customers). In the first place, when customers decide to opt-in, they have already evaluated the email sender as trustworthy. Also, reflecting customers' specific interests indicated when they opt-in, marketing messages in the opt-in email tend to have high relevance to the customers. In addition, opt-in emails contain promotion offers that can be perceived as economic gains (Carmen and Nicolae 2010). The permission-based email with such features can boost customers' engagement through the customers' motivation process. As expected benefits enhance the ability to strengthen confidence, improve the status, establish a reputation, and enhance self-efficacy (Verhagen et al. 2015), perception of expected benefits, such as economic benefits from promotional offers in an email, can raise enthusiasm for and thus customers' involvement in the product/service or brand (Nardi et al. 2020). Based on the discussion, recipients of permission-based emails are likely to execute engagement with a product/service or brand. Therefore, given that most customers receive promotional emails after voluntarily agreeing to receive promotional emails (Godin 1999), permission-based email recipients are more receptive to promotional emails and are likely to demonstrate CEBs. Thus,

H5: Customers' receptivity to promotional emails is positively associated with customer engagement behaviors in the omnichannel context.

It also follows that the effect of web usability on CEBs will be intensified under the condition that customers are more receptive to promotion-related information via email. Hence,

H6: Customers' receptivity to promotional email strengthens the association between web usability and customer engagement behaviors in the omnichannel context.

In addition, we expect that customer's receptivity to email promotion can moderate the relationship between store proximity (or store remoteness) and CEBs. As we discussed earlier, store proximity can enhance CEBs, or store remoteness can diminish CEBs. Considering the strong involvement of customers with a strong preference for email promotion, we expect the receptivity to email promotion can mitigate the negative relationship between store remoteness and CEBs. That is, as the distance between customer and physical store increases, the customer with high receptivity (vs. low receptivity) to email promotion is likely to perform the higher CEBs. Therefore,

H7: Customers' receptivity to promotional email diminishes the association between store remoteness (i.e., low proximity) and customer engagement behaviors in the omnichannel context.

3   Methods

The research site was a traditional building supply company with siloed structures in which the virtual and physical operations were done almost independently without being integrated. The company has focused its marketing strategy on business-to-business customers. By the period of data collection, the company was planning for omnichannel integration under the leadership of the CMO. We randomly selected 1,000 names of existing customers from the company's customer database and sent them an email survey. The database contained repeat customers who had made multiple purchases. We collected 340 participants to whom we gave a gift card ($50). The response rate was 34%. We finally obtained a valid dataset from 322 participants after removing incomplete data from 18 participants. We used various scales for the current research. The survey instruments were carefully discussed and selected through three in-person meetings with the company's marketing team. Whenever available, we used existing scales from the literature after adapting them for the context. Since some of the scales include multiple items, we used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess the factor structure of survey measures. Then, we adopted structural equation modeling (SEM) to test the hypotheses. CFA results demonstrated that the model has acceptable model fits ($\chi 2 = 178.81$, df $= 72$, p $< .01$; SRMR $= .06$, RMSEA $= .07$; CFI $= .93$). Prior to conducting SEM, we conducted multiple methods to ensure the dataset is free from common method variance (CVM) since the data were collected from single sources. We controlled CVM factoring CLF into the model to ensure the validity of the analysis. We report results from both models with CLF and without CLF.

4   Analysis Results

In the structural model ($\chi 2 = 154.00$, df $= 86$, p $< .01$; SRMR $= .04$, RMSEA $= .05$; CFI $= .96$), we controlled for the effects of CMV, homeownership, homeownership, years of having known the company, age, and gender. Also, as in the CFA model, negative error variance at one item of web usability was fixed at .001. First, we tested the direct effect of each independent variable on CEBs. Except for H2, all other hypotheses were supported. In addition to the direct effect tests, the moderation effects of email receptivity were tested. First, we tested the moderating effect of email receptivity on the relationship between usability and CEB ($\chi 2 = 521.66$, df $= 145$, p $< .01$; SRMR $= .06$, RMSEA $= .09$; CFI $= .83$). The result discovered that email receptivity intensified the relationship between usability and CEBs both when CMV was controlled ($\beta = .13$, p $< .05$) and uncontrolled ($\beta = .14$, p $< .05$). H6 and H7 were supported in both models (Table 1).