

Capturing consumer engagement: duality, dimensionality and measurement

Laurence Dessart, Cleopatra Veloutsou & Anna Morgan-Thomas


To cite this article: Laurence Dessart, Cleopatra Veloutsou & Anna Morgan-Thomas (2016): Capturing consumer engagement: duality, dimensionality and measurement, Journal of Marketing Management

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2015.1130738>




Published online: 25 Jan 2016.



Submit your article to this journal 



View related articles 



View Crossmark data 



Capturing consumer engagement: duality, dimensionality and measurement

Laurence Dessart^a, Cleopatra Veloutsou^b and Anna Morgan-Thomas^b

^aKEDGE Business School, Bordeaux, France; ^bAdam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

ABSTRACT

This study advances the conceptualisation and operationalisation of consumer engagement in the context of online brand communities (OBCs). Past scholarship has only partially addressed the dimensionality of engagement and the different engagement foci, and these oversights have important theoretical and empirical consequences. This study contributes to the nascent stream of research that aims to theoretically refine and operationalise engagement by espousing the duality of engagement with two engagement foci (brand and community) and seven sub-dimensions of consumer engagement. Using qualitative data from consumers and experts, three survey data sets based on English and French samples, and two pools of mirrored items (one for each engagement focus), the study develops and validates a dual-focus 22-item scale of consumer engagement that can be used to operationalise engagement with various consumer engagement objects.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 18 June 2015

Accepted 26 November 2015

KEYWORDS

Consumer engagement;
brand engagement;
community engagement;
online brand community;
social networks; scale
development

Introduction

Contemporary scholarship on consumer engagement promises to significantly advance research on consumer–brand relationships (Vivek, Beatty, & Morgan, 2012). Consumer engagement is often defined in marketing as ‘a psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive, co-creative customer experiences with a focal agent/object (e.g., a brand) in focal service relationships’ (Brodie, Hollebeek, Juric, & Ilic, 2011, p. 260). Contrasted with more established concepts that capture consumer–brand relationships, such as brand commitment, brand relationship quality, or brand involvement (Hollebeek, 2011a), consumer engagement offers a modified view of relationships that is highly interactive (Hollebeek, Glynn, & Brodie, 2014) and social (Vivek, Beatty, Dalela, & Morgan, 2014). Reflecting the fundamental shifts in consumer relationships brought by computer-mediated interaction (Yadav & Pavlou, 2014), these features of engagement potentially enhance the conceptualisation and empirical treatment of the modern-day customer relationships that are inevitably affected by social, interactive and highly empowering situational elements (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2010).

Unsurprisingly, the concept of online consumer engagement attracts significant and growing attention from both academics (Baldus, Voorhees, & Calantone, 2015; Brodie, Ilic, Juric, & Hollebeek, 2013), and practitioners of online marketing. Delivering compelling experiences for consumers is vital for online platforms and significant efforts concern enriching consumer engagement through the capture of relevant data. Facebook, for instance, uses Edgerank to predict and measure the engagement level of newsfeed content through site usage metrics and information (Labrecque, Vor Dem Esche, Mathwick, Novak, & Hofacker, 2013). Engagement agency SocialMetrics advocates the need to go beyond positional data used by Edgerank and calls for a measure of engagement with relational metrics, which also include sentiment (Insead Knowledge, 2014). These recommendations are being implemented: Facebook has encouraged consumers to express their feelings by using the like button for years and is currently testing the use of a number of additional sentiment buttons, such as love, surprise and sadness, based on massive user requests (Peterson, 2015). Therefore, the conceptualisation of consumer engagement has important theoretical and pragmatic consequences. Considering the nascent nature of consumer engagement research against the background of dynamic shifts in online communities and platforms, further refinement seems urgently needed.

Despite the advancement in the conceptual (Van Doorn et al., 2010) and empirical (Brodie et al., 2013) treatment of consumer engagement, the understanding of this important construct remains partial. For instance, conceptual research thus far has focused on engagement with brands (Gambetti & Graffigna, 2010). Yet, engagement is by nature social and interactive, and there is evidence that consumers can engage concurrently with other actors than a brand, such as a community (Algesheimer, Dholakia, & Herrmann, 2005) or a communication medium (Calder, Malthouse, & Schaedel, 2009). Similarly, measurement studies have tended to capture engagement with one focus at a time, namely, a brand (Hollebeek et al., 2014), brand-related content (Schivinski, Christodoulides, & Dabrowski, *in press*), an organisational entity (Vivek et al., 2014) or an online brand community (OBC) (Baldus et al., 2015).

In reality, consumers engage and enter into relationships with different foci simultaneously (Brodie et al., 2011; Dessart, Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2015; Vivek et al., 2012, 2014). Research in other domains, such as social identification, suggests that consumers identify with brands as well as other consumers (Marzocchi, Morandin, & Bergami, 2013) and that they develop relationships with multiple foci concurrently, for example with a brand and a brand community (Veloutsou & Moutinho, 2009). The multiple foci of consumer engagement have thus far been ignored and this narrow treatment of consumer engagement operationalisation is worrying because the focus on one object of engagement may obscure the relevance of other objects, casting doubt on the validity of the research models. For example, overlooking different foci of engagement potentially leads to a partial understanding of the drivers and outcomes of engagement, thus increasing the possibility of conflation in research findings. Given the relative dearth of research on multiple foci, it remains questionable whether the empirical conceptualisations of engagement with one focus are applicable to another focus. Failing to take into account the multiplicity of engagement foci in a specific context seems an important oversight and is yet to be operationalised in confirmatory settings.

This study answers the calls for further refinement of consumer engagement by explicitly addressing the question of different engagement foci. The study aims to reconceptualise consumer engagement and to develop a novel scale, which reflects the multi-dimensionality of the concept (Brodie et al., 2011, 2013) and offers the possibility to accommodate multiple engagement foci in a given context (Wirtz et al., 2013). Specifically, the study addresses two objectives: first, to refine the conceptualisation of engagement by manifestly embracing different foci (Brodie et al., 2013; Dessart et al., 2015); second, to develop a multi-focal scale that uses more than one engagement focus in a given context.

Building on the research on consumer engagement in marketing, the study focuses on the two most accepted engagement foci in OBCs: brand and brand community (Baldus et al., 2015) and OBCs embedded in social networks provide the setting for the empirical work. More specifically, this study focuses on OBCs embedded in the social network Facebook. Social networks are one of the most popular forms of social media (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010), and Facebook in particular is the preferred social network for consumers to engage with brands (Headstream, 2015). Such context seems to offer an excellent opportunity for examination of OBCs (Brodie et al., 2013; Dessart et al., 2015). OBCs are defined as 'a specialised, non-geographically bound community, based upon social relationships among admirers of a brand in cyberspace' (Jang, Olfman, Ko, Koh, & Kim, 2008, p. 57). OBCs on social media are highly relevant to the study of consumer engagement because of their interactive and dynamic nature (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010), and also because they support the creation of multi-way relationships between consumers and brands and among consumers (Ouwersloot & Odekerken-Schröder, 2008; Stokbürger-Sauer, 2010). Because OBCs foster consumer engagement with multiple partners, including the brand and the community (McAlexander, Schouten, & Koenig, 2002; Wirtz et al., 2013), they do represent excellent settings for the study of engagement with multiple foci (Brodie et al., 2013; Dessart et al., 2015).

By extending consumer engagement beyond the usual brand focus (Gambetti & Graffigna, 2010) and including other consumers as engagement partners (Algesheimer et al., 2005), this study significantly broadens the scope and the current conceptualisation and operationalisation of consumer engagement. This study builds on core research on consumer engagement in marketing. Starting with an extensive structured literature review on consumer engagement and using expert advice, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from multiple linguistic samples. These efforts contribute to the development and validation of a consumer engagement scale, which expand current conceptualisations and is well suited for dealing with multiple engagement foci, such as found in the context of OBC. In this study, the scale measures OBC participants' engagement with brands and brand communities. The article concludes with a discussion and final remarks.

Existing research on consumer engagement

Consumer engagement is a relatively new concept in marketing (Hollebeek et al., 2014), and its initial conceptualisations have drawn on other fields of the social sciences, such as educational psychology and organisational behaviour (Bowden, 2009; Brodie et al., 2011). For instance, student engagement may develop in an education environment (Bryson & Hand, 2007) and employees are engaged in the context of organisations

(Kahn, 1990). Within marketing, engagement has been investigated in contexts such as social media (Hollebeek et al., 2014), retailing (Vivek et al., 2014) and services (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014).

Despite its relatively short history in marketing literature, multiple studies address consumer engagement from a variety of perspectives, and the literature includes conceptual contributions and qualitative and quantitative studies (see Table 1 for an overview of key studies). Conceptualisations of consumer engagement tend to include a subject and an object (Hollebeek, 2011a, 2011b) and varying levels of intensity (Patterson, Yu, & De Ruyter, 2006). Engagement is also context specific (Hollebeek, 2011a) and occurs in consumption-related contexts that extend beyond purchase (Van Doorn et al., 2010).

Different theoretical definitions have been used in the published academic work to report the object of engagement, including 'engagement', 'brand engagement', 'brand community engagement' and 'consumer engagement with a product' (see Table 1). This inconsistency in the terms is either because of a lack of agreement on the terminology or because of the different foci of engagement. Further analysis of the discrepancy in terminology reveals an important theoretical distinction concerning the conceptualisation of engagement. Whereas the studies generally agree that the relationship that forms the basis of engagement involves an actor or subject of engagement, typically the individual 'customer' (e.g. Bowden, 2009) or 'consumer' (Calder et al., 2013), significant diversity concerns the focus of engagement, that is the object at the centre of a relationship (Hollebeek, 2011a, 2011b).

Considerable differences concern the dimensionality of engagement, that is the question of what constitutes engagement. Although some studies consider one dimension, for example behaviour (Van Doorn et al., 2010), the conceptual and qualitative research increasingly incorporates multiple dimensions and frequently recognises the behavioural, affective and cognitive aspects of engagement (see the 'dimension' column of Table 1). The most recent theoretical work has also delineated the motivational, social and interactive aspects of the concept (Brodie et al., 2011; Chandler & Lusch, 2015). To date, there is no agreement on the best way to represent engagement, nor is there consensus on the meaning of the dimensions.

A second point of confusion in the existing literature concerns the emphasis on single versus multiple engagement foci. To make this distinction clear, studies presented in Table 1 have been grouped into four categories. The top three sections include studies that investigate only one engagement focus at a time, namely, a brand, firm or organisation (Section 1); a brand community (Section 2); or other actors (Section 3). Studies presented in the last section of the table (Section 4) have sought to combine two or more engagement foci in the same study.

Existing measurement of consumer engagement and the research gaps

As illustrated in Table 1, consumer engagement has often been treated conceptually or in exploratory qualitative studies. By contrast, there seems to be a relative dearth of quantitative studies, and very few of the existing studies aim to develop or report valid and reliable scales of consumer engagement (Table 2). The existing operationalisations are affected by shortcomings pertaining to dimensionality of the construct and/or foci of engagement.

Table 1. Consumer engagement studies in marketing.

Authors	Construct	Dimensions	Paper type
I. Engagement with a brand, firm, or organisation			
Patterson et al. (2006)	Consumer engagement	Absorption, dedication, interaction, vigour	Conceptual
Bowden (2009)	Consumer engagement process	N/A	Conceptual
*Sprott, Czellar, and Spangenberg (2009)	Brand engagement in self-concept	Emotional	Quantitative
Mollen and Wilson (2010)	Engagement	Affective, cognitive	Conceptual
Van Doorn et al. (2010)	Consumer engagement behaviours	Behavioural	Conceptual
Verhoef, Reinartz, and Krafft (2010)	Consumer engagement	Behavioural	Conceptual
Brodie et al. (2011)	Consumer engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Conceptual
Hollebeek (2011a)	Consumer engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Conceptual
Hollebeek (2011b)	Consumer-brand engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Conceptual
Gambetti, Graffigna, and Biraghi (2012)	Consumer-brand engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Qualitative
Kumar, Pozza, and Ganes (2013)	Consumer-brand engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Qualitative
Kaltcheva, Patino, Laric, Pitta, and Imparato (2014)	Customer engagement value	Experiential, social	Conceptual
Franzjak, Makarem, and Jae (2014)	Customer engagement	Behavioural, emotional	Conceptual
Hollebeek and Chen (2014)	Brand engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Conceptual
*Hollebeek et al. (2014)	Brand engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Conceptual
Jaakkola and Alexander (2014)	Consumer-brand engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Qualitative
Sarkar and Sreejesh (2014)	Consumer engagement behaviour	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Quantitative
*Vivek et al. (2014)	Active customer engagement	Behavioural	Qualitative
Wallace, Bull, and De Chernatony (2014)	Consumer engagement	Behavioural and cognitive	Quantitative
	Consumer engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective, social	Quantitative
II. Engagement with a(n) (online) brand community			
Wirtz et al. (2013)	Online brand-community engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Conceptual
Algesheimer et al. (2005)	Brand-community engagement	Motivational	Quantitative
Gummerus, Liljander, Weman, and Pihlström (2012)	Consumer engagement	Behavioural	Quantitative
Kuo and Feng (2013)	Brand-community engagement	Interactive	Quantitative
Habibi, Laroche, and Richard (2014)	Brand-community engagement	Practices	Qualitative
*Baldus et al. (2015)	Online brand-community engagement	Motivational	Quantitative
III. Engagement with other foci			
Higgins and Scholer (2009)	Consumer engagement with a goal pursuit	Sustained attention	Conceptual
Calder et al. (2009)	Consumer engagement with a communication medium	Experiential, social	Quantitative
Phillips and McQuarrie (2010)	Engagement with advertising	Behavioural, affective, immersive, transporting, identification	Qualitative
Scott and Craig-Lees (2010)	Audience engagement with an entertainment piece	Emotional	Quantitative
Calder, Isaac, and Malthouse (2013)	Consumer engagement with a product or service	Civic, identity, intrinsic enjoyment, social, utilitarian	Quantitative
*Schivinski et al. (in press)	Brand-related content on social media	Behavioural	Quantitative
IV. Engagement with multiple engagement foci			
Gambetti and Graffigna (2010)	Engagement	N/A	Review
Brodie et al. (2011)	Consumer engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective	Qualitative
Vivek et al. (2012)	Consumer engagement	Behavioural, cognitive, affective, social	Qualitative
Dessart et al. (2015)	Consumer engagement	Cognition, affect and behaviours	Qualitative

* Indicates scale development studies.

Table 2. Existing scales of consumer engagement.

Study	Sprott et al. (2009)	Hollebeek et al. (2014)	Vivek et al. (2014)	Baldus et al. (2015)	Schivinski et al. (in press)
Concept	Brand engagement in self-concept	Consumer-brand engagement	Customer engagement	Online brand community engagement	Consumer engagement with social media brand-related content
Definition	A generalised tendency to include brands as a part of the self-concept	A consumer's positively valenced brand-related cognitive, emotional and behavioural activity during or related to focal consumer-brand interactions	The level of the customer's (or potential customer's) interactions and connections with the brand or firm's offerings or activities, often involving others in the social network created around the brand, offering or activity	N/A	COBRA, a set of brand-related online activities on the part of the consumer that vary in the degree to which the consumer interacts with social media and engages in the consumption, contribution and creation of media content
Subject Focus/foi	Consumer Brand	Consumer Brand	Customer Brand/offering/activity	Consumer Online brand community	Consumer Social media brand-related content
Context(s) and brands under investigation (if applicable)	University setting; multiple brands	Social media settings; social media brands; Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn in three different studies	University settings (for exploratory work) and focus on the Apple brand as well as retail brands in two different studies	OBC members; panel respondents No brand or community information	Social media settings; multiple brands in each study
Dimensions	Affective (<i>inferred</i>)	Cognitive (cognitive processing), affective (affection) and behavioural (activation)	Cognitive (conscious attention), affective and behavioural (enthused participation) social (social connection)	11 motivations: brand influence, brand passion, connecting, helping, like-minded discussion, rewards (hedonic and utilitarian), seeking assistance, self-expression, up-to-date information, validation	Behavioural (consuming, contributing, creating)

The first issue warranting further research concerns the dimensionality of engagement. To date, existing empirical studies largely fail to recognise the multiple dimensions of engagement in spite of the conceptual and qualitative work on the topic. For example Sprott et al. (2009) provide a conceptualisation of consumer engagement, which is largely psychological and rests on affective items, and do not take into account the interactive nature of engagement and its behavioural and cognitive dimension (Hollebeek et al., 2014). Similarly, Baldus et al. (2015) introduce a measure of consumer engagement with an OBC that is based on motivations to interact rather than the interaction itself. Last, Schivinski et al. (in press) envisage engagement as only behavioural.

Further research concerning clarification of the dimensionality of consumer engagement seems warranted in order to achieve a strong and adequate conceptualisation and operationalisation. Although major studies on consumer engagement define it as multi-dimensional (Brodie et al., 2011; Hollebeek, 2011a, 2011b), and some empirical studies measure it as such (Hollebeek et al., 2014; Vivek et al., 2014), the dimensionality of consumer engagement remains unclear. There seems to be a level of disagreement on the number of dimensions of engagement as well as their definition or composition.

The second problem concerns the treatment of different engagement foci. Conceptual and qualitative studies show that consumers can be engaged with more than one entity (see Table 1). Conceptual and qualitative work argues that engagement with different foci can happen concurrently and affect one another in the same consumption-related context; for example in OBCs, consumer engagement comes about from the concurrent engagement with brand, online community and individual members of the community (Brodie et al., 2011; Dessart et al., 2015; Vivek et al., 2012).

Broader marketing scholarship supports the need to account for different foci of consumer engagement. For instance, recent research studies on consumer–brand relationships and brand communities have explicitly acknowledged that consumers can create relationships with other referents than brands, including individual members of the brand community and the brand community as a collective (Veloutsou, 2009; Veloutsou & Moutinho, 2009). The social identity theory also supports the multiplicity of foci in consumer research. Social identity is a concept whereby one perceives actual or symbolic belongingness to a group (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). Similar to consumer engagement, scholarship on consumer identification began with consumer–brand identification (e.g. Del Río, Vazquez, & Iglesias, 2001) but quickly widened to reflect the way consumers develop relationships (Johnson, Herrmann, & Huber, 2006). Brand community research embraces the concept of brand community identification and applies it in off-line (Algesheimer et al., 2005) and online (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2006) community settings.

Importantly, the coexistence and interrelationship of consumer–brand and consumer–community identification is now well recognised. Specifically, Marzocchi et al. (2013) show that consumer–brand and consumer–community identifications coexist in a brand–community setting, that they differ, and that their role in the formation of consumer–brand relationships is complementary yet different. Brand community identification activates affect more, whereas brand identification is based on cognitive processes (Marzocchi et al., 2013). The notion of coexistence also applies to other relationship marketing concepts in online contexts, extending, for example to brand commitment and brand community commitment (Kim, Choi, Qualls, & Han, 2008) and to research on

brand community integration (Stokbürger-Sauer, 2010). In essence, the need to study a multiplicity of foci of consumer engagement seems to be strongly supported by previous social identity, brand relationship and brand community literature.

In contrast to these considerations, the scales reported in Table 2 focus only on one type of engagement. The studies measure engagement with brands or brand-related content or activities. For example, although Hollebeek et al. (2014), Vivek et al. (2014) and Schivinski et al. (in press) view engagement as a multi-dimensional and interactive concept and model engagement with different brands, they do not account for other engagement foci. Neither scale seems easily applicable to other foci of engagement. Specifically, in Hollebeek et al. (2014), consumer engagement is captured with items pertaining to 'activation', which relates to 'usage' of a brand, and this concept cannot easily be extended to another focus, for example 'other community members', without losing its substantive meaning. In the same way, Vivek et al. (2014) notion of 'social dimension' is not very adaptable to all engagement contexts, and thus foci. To illustrate, most consumers tend to be physically alone when interacting online. Similarly, Schivinski et al. (in press) conceptualisation is solely related to the actions that consumers undertake when they are engaging with brand-related content, and the scale cannot be used for other foci of engagement, such as the brand or the brand community. A full appreciation of what it means to be engaged is made possible only by accounting for different foci of engagement (Brodie et al., 2013; Vivek et al., 2014).

To summarise, the examination of the different foci of engagement is important for several reasons. First, different foci often coexist in a given consumption context such as (online) brand communities (Stokbürger-Sauer, 2010). Second, one focus might prevail or precede another in the formation of relevant consumer relationship outcomes (Kim, Kim, & Wachter, 2013). Third, the different foci may play different and variable roles in shaping engagement in terms of the underlying psychological processes that may be activated (Marzocchi et al., 2013). For these reasons, it seems crucial to consider the multiplicity of different foci when studying consumer engagement.

Clearly, very few studies model consumer engagement in a comprehensive manner by accounting for different foci of engagement or providing a precise meaning to its dimensions (Brodie et al., 2011; Dessart et al., 2015) (see Table 1). Moreover, these efforts have largely concerned exploratory settings (see Table 2). Given the limited number of quantitative studies on consumer engagement (Brodie et al., 2013; Dessart et al., 2015; Hollebeek et al., 2014), this is probably not surprising. Nonetheless, the exploratory studies offer important insights concerning the implications of different foci for engagement, and it seems imperative that these lessons are incorporated into confirmatory designs (Brodie et al., 2013; Hollebeek et al., 2014). The current article thus provides a conceptual framework that attempts to clarify the conceptual dimensionality of consumer engagement prior to the development of a dual-focus scale.

The context of OBCs embedded in social networks seems to offer an excellent opportunity for such an examination (Brodie et al., 2013; Dessart et al., 2015). OBCs are defined as 'a specialised, non-geographically bound community, based upon social relationships among admirers of a brand in cyberspace' (Jang et al., 2008, p. 57). OBCs on social media are recognised as highly relevant to the study of consumer engagement because of their interactive and dynamic nature (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010), and also because they support the creation of multi-way relationships between consumers and

brands, and among consumers (Ouwensloot & Odekerken-Schröder, 2008; Stokbürger-Sauer, 2010). Because OBCs foster consumer engagement with multiple partners, including the brand and the community (McAlexander et al., 2002; Wirtz et al., 2013), they do represent excellent settings for the study of engagement with multiple foci (Brodie et al., 2013; Dessart et al., 2015). More specifically, this study focuses on OBCs embedded on the social network Facebook. Social networks are one of the most popular forms of social media (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010), and Facebook in particular is the preferred social network for consumers to engage with brands (Headstream, 2015).

Methodology

The reconceptualisation of consumer engagement follows a multi-stage process incorporating the guidelines by Churchill (1979). Specifically, the development work includes five phases. The explorative Study 1 offers conceptual insights into the meaning of engagement for consumers and marketing industry experts in the OBC context. These insights combined with a literature review generate a conceptual foundation for consumer engagement and a first pool of items. The second phase, Study 2, involves a panel of academic experts who ensure the face validity of the scale and trim the initial pool of items. The third phase, Study 3, relies on the collection of quantitative consumer data and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to test the factorial validity of scores from the consumer engagement scales. The next phase, Study 4, aims to ensure the nomological validity of the constructs by fitting the consumer engagement scales in a nomological network of relationships with brand commitment and online interaction propensity. Finally, in Study 5, the results are validated using another linguistic sample, signalling the cross-cultural group invariance of the scales. The methodological decisions undertaken in each one of these studies will be presented in each study.

Results

Study 1: dimensionality of consumer engagement and item generation

The aim of Study 1 is to deepen our understanding of the conceptual dimensionality of consumer engagement in OBC. This study provides the foundation for the development of a pool of relevant items to reflect these dimensions. It is not uncommon to use qualitative consumer and expert data to develop a scale (e.g. Brakus, Schmitt, & Zarantonello, 2009; Christodoulides, De Chernatony, Furrer, Shiu, & Abimbola, 2006; Walsh & Beatty, 2007), because such data tends to increase scale reliability (Churchill, 1979). In this instance, the exploratory stage involved 20 consumer informants who were members of OBCs embedded in social networks, as well as five marketing experts, specialised in social media marketing and engagement.

Using a snowball technique, the study informants were recruited directly through social networks until information saturation was reached (Creswell, 2007). In line with other OBC studies, the sampling sought highly engaged consumer informants (Cova, Pace, & Park, 2007; Muñiz & Schau, 2005) of diverse demographic profiles. Consumers were asked to select one or several brands that they followed on OBCs embedded in social networks and to explain their interactions with other consumers and brands in

these settings. Moving from their general experience to more specific questions, they were ultimately asked to describe their experience with a brand and OBC, which they considered being engaged with, as well as to provide their own definition of the concept of consumer engagement.

The expert panel included digital marketing consultants and marketing managers directly in charge of their brand's OBCs on social networks, and the interviews provided a range of industry perspectives. The expert informants provided evidence of extensive experience in OBC and social network management, with a strong consumer engagement orientation. They were asked to define and detail their understanding of consumer engagement and comment on how they enact and measure engagement in their company.

Interviews were carried out in person or via Skype, and were recorded, and transcribed. All transcribed data were content analysed and coded in line with existing procedures (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Based on a content analysis, [Appendix 1](#) provides an overview of the respondents, the brands they discussed, and key quotes that unveil the nature and dimensionality of consumer engagement. The analysis reveals that consumer engagement is a multi-dimensional concept and that the affective, cognitive and behavioural dimensions, as previously conceptualised (Brodie et al., 2011; Hollebeek, 2011a). However, informants added depth to the meaning of these dimensions and the analysis allowed for sub-dimensions to be extracted in light of the existing marketing literature.

To illustrate, the data evidences affective engagement and our informants use words such as 'bond', 'care' and 'emotion' when they speak of the brands or consumers they engage with. Affective engagement captures the summative and enduring level of emotions experienced by a consumer with respect to his or her engagement focus (Calder et al., 2013). The interviews show that the affective dimension can be broken down into enthusiasm and enjoyment. For example, the discourse of Anthony or Nigel (see [Appendix 1](#)) show that engagement is associated with a pleasurable state of enjoyment (Mollen & Wilson, 2010). Enthusiasm, however, is evident in the stories of Derek, who explained that he gets very excited about some of the brands he engages with. Similarly, Sam's experience supports the same notion of enthusiasm when he comments that the community is like a family to him and that he even feels 'too involved' with it. Consumer enthusiasm seems to be a strong component of affective engagement, which reflects the consumer's level of excitement and interest regarding the engagement focus (Vivek et al., 2014).

The second dimension of engagement exposes its cognitive aspect. The data bring clarity to the meaning of cognitive engagement, which has been defined as a set of enduring and active mental states experienced by the consumer (Hollebeek, 2011a; Mollen & Wilson, 2010). Industry experts from IronValley and SmartForest agree that gaining the attention of consumers is a key aspect of engagement. Sophia makes a strong point by explaining that when she feels engaged with a clothing brand, 'it's an engagement of the mind'.

The interview data strongly support the behavioural aspects of engagement. Consumer and expert informants frequently refer to activity and actions when characterising engagement in the OBC context. The notion of sharing information and being brand ambassadors is prominent in the data and so is the search for information

and the act of sanctioning or showing approval (Brodie et al., 2013). For instance, [Appendix 1](#) illustrates this aspect in the interviews with James, Liam and Judith. Overall, behavioural engagement encompasses the behavioural manifestations towards an engagement focus, beyond purchase, that result from motivational drivers (MSI, 2010; Van Doorn et al., 2010). These manifestations can take the form of sharing, learning and endorsing behaviours, which are all inherently social.

A common thread that cuts through all these dimensions and sub-dimensions concerns multiple foci of engagement. The interviews clearly show that engagement in the OBC is not restricted to direct engagement with the brand but also encompasses interactions with the community of OBC members. Consumers comment that they develop bonds and interactions with other consumers as a result of their common interest in the brand. Consumers ask questions to the community and learn from it (Claire), they value other's actions (James), enjoy interacting with them (Liam and Anthony), and consciously associate with them as a peer group interested in the same things (Steven).

Conceptual frame

Based on the results from Study 1 and taking into account lessons from existing literature (Brodie et al., 2011, 2013; Hollebeek, 2011a), this study defines consumer engagement as 'the state that reflects consumers' individual dispositions toward engagement foci, which are context-specific. Engagement is expressed through varying levels of affective, cognitive, and behavioural manifestations that go beyond exchange situations'. This definition conceptualises engagement as a state composed of explicit manifestations (Hollebeek et al., 2014; Vivek et al., 2014). The definition thus reflects Chandler and Lusch's (2015) focus on the internal dispositions of an actor, but contrasts with other views of engagement that qualify and measure it as a sum of motivational factors (see, for instance Algesheimer et al., 2005, on community engagement, and more recently Baldus et al., 2015, on OBC engagement). Accordingly, the engagement as defined here is composed of a sum of activities and the subsequent measurement of engagement aims to understand the nature of these mental, emotional and behavioural activities rather than to elaborate on the motivations (Baldus et al., 2015).

Consumer engagement is context-dependent (Hollebeek, 2011a) and individual consumers engage with different foci including brand, community, other individuals, advertisers or the social network. Based on previous literature and the results of Study 1, we postulate that in the context of OBC, the most relevant foci to consider are the brand and the community of other OBC members (Brodie et al., 2013; Dessart et al., 2015). This study refers to these two foci as 'brand engagement' and 'community engagement', respectively.

[Table 3](#) captures the dimensions and sub-dimensions of engagement as derived from the interviews and the review of extant literature. Based on these foundations, a first pool of items was developed including 47 items for community engagement and an identical 47 items for brand engagement.

Study 2: academic expert insight

The second study sought insight from academic experts to validate and refine the pool of items generated from the Study 1 data. Academic input is particularly valuable for

Table 3. Consumer engagement: definitions of the dimensions and sub-dimensions.

Dimensions and sub-dimensions	References
Affective: Summative and enduring level of emotions experienced by a consumer	Brodie et al. (2011)
Enthusiasm	Calder et al. (2013)
Intrinsic level of excitement and interest regarding the engagement partner	Hollebeek (2011a, 2011b) Mollen and Wilson (2010)
Enjoyment	Patterson et al. (2006)
Pleasure and happiness derived from interactions with the engagement partner	
Behavioural: Behavioural manifestations towards an engagement partner, beyond purchase, which results from motivational drivers	Brodie et al. (2011)
Sharing	Gummerus et al. (2012) Hollebeek (2011a, 2011b)
The act of providing content, information, experiences, ideas or other resources to the engagement partner	Van Doorn et al. (2010) Verhoef et al. (2010)
Learning	
The act of seeking content, information, experiences, ideas or other resources from the engagement partner	
Endorsing	
The act of sanctioning, showing support, referring resources shared by the engagement partner	
Cognitive: Set of enduring and active mental states that a consumer experiences	Brodie et al. (2013)
Attention	Brodie et al. (2011)
Cognitive availability and amount of time spent thinking about, and being attentive to, the engagement partner	Hollebeek (2011a, 2011b) Mollen and Wilson (2010)
Absorption	Patterson et al. (2006)
Level of consumer's concentration and immersion with an engagement partner	Vivek et al. (2012)

content validity and item clarity and conciseness (DeVellis, 2012). In total, 12 international academics were identified on the basis of the expertise and publication record in the fields of consumer engagement and/or OBC. They were contacted by email. In total, 9 of the 12 experts replied to the initial enquiry and were subsequently sent a link to an online questionnaire.

The questionnaire included the definitions from Table 4 and a list of items reflecting engagement with the brand and engagement with the OBC, respectively. Experts were invited to rate on a Likert scale from 1 (completely agree) to 5 (completely disagree) the extent to which they believed the item to be representative of a specific sub-dimension. They were also encouraged to comment on the clarity, conciseness and representativeness of the items. As a rule, all items unanimously rated as highly representative of the dimensions and sub-dimensions among experts were kept. Subsequent item modifications reflected three types of comments: redundancy in meaning with another item, inadequate capturing of the conceptual domain of

Table 4. CFA: Calibration sample.

Focus	Fit indices	Enthusiasm and enjoyment	Attention and absorption	Sharing, learning and endorsing
Community	Chi-square	10.37	6.92	71.28
	<i>p</i> -value	0.25	0.32	0.00
	df	8.00	6.00	32.00
	CFI	0.99	0.99	0.98
	TLI	0.99	0.99	0.98
	RSMEA	0.04	0.03	0.07
Brand	Chi-square	18.94	11.85	56.57
	<i>p</i> -value	0.01	0.07	0.01
	df	8.00	6.00	32.00
	CFI	0.99	0.99	0.98
	TLI	0.98	0.99	0.98
	RSMEA	0.08	0.06	0.06

consumer engagement or complexity of a statement. For instance the item 'the (brand community/brand) generates in me a feeling of excitement' was deemed to tap into a transient emotion that was not representative of the enduring aspect of engagement and thus was deleted. Another item 'I sanction the brand/brand community's behaviour', was deleted because 'sanction' seemed too complex to understand. Following the recommendations of the experts, 14 items were edited and 9 of them were deleted, resulting in two pools of 39 items.

Study 3: scale development, reliability and validity

The two pools of 39 items were edited to form an online questionnaire, using 7-point Likert scales anchored in 1 = completely disagree to 7 = completely agree. The questionnaire was first pre-tested on six OBC users to assess the overall quality of the instrument and then administered to a pilot sample of 101 undergraduate and postgraduate university students. As a result of the pre-test and pilot phases, a further four items were deleted from each pool, resulting in a 35 × 2-item questionnaire.

The questionnaire in English was then posted on OBCs for the main data collection. Sampling of OBCs followed a purposive (Kozinets, 1999), two-step approach by selecting first OBCs on Facebook that represented a wide range of product categories (i.e. official branded Facebook pages). The administrators of the pages were contacted and prompted to post the link to the survey on their page to ensure that the population of interest, that is the individual consumer members of an OBC, could then be reached. Although not adhering to the principle of random sampling, the approach adopted here seemed valid for accessing OBC populations on social networks, because they are inherently hard to reach (Preece, Nonnecke, & Andrews, 2004) and a reliable listing of OBCs that would form robust sampling frames seemed unobtainable (Wright, 2005).

A total of 326 Facebook page administrators were contacted using an introduction letter explaining the purpose of the study and content of the questionnaire. Once the questionnaire was posted on the page, it would be visible to its members. In total, 989 individuals started the questionnaire but only 448 cases were retained after a deletion of cases with more than 10% missing data. Missing data was addressed with the expectation maximisation method on SPSS (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2000). The final study sample shows considerable diversity and includes 56% male and 44% of female respondents majority of whom were younger consumers (43% were 25 to 34 years old, and 23% were within 35 to 44 category). A significant proportion of the sample, 48%, had a postgraduate degree and 28% lived in the United Kingdom. In general, the respondents were active Facebook users, with 34% of the sample reporting to be continually connected through push notifications, and most others admitting to log onto Facebook at least once every day. In terms of visits of the pages they like, the frequency varied with 15% admitting to visiting several times a week and 27% stating less than once a month.

The represented brand categories include travel (33%), food and beverage (20%), durable goods (15%), entertainment (13%), fashion and beauty (11%), services (5%) and others (3%). In total, 48 different pages were represented, including international brands such as Star Alliance, Apple, ASOS, or Porsche, but the sample also includes a large

number of local retailers. The number of responses per brand community varied ranging from 1 to 142.

The usable sample was randomly split into calibration and validation samples (Churchill, 1979; Gerbing & Anderson, 1988). Each sub-sample consisted of 224 consumers. The calibration sample was used to develop the scale, and the validation sample served to verify its dimensionality and establish its psychometric properties.

To verify that a factor structure underlies the data, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was carried out on the calibration sample, using the principal axis factor extraction with oblique rotation (Byrne, 2010). Two models were estimated: one for brand engagement and one for community engagement and on each occasion the EFA model included a full set of items for the three dimensions of the scale. The results largely support the expected structure of the whole measurement model. The KMO statistic of 0.94 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity for the correlation matrix ($\chi^2(528) = 8217.489$ ($p = 0.000$)) both support the existence of large correlations amongst the items of the brand engagement scale (Kaiser, 1974). The factor extraction suggests the existence of five factors: the affective items all load on the same factor, as well as the cognitive items on another factor and the behavioural items load on three different factors, adequately polarising the sharing, learning and endorsing items. This extraction cumulatively explains 83% of the average variance extracted. Following Hair, Bush, & Ortinau (2014), one offending 'learning' item with loading below 0.40 was deleted at that stage. For the community engagement scale, the KMO statistic of 0.95 and the Bartlett's test of sphericity for the correlation matrix ($\chi^2(528) = 9284.035$ ($p = 0.000$)) also support the existence of an underlying factor structure. Specifically, 85 cumulative percent of the average variance extracted is explained by a six-factor structure, which once again parts the expected dimensions as expected, and sub-dimensions as well, to some extent: the affective enjoyment and enthusiasm items load on two factors, respectively, the three behavioural sub-dimensions of sharing, learning and endorsing also load on separate factors, and the cognitive items on the other hand all load together on one factor. No factor with below-standard loading is detected here.

Although the extracted factor structure is not a perfect replication of the theorised one, there is a clear extraction of at least five factors for both brand and community engagement scale, which perfectly respects the dimensions split, as well as the behavioural sub-dimensions categorisation. As Hurley et al. (1997) suggest that EFA procedures are better used in conjunction with CFA, it is conducted to verify whether the expected factor structure can be confirmed and assess the representativeness of the items for each. The sub-dimensions of each dimension were correlated, as depicted in Figure 1. This first-order CFA initially exhibited a poor fit for each of the dimensions and items were deleted based on the validity and reliability indicators (Gerbing & Hamilton, 1996). The final model including 22 items showed an acceptable fit (see Table 4 for details).

The validation sample was then used to verify the psychometric properties of the scale. Similar to the previous step, a CFA was carried out, this time using the reduced 22-item model to validate the model on the first-order level (see Figure 1). The brand engagement model's shows acceptable fit with χ^2 at 326.10 ($p = 0.00$), RMSEA at 0.06, CFI at 0.97 and TLI at 0.96. For the community engagement model's χ^2 stood at 438.04 ($p = 0.00$), RMSEA at 0.07, CFI at 0.96 and TLI at 0.95.




Figure 1. First-order and second-order level CFA.

Considering convergent validity, all item loadings were significant and strong ranging from 0.80 to 0.99, as shown in Table 5. The scale has good reliability with Cronbach’s alphas and construct reliabilities all above 0.88 for each sub-dimension, exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2014). The values for average variance extracted (AVE) were all above 0.50 to indicate convergent validity for all sub-dimensions (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). To test for discriminant validity, we used the Fornell–Larcker approach and compared the respective AVEs with the squared inter-construct correlation. For each combination of the paired constructs, AVE value exceeded the squared correlations (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In addition, a chi-square difference test was used to test for discriminant validity. Following this method, models with fewer sub-dimensions were compared against models with more sub-dimensions (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988) to assess if all sub-dimensions were distinct and thus required. The *p*-values in this test all being below 0.05 indicated that the chi-square of the full seven sub-dimension model was significantly lower than all other nested models’ chi-squares, therefore indicating discriminant validity between sub-dimensions.

Having assured validity of the first-level measurement model, a CFA was then carried out at the second-order (i.e. dimension) level. Because each dimension represented a rather large number of items, in order to make the manipulation of the second-order level factors manageable, the aggregate score of each sub-dimension was computed to fit into the model, using the following formula:

Table 5. CFA first order: Validation sample.

Latent factors and items	Brand engagement		Community engagement	
	St loading	t-value	St loading	t-value
Enthusiasm	Alpha = 0.94, AVE = 0.79, CR = 0.92		Alpha = 0.93, AVE = 0.83, CR = 0.94	
I feel enthusiastic about (engagement focus – hereafter EF)	0.88	17.78	0.93	19.85
I am interested in anything about (EF)	0.90	17.08	0.87	21.78
I find (EF) interesting	<i>Deleted CFA</i>			
Enjoyment	Alpha = 0.95, AVE = 0.88, CR = 0.96		Alpha = 0.94, AVE = 0.85, CR = 0.94	
When interacting with (EF), I feel happy	0.97	22.6	0.91	24.04
I get pleasure from interacting with (EF)	0.99	23.69	0.92	24.8
Interacting with (EF) is like a treat for me	0.86	23.04	0.93	24.52
Attention	Alpha = 0.93, AVE = 0.87, CR = 0.93		Alpha = 0.97, AVE = 0.94, CR = 0.97	
I spend a lot of time thinking about (EF)	0.92	23.01	0.97	35.54
I make time to think about (EF)	0.94	24.85	0.97	32.64
Absorption	Alpha = 0.96, AVE = 0.87, CR = 0.96		Alpha = 0.98, AVE = 0.88, CR = 0.96	
When interacting with (EF), I forget everything else around me	0.94	23.86	0.94	29.9
Time flies when I am interacting with (EF)	0.96	25.01	0.96	33.08
When I am interacting with (EF), I get carried away	0.92	27.14	0.94	42.46
When interacting with (EF), it is difficult to detach myself	0.90	25.16	0.95	37.18
Sharing	Alpha = 0.94, AVE = 0.83, CR = 0.94		Alpha = 0.95, AVE = 0.88, CR = 0.96	
I share my ideas with (EF)	0.90	20.44	0.92	23.97
I share interesting content with (EF)	0.93	22.95	0.97	28.02
I help (EF)	0.90	19.56	0.92	29.56
Learning	Alpha = 0.90, AVE = 0.72, CR = 0.88		Alpha = 0.90, AVE = 0.76, CR = 0.90	
I ask (EF) questions	0.89	13.83	0.85	16.36
I seek ideas or information from (EF)	0.84	16.02	0.90	18.09
I seek help from (EF)	0.81	18.52	0.87	17.52
Endorsing	Alpha = 0.92, AVE = 0.74, CR = 0.92		Alpha = 0.95, AVE = 0.82, CR = 0.95	
I promote (EF)	0.88	15.59	0.93	22.16
I try to get other interested in (EF)	0.89	15.74	0.93	22.75
I actively defend (EF) from its critics	0.86	15.15	0.87	19.11
I say positive things about (EF) to other people	0.80	16.2	0.89	21.05

$$\text{Aggregate value of enthusiasm items} = 0.332 * BENT1 + 0.336 * BENT2 + 0.332 * BENT4$$

The weight of an item was calculated as the fraction of the path estimate of that dimension over the sum of the other relevant path estimates, in line with Yoo and Donthu's (2001) procedure.

CFA was thus carried out at the dimension level, where the aggregate score of the sub-dimensions were items, and the dimensions of which they were reflective, first-order factors. The brand engagement CFA performed adequately with a χ^2 of 26.78 ($p = 0.003$) with 10 degrees of freedom. RMSEA was 0.08, CFI is 0.99 and TLI was 0.98. The community engagement model exhibited a χ^2 of 15.03 ($p = 0.053$) with 8 degrees of freedom, and an RMSEA of 0.06, a CFI equal to 0.99 and a TLI of 0.98. The item loadings to their constructs on the validation sample ranged from 0.71 to 1.00, as shown in Table 6, so they were all significant.

Table 6. CFA second order: Validation sample.

Latent factors/items (aggregate scores)	Online brand engagement		OBC engagement	
	St loading	t-value	St loading	t-value
Affective	Alpha = 0.86, AVE = 0.76, CR = 0.86		Alpha = 0.83, AVE = 0.76, CR = 0.84	
Enthusiasm	0.94	14.60	0.74	13.74
Enjoyment	0.80	15.20	0.96	15.89
Cognitive	Alpha = 0.88, AVE = 0.78, CR = 0.87		Alpha = 0.90, AVE = 0.82, CR = 0.90	
Attention	0.89	16.49	0.88	19.97
Absorption	0.87	15.28	0.93	21.54
Behavioural	Alpha = 0.93, AVE = 0.76, CR = 0.91		Alpha = 0.93, AVE = 0.82, CR = 0.93	
Sharing	0.89	24.93	0.95	40.63
Learning	0.71	14.77	0.74	16.39
Endorsing	1.00	18.52	1.00	17.20

The CFA also yielded satisfactory goodness-of-fit values at the second-order level without aggregating the sub-dimensions item values. This CFA for the brand engagement scale had a χ^2 of 471.17 ($p = 0.000$) with 195 degrees of freedom, an RMSEA of 0.07, CFI of 0.95 and TLI of 0.95. The community engagement model exhibited a χ^2 of 657.14 ($p = 0.000$) with 204 degrees of freedom, and an RMSEA of 0.08, a CFI equal to 0.93 and a TLI of 0.92. The item loadings to their constructs on the validation sample ranged from 0.70 to 0.99, and were all significant. Model parsimony explains the slightly weaker performance of the full scales versus the scales with aggregated sub-dimensions values: more complex scales tend to perform worse than those with fewer items (Ruvio, Shoham, & Brencic, 2008).

The measurement model shows good reliability at the dimension level, with Cronbach's alphas all largely above the cut-off value of 0.70, and coefficients of reliability (CR) also ranging from 0.76 to 0.93. Convergent validity was also acceptable with AVE values above 0.50 for all three dimensions of each scale. Specifically, for the brand engagement scale, the AVE was 0.76 for the affective dimension, 0.78 for the cognitive dimension and 0.76 for the behavioural dimension. The corresponding values for the community engagement scale were 0.76, 0.82, and 0.82, respectively. In order to assess discriminant validity, a chi-square difference test was used, similar to the first-order CFA. Again, p -values were below 0.05, indicating that the chi-square of the full three-dimensional model was significantly lower than all other nested models' chi-squares. The model could not be further reduced without compromising fit, therefore indicating discriminant validity.

In the final step, discriminant validity was assessed across the two foci. Although the items were mirrored across brand and community engagement scales, it was important to show that measuring engagement with different foci actually generated different results. To this end, both scales were included in one CFA model to enable the calculation of the Fornell and Larcker (1981) test. The scales demonstrate acceptable level of discriminant validity: AVE values for brand engagement and community engagement were 0.84 and 0.86, respectively exceeding their squared correlation at 0.79. This result provides a strong support for discriminant validity of the different engagement foci.

Study 4: scale validation: nomological network

Study 4 aimed to assess the nomological validity of the scale by verifying that the scale behaved as expected in relation to other constructs. To this end, the study tested the psychometric properties of consumer engagement in relation to another brand relationship concept, brand commitment, as well as online interaction propensity. Brand commitment was chosen because consumer engagement is likely to strengthen the relationships that consumers have with a brand (Hollebeek, 2011a) and more specifically increase their likelihood to remain committed to this brand, therefore increasing their brand commitment (Van Doorn et al., 2010). This relationship has been conceptually explored but never validated empirically. Moreover, we know that consumers can develop high levels of brand commitment in OBC settings (Kim et al., 2008). Validating the empirical distinctiveness of brand engagement and brand commitment is important because they are relational constructs (Hollebeek, 2011a). Additionally, the OBC literature suggests that individuals with overall higher online interaction propensity are more likely to establish interactions with other members of a community (Wiertz & De Ruyter, 2007). For these reasons, brand commitment and online interaction propensity seemed adequate variables to test the nomological validity of the scale.

To test these relationships, the validation sample of Study 3 was used. To capture online interaction propensity, the scale developed by Wiertz and De Ruyter (2007) was used, with four items on a 7-point Likert scale. Brand commitment was measured using items adapted from El-Manstrly and Harrison (2013), who view brand commitment as an attitudinal concept capturing the consumer's intention to remain in a long-term relationship with the brand.

All variables were included in a CFA model in AMOS. The consumer engagement scale used the aggregate scores of the sub-dimensions to reduce the complexity of the model. The model demonstrated good fit, with χ^2 (53 df) = 129,706, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.96 and RMSEA = 0.08. The Cronbach's alpha values for each scale ranged from 0.90 to 0.93 and construct reliabilities ranged from 0.74 to 0.92. These values exceeded the threshold of 0.70, indicating the internal consistency of the scales. All factor-loading estimates were statistically significant and ranged from 0.71 to 0.97 ($p < 0.001$). The AVE and MSV values were also calculated for each sub-scale. The AVE values ranged from 0.60 to 0.75 and were greater than squared correlations of the underlying variables. These results support the nomological validity of the consumer engagement dual-focus scale and indicate that the new scale seems a reliable and valid instrument.

Study 5: cross-linguistic scale validation

Studies 1 to 4 used data collected from an English-speaking sample. To provide further evidence of the validity, data were collected on a French sample using procedures that ensured translation and administration equivalence (Douglas & Craig, 2006; Van De Vijver & Tanzer, 2004). Cross-cultural validation seemed warranted given the global nature of computer-mediated platforms such as OBCs and the need to embrace the increasingly diverse international audience (Jang et al., 2008). The French sample

showed good diversity and consisted of residents of France and Belgium, 49% of whom were male, largely younger respondents (with 51% between 25 to 34 years old). They tended to be well educated with 51% of sample reporting to have a postgraduate degree. Moreover, 36% of respondents received push notifications from Facebook. Their page visits were varied in terms of frequency but overall tended to be lower than the English sample. The represented brand categories included mainly food and beverage (55%), entertainment (12%) and fashion and beauty (18%) spanning a total of 20 different business pages, mainly of local nature.

The cross-cultural validity was examined with using invariance test in AMOS multi-group analysis function. The test compared the English sample (first 'group') with the French sample (the second 'group') at the configural, measurement and structural levels (Byrne, 2010). The consumer engagement scale developed in Study 3 was used as a baseline model and subsequently established as a configural model. To test for measurement invariance across groups, the factor loadings were constrained as equal and a cut-off criterion of the CFI difference between the configural and constrained model was set at $p = < 0.01$. The community engagement scale exhibited a CFI difference of 0.01 and the brand engagement scale 0.001, indicating invariance between the French and English samples. The same procedure of constraint was applied to the structural weights and covariances, with community and brand engagement scales having a CFI difference equal to 0.003. These values confirmed that there was full-group invariance on configural, measurement and structural levels between the English- and the French-speaking samples, constituting an indication of the applicability of the scale across languages.

Discussion and concluding remarks

This study offers a novel conceptualisation and operationalisation of consumer engagement as a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional construct. Building on current literature on engagement, the study provides a new conceptualisation of engagement and validates its operationalisation through a multi-stage procedure. The research is based on the context of OBCs, which lent itself particularly well to this investigation because of the multiple actors involved (McAlexander et al., 2002). The new scale of consumer engagement offers several contributions to existing knowledge.

Recognition and successful operationalisation of multiple engagement foci represent a major contribution of this study, answering earlier calls for a better measurement of engagement (Brodie et al., 2013). Prior literature in relationship marketing, brand communities and consumer identification research has argued that the recognition of different foci is important to avoid conflation of findings (Marzocchi et al., 2013). The variety of foci is particularly relevant in online contexts where the opportunities of interaction are magnified and at the same time subject to considerable complexity. For example, engagement with a Facebook brand page involves interactions with other users, the platform and the brand. By examining two different engagement foci, a brand and a community of consumers centred on the said brand, in a confirmatory setting, this study makes a pioneering attempt to measure consumer engagement in a uniform way, which may help to better understand engagement, its antecedents and outcomes. For instance, following Marzocchi et al.'s (2013) logic, consumer engagement might be a

strong predictor of brand trust and affect, whereas brand engagement could have stronger ties with brand loyalty.

Additionally, this article clarifies the dimensionality of engagement by proposing three dimension and seven sub-dimensions of engagement. The adopted conceptualisation supports the existence of the recognised three-dimensionality of consumer engagement with behavioural, cognitive and emotional engagement as dimensions (Brodie et al., 2011, 2013; Hollebeek et al., 2014), but enhances the understanding of these dimensions of engagement by adding detail in their conceptual and operational makeup.

To be more precise, in an effort to operationalise the behavioural aspect of engagement, this study elaborates on the notion that behavioural engagement is a level of energy, effort and time spend (Hollebeek et al., 2014) and clarifies its exact nature through three dimensions (sharing, learning and endorsing). Similarly, the conscious cognitive processing (Hollebeek et al., 2014) or degree of cognitive interest (Vivek et al., 2014) previously approached as one dimension is conceptually refined with two aspects of active mental processing: attention and absorption, which are more precise depictions of the engagement construct (Higgins & Scholer, 2009; Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). Lastly, the emotional aspect of engagement, which past research defines as a general degree of positive brand-related affect (Hollebeek et al., 2014) or 'zealous reactions' and feelings (Vivek et al., 2014), is here more precisely envisioned and operated through measures of enthusiasm and enjoyment, both recognised to be enduring forms of affect related to a specific focus (Schaufeli et al., 2002). These conceptual and methodological refinements contribute to construct clarity and rigorously add operational precision to the constructs previously identified by Hollebeek et al. (2014) and Vivek et al. (2014).

This article also offers broader theoretical implications regarding the role of consumer engagement in the interactive and social aspect of consumer-brand relationships. In recognising different engagement foci, the study supports prior research, which stresses the role of social interaction with and around a brand, supported by OBC (Fetscherin & Heinrich, 2015). This view parallels the notion that brands are social agents in brand-related communities (Quinton, 2013). In addition, the article contributes to the wider brand community and social network literature by providing a way to capture multi-dimensional interactive participation on these platforms (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2006; Gummerus et al., 2012; Kim et al., 2008).

Consumer engagement has significant and growing importance for the management of brands, and the study offers several managerial implications. The first set concerns multiple manifestations of engagement that include cognitive, affective and behavioural manifestations. Managers need to include all three dimensions when measuring engagement, not just behavioural site metrics. Importantly, the study also gives a more accurate understanding of engagement to managers to classify and target consumers with more relevant and appropriate content, based on their precise 'engagement profile'. For instance, consumers with high attention but little enjoyment might respond entirely differently to marketing efforts than low-attention, high-enjoyment users. An important managerial contribution concerns instrumentality: in order to manage or affect change in consumer attitudes, beliefs and behaviours, it is essential to accurately determine their root causes. In this respect, the distinction

between engagements with different foci seems of paramount importance: there is little point in changing brands when the root cause of disengagement may concern community features. To affect its change in engagement, it seems of upmost importance for practitioners to understand its precise makeup. For example, does product involvement affect engagements with the community and the brand? Similarly, considering outcomes of engagements, it seems of huge practical, if not theoretical, relevance if engagement with different foci leads to similar or different results in terms of loyalty or commitment. Although the latter have not been investigated in this study, it seems plausible that different sets of outcomes and different antecedents affect engagement with different foci differently. Futures studies may focus on the testing of such relationships.

Despite these contributions, this article has several limitations. First, the nature of OBCs embedded in social networks did not enable accessing a probabilistic random sample (Preece & Maloney-Krichmar, 2005), which has implications for the generalisability of the study's results. Once the survey was posted on the Facebook pages, the authors did not have control over who did or did not see it. Studies may try to avoid these sampling issues in future by using larger samples or through the application of randomised sampling.

Generalisability of the study's results could be further enhanced by extending the context to other social networks hosting OBCs, such as Twitter, Pinterest and Instagram. The scale is created to enable transferability across contexts and different types of platforms, which might generate different levels of engagement (Hollebeek et al., 2014). As online platforms keep growing in size, evolving in form and expanding in terms of marketing applications, it is expected that the number of consumer engagement options will grow exponentially.

Last, the results did not enable the ability to directly compare brands or brand categories because of a lack of consistency in the representation of each brand category. The aim in selecting OBCs was to represent a broad range of brand categories (Schau, Muñiz, & Arnould, 2009), which would span a majority of brand types present on Facebook. Diversity in brand types was favoured against an even representation of the product categories.

The study findings offer several new research avenues. Future studies may, for example embrace the socially constructed view of relationships presented here and examine other relationship foci. It is possible that others are present in an online context, for example it would be interesting to determine if the social network (Facebook, Twitter) or ecosystem potentially affects engagement and its outcomes as suggested by Breidbach, Brodie, and Hollebeek (2014). Second, because engagement is context specific, future investigations may look into engagement foci that seem of relevance to other contexts. Future research may draw on larger samples, focus on specific brand types, or control for product category effects in order to be able to statistically verify if there are differences of engagement levels or relationships for different types of foci. Additionally, an important point that was raised throughout the article is the instrumental role that this scale could play in better understanding the antecedents and outcomes of consumer engagement. We strongly advocate investigating the drivers and outcomes of consumer engagement with different foci in future research.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Laurence Dessart is Assistant Professor at KEDGE Business School in France. She completed her PhD at the University of Glasgow, focusing on consumer engagement in online brand communities. Her wider research interests are digital marketing, branding and consumer behaviour. Alongside her PhD, she has conducted several research projects in the area of online brand communities. Laurence has published in the *Journal of Product and Brand Management* and has presented her work at several conferences in Europe and the US, including the Academy of Marketing Science Annual conference.

Dr Cleopatra Veloutsou is a Senior Lecturer in Marketing at University of Glasgow and the editor of the *Journal of Product and Brand Management*. Her primary research concerns brand management and marketing organisation, focusing mostly on the questions of brand management structure and brand support. She is also interested in relationship marketing and marketing communications. Cleopatra has published over 35 articles in these areas and her papers have appeared, amongst others, in the *International Journal of Advertising*, the *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, the *European Journal of Marketing*, the *Journal of Marketing Management* and the *Journal of Business Research*.

Dr Anna Morgan-Thomas is a Senior Lecturer at the Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow. Positioned at the interface of marketing and information systems, her research is concerned with implications of digital objects for marketing practices. Her research examines antecedents and outcomes of digital transformation of marketing and international marketing function in small and medium enterprises. Her work has been published in the *International Marketing Review*, the *Journal of Business Research* and the *International Small Business Journal*.

References

- Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U. M., & Herrmann, A. (2005). The social influence of brand community: Evidence from European car clubs. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(3), 19–34. doi:10.1509/jmkg.69.3.19.66363
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411–423. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Dholakia, U. M. (2006). Antecedents and purchase consequences of customer participation in small group brand communities. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23(1), 45–61. doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2006.01.005
- Baldus, B. J., Voorhees, C., & Calantone, R. (2015). Online brand community engagement: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(5), 978–985. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.09.035
- Bowden, J. L. H. (2009). The process of customer engagement: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 17(1), 63–74. doi:10.2753/MTP1069-6679170105
- Brakus, J. J., Schmitt, B. H., & Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand experience: What is it? How is it measured? Does it affect loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 73(3), 52–68. doi:10.1509/jmkg.73.3.52
- Breidbach, C., Brodie, R., & Hollebeek, L. (2014). Beyond virtuality: From engagement platforms to engagement ecosystems. *Managing Service Quality*, 24(6), 592–611. doi:10.1108/MSQ-08-2013-0158
- Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Juric, B., & Ilic, A. (2011). Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 252–271. doi:10.1177/1094670511411703

- Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 105–114. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.029
- Bryson, C., & Hand, L. (2007). The role of engagement in inspiring teaching and learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(4), 349–362. doi:10.1080/14703290701602748
- Byrne, B. (2010). *Structural equation modelling with AMOS: Basic concept, applications and programming* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Calder, B. J., Isaac, M. S., & Malthouse, E. C. (2013). Taking the customer's point-of-view: Engagement or satisfaction? *Marketing Science Institute Working Paper Series 2013. Report no 13-102*.
- Calder, B. J., Malthouse, E. C., & Schaedel, U. (2009). An experimental study of the relationship between online engagement and advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23(4), 321–331. doi:10.1016/j.intmar.2009.07.002
- Chandler, J. D., & Lusch, R. F. (2015). Service systems: A broadened framework and research agenda on value propositions, engagement, and service experience. *Journal of Service Research*, 18(1), 6–22. doi:10.1177/1094670514537709
- Christodoulides, G., De Chernatony, L., Furrer, O., Shiu, E., & Abimbola, T. (2006). Conceptualising and measuring the equity of online brands. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22(7–8), 799–825. doi:10.1362/026725706778612149
- Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64–73. doi:10.2307/3150876
- Cova, B., Pace, S., & Park, D. J. (2007). Global brand communities across borders: The Warhammer case. *International Marketing Review*, 24(3), 313–329. doi:10.1108/02651330710755311
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Del Río, A., Vazquez, R., & Iglesias, V. (2001). The effects of brand associations on consumer response. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 18(5), 410–425. doi:10.1108/07363760110398808
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2015). Consumer engagement in online brand communities: A social media perspective. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 24(1), 28–42. doi:10.1108/JPBM-06-2014-0635
- DeVellis, R. F. (2012). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Douglas, S. P., & Craig, C. S. (2006). On improving the conceptual foundations of international marketing research. *Journal of International Marketing*, 14(1), 1–22. doi:10.1509/jimk.14.1.1
- El-Manstrly, D., & Harrison, T. (2013). A critical examination of service loyalty measures. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(15–16), 1834–1861. doi:10.1080/0267257X.2013.803139
- Fetscherin, M., & Heinrich, D. (2015). Consumer brand relationships research: A bibliometric citation meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(2), 380–390. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.06.010
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. doi:10.2307/3151312
- Franzak, F., Makarem, S., & Jae, H. (2014). Design benefits, emotional responses, and brand engagement. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 16–23. doi:10.1108/JPBM-07-2013-0350
- Gambetti, R. C., & Graffigna, G. (2010). The concept of engagement: A systematic analysis of the ongoing marketing debate. *International Journal of Market Research*, 52, 801–826. doi:10.2501/S147078531020166
- Gambetti, R. C., Graffigna, G., & Biraghi, S. (2012). The Grounded Theory approach to consumer–brand engagement: The practitioner's standpoint. *International Journal of Market Research*, 54(5), 659–687. doi:10.2501/IJMR-54-5-659-687
- Gerbing, D. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25(2), 186–192. doi:10.2307/3172650
- Gerbing, D. W., & Hamilton, J. G. (1996). Viability of exploratory factor analysis as a precursor to confirmatory factor analysis. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(1), 62–72. doi:10.1080/10705519609540030

- Gummerus, J., Liljander, V., Weman, E., & Pihlström, M. (2012). Customer engagement in a Facebook brand community. *Management Research Review*, 35(9), 857–877. doi:10.1108/01409171211256578
- Habibi, M. R., Laroche, M., & Richard, M.-O. (2014). Brand communities based in social media: How unique are they? Evidence from two exemplary brand communities. *International Journal of Information Management*, 34(2), 123–132. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.11.010
- Hair, J., Bush, R., & Ortinau, D. (2014). *Marketing research within a changing environment* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Headstream. (2015, September, 21). *Is your brand welcome on social media?* Retrieved from <http://www.headstream.com/blog/is-your-brand-welcome-in-social-media-research>
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Malhotra, E. C., Friege, C., Gensler, S., Lobschat, L., Rangaswamy, A., & Skiera, B. (2010). The impact of new media on customer relationships. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 311–330. doi:10.1177/1094670510375460
- Higgins, E. T., & Scholer, A. A. (2009). Engaging the consumer: The science and art of the value-creation process. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(2), 100–114. doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2009.02.002
- Hollebeek, L. (2011a). Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty nexus. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27(7–8), 785–807. doi:10.1080/0267257X.2010.500132
- Hollebeek, L. D. (2011b). Exploring customer brand engagement: Definition and themes. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19(7), 555–573. doi:10.1080/0965254X.2011.599493
- Hollebeek, L. D., & Chen, T. (2014). Exploring positively – versus negatively – valenced brand engagement: A conceptual model. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 62–74. doi:10.1108/JPBM-06-2013-0332
- Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28(2), 149–165. doi:10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002
- Hurley, A. E., Scandura, T. A., Schriesheim, C. A., Brannick, M. T., Seers, A., Vandenberg, R. J., & Williams, L. J. (1997). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis: Guidelines, issues and alternatives. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(6), 667–683. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199711)18:6<667::AID-JOB874>3.0.CO;2-T</u>
- Insead Knowledge. (2014, September 22). The future of social media ROI: From likes to relational metrics. Retrieved from <http://knowledge.insead.edu/marketing-advertising/the-future-of-social-media-roi-from-likes-to-relational-metrics-3290>
- Jaakkola, E., & Alexander, M. (2014). The Role of Customer Engagement Behavior in Value Co-Creation: A Service System Perspective. *Journal of Service Research*, 17(3), 247–261. doi:10.1177/1094670514529187
- Jang, H., Olfman, L., Ko, I., Koh, J., & Kim, K. (2008). The influence of on-line brand community characteristics on community commitment and brand loyalty. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 12(3), 57–80. doi:10.2753/JEC1086-4415120304
- Johnson, M. D., Herrmann, A., & Huber, F. (2006). The evolution of loyalty intentions. *Journal of Marketing*, 70(2), 122–132. doi:10.1509/jmkg.70.2.122
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. doi:10.2307/256287
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31–36. doi:10.1007/BF02291575
- Kaltcheva, D., Patino, V., Laric, A. V., Pitta, D., & Imparato, N. (2014). Customers' relational models as determinants of customer engagement value. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 55–61. doi:10.1108/JPBM-07-2013-0353
- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59–68. doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003
- Kim, J. W., Choi, J., Qualls, W., & Han, K. (2008). It takes a marketplace community to raise brand commitment: The role of online communities. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(3–4), 409–431. doi:10.1362/026725708X306167

- Kim, Y. H., Kim, D. J., & Wachter, K. (2013). A study of mobile user engagement (MoEN): Engagement motivations, perceived value, satisfaction, and continued engagement intention. *Decision Support Systems*, 56, 361–370.
- Kozinets, R. V. (1999). E-tribalized marketing?: The strategic implications of virtual communities of consumption. *European Management Journal*, 17(3), 252–264. doi:10.1016/S0263-2373(99)00004-3
- Kumar, V., Pozza, I. D., & Ganesh, J. (2013). Revisiting the satisfaction-loyalty relationship: Empirical generalizations and directions for future research. *Journal of Retailing*, 89(3), 246–262. doi:10.1016/j.jretai.2013.02.001
- Kuo, Y.-F., & Feng, L.-H. (2013). Relationships among community interaction characteristics, perceived benefits, community commitment, and oppositional brand loyalty in online brand communities. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(6), 948–962. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.08.005
- Labrecque, L. I., Vor Dem Esche, J., Mathwick, C., Novak, T. P., & Hofacker, C. F. (2013). Consumer power: Evolution in the digital age. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 27(4), 257–269. doi:10.1016/j.intmar.2013.09.002
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 103–123. doi:10.1002/job.4030130202
- Marzocchi, G., Morandin, G., & Bergami, M. (2013). Brand communities: Loyal to the community or the brand? *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(1/2), 93–114. doi:10.1108/03090561311285475
- McAlexander, J. H., Schouten, J. W., & Koenig, H. F. (2002). Building brand community. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(1), 38–54. doi:10.1509/jmkg.66.1.38.18451
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. New York, NY: Sage.
- Mollen, A., & Wilson, H. (2010). Engagement, telepresence and interactivity in online consumer experience: Reconciling scholastic and managerial perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, 63(9–10), 919–925. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.014
- MSI. (2010). *2010–2012 research priorities*. Boston, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Muñiz Jr., A. M., & Schau, H. J. (2005). Religiosity in the abandoned Apple Newton brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(4), 737–747. doi:10.1086/426607
- Ouwersloot, H., & Odekerken-Schröder, G. (2008). Who's who in brand communities – and why? *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(5/6), 571–585. doi:10.1108/03090560810862516
- Patterson, P., Yu, T., & De Ruyter, K. (2006, December 4–6). Understanding customer engagement in services. In Y. Ali and M. van Dessel (Eds.), *Advancing theory, maintaining relevance: Proceedings of ANZMAC 2006 conference*. Brisbane: ANZMAC.
- Peterson, T. (2015, October 8). Facebook unveils 'reactions,' emoji buttons that go beyond 'like': What the buttons mean for brands. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved from <http://adage.com/article/digital/facebook-starts-testing-ways-react/300816/>
- Phillips, B. J., & McQuarrie, E. F. (2010). Narrative and persuasion in fashion advertising. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(3), 368–392. doi:10.1086/653087
- Preece, J., & Maloney-Krichmar, D. (2005). Online communities: Design, theory, and practice. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 10(4), 00–00. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00264.x
- Preece, J., Nonnecke, B., & Andrews, D. (2004). The top five reasons for lurking: Improving community experiences for everyone. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 20(2), 201–223. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2003.10.015
- Quinton, S. (2013). The community brand paradigm: A response to brand management's dilemma in the digital era. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(7–8), 912–932. doi:10.1080/0267257X.2012.729072
- Ruvio, A., Shoham, A., & Brencic, M. M. (2008). Consumers' need for uniqueness: Short-form scale development and cross-cultural validation. *International Marketing Review*, 25(1), 33–53. doi:10.1108/02651330810851872
- Sarkar, A., & Sreejesh, S. (2014). Examination of the roles played by brand love and jealousy in shaping customer engagement. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 24–32. doi:10.1108/JPBM-05-2013-0315

- Schau, H. J., Muñiz, A. M., Jr., & Arnould, E. J. (2009). How brand community practices create value. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(5), 30–51. doi:10.1509/jmkg.73.5.30
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326
- Schivinski, B., Christodoulides, G., & Dabrowski, D. (in press). Developing and validating a scale to measure consumers' engagement with social media brand-related content. *Journal of Advertising Research*.
- Scott, J., & Craig-Lees, M. (2010). Audience engagement and its effects on product placement recognition. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 16(1–2), 39–58. doi:10.1080/10496490903571803
- Sprott, D., Czellar, S., & Spangenberg, E. (2009). The importance of a general measure of brand engagement on market behavior: Development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 46(1), 92–104. doi:10.1509/jmkr.46.1.92
- Stokbürger-Sauer, N. (2010). Brand community: Drivers and outcomes. *Psychology and Marketing*, 27(4), 347–368. doi:10.1002/mar.20335
- Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2000). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Van De Vijver, F., & Tanzer, N. K. (2004). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 47(4), 263–279. doi:10.1016/j.erap.2003.12.004
- Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research directions. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 253–266. doi:10.1177/1094670510375599
- Veloutsou, C. (2009). Brands as relationship facilitators in consumer markets. *Marketing Theory*, 9(1), 127–130. doi:10.1177/1470593108100068
- Veloutsou, C., & Moutinho, L. (2009). Brand relationships through brand reputation and brand tribalism. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(3), 314–322. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.05.010
- Verhoef, P. C., Reinartz, W. J., & Krafft, M. (2010). Customer engagement as a new perspective in customer management. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 247–252. doi:10.1177/1094670510375461
- Vivek, S. D., Beatty, S. E., Dalela, V., & Morgan, R. M. (2014). A Generalized Multidimensional Scale for Measuring Customer Engagement. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 22(4), 401–420. doi:10.2753/MTP1069-6679220404
- Vivek, S. D., Beatty, S. E., & Morgan, R. M. (2012). Customer engagement: Exploring customer relationships beyond purchase. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 20(2), 122–146. doi:10.2753/MTP1069-6679200201
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., & De Chernatony, L. (2014). Consumer engagement with self-expressive brands: Brand love and WOM outcomes. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 33–42. doi:10.1108/JPBM-06-2013-0326
- Walsh, G., & Beatty, S. E. (2007). Customer-based corporate reputation of a service firm: Scale development and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35(1), 127–143. doi:10.1007/s11747-007-0015-7
- Wiertz, C., & De Ruyter, K. (2007). Beyond the call of duty: Why customers contribute to firm-hosted commercial online communities. *Organization Studies*, 28(3), 347–376. doi:10.1177/0170840607076003
- Wirtz, J., Den Ambtman, A., Bloemer, J., Horváth, C., Ramaseshan, B., Van De Klundert, J., ... Aksoy, L. (2013). Managing brands and customer engagement in online brand communities. *Journal of Service Management*, 24(3), 223–244. doi:10.1108/09564231311326978
- Wright, K. B. (2005). Researching Internet-based populations: Advantages and disadvantages of online survey research, online questionnaire authoring software packages, and web survey services. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 10(3). doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00259.x
- Yadav, M. S., & Pavlou, P. A. (2014). Marketing in computer-mediated environments: Research synthesis and new directions. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(1), 20–40. doi:10.1509/jm.12.0020
- Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. (2001). Developing and validating a multidimensional consumer-based brand equity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 52(1), 1–14. doi:10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00098-3

**Appendix****Appendix 1: Study 1 informant information**

Consumer informant (pseudonyms)	Number of pages followed	Facebook communities discussed	Consumer engagement quote (brands)	Dimension (sub-dimension) expressed
Akim M, 27, Pakistan	87	Apple, Morgan Stanley	If you want to know what other people are saying, you need to go on Facebook because they [the brand] don't publish it on their website	Behavioural (learning)
Anthony M, 48, Belgium	34	Paul Smith, The Rolling Stones, Digital Wallonia	It is not necessarily important to have comments on what you posted, but it's a pleasure; it's a nice added value	Affective (enjoyment)
Claire F, 28, UK	23	Michael Kors, Liz Earle, Urban Outfitters	I got a pen burst in one of my favourite bags and I tweeted about it and asked if anybody had any 'at-home' remedies, and I got loads back	Behavioural (learning)
Derek M, 33, Canada	187	Apple, Shanghaiist	Being engaged, it is being excited about something, at least a little bit	Affective (enthusiasm)
Flora F, 23, Peru	67	Disney, KLM, Paypal	It just depends how much time you are willing to sacrifice for the group, how much time you spend thinking about it	Cognitive (attention)
Fred M, 40, Belgium	36	Louis Vuitton, David Bowie, The Rolling Stones	I follow people that I find remarkable, [who] are worth sharing, [who] are the best of their kind. This is what I get hooked on, what I really like	Affective (enthusiasm)
Helen F, 24, Greece	131	I Love Greece, Greek Radio	For instance, I sent a picture from their page to my friend, asking her 'Look at this, do you want to go there?'	Behavioural (sharing)
James M, 27, UK	122	Rangers Football Club, Bose	If you see that some comment got a lot of likes, it is as if the group has authenticated the words for you. It gives some sort of seal of approval, or quality seal	Behavioural (endorsing, learning)
Judith F, 28, Belgium	1007	Rotary Club, Yelp	I find it extremely difficult to stop reading on Facebook pages. It takes me hours, I have to check everything	Cognitive (absorption)
Laura F, 26, Germany	180	Designed by Humans, Bastille, Morphsuits	I'm liking things a lot; I'm the kind of person [who] sees someone and then, hop, I like it.	Behavioural (endorsing)
Liam M, 25, China	185	Vivienne Westwood, Glasgow Angling Center	I took part in the vote and then promoted the campaign on Facebook	Behavioural (endorsing, sharing)
Maria F, 25, Greece	523	Sticky, Pet Shelter	I love to like on Facebook	Behavioural (endorsing)
Matt M, 25, Belgium	319	Coldplay, Apple	I use the Facebook page to share experiences about visits	Behavioural (sharing)
Nigel M, 28, China	136	Starbucks	I'm quite sensitive to good, interesting or funny content	Affective (enjoyment)
Ray M, 28, Belgium	85	Brussels Airlines, Twitter	When they post a beautiful picture, which makes me feel great, then yes, there is something in there for me	Affective (enjoyment)
Sabrina F, 27, Belgium	167	Nutella, Bebat, Esprit, Rihanna	They reply to your requests; so they show that they care about what the consumers think [...] it creates an emotional bond	Cognitive (attention)
			They always have something fun to tell on their page [...] I really like this page because it represents what I enjoy in life	Affective (enjoyment)

(Continued)

Appendix 1: (Continued).

Consumer informant (pseudonyms)	Number of pages followed	Facebook communities discussed	Consumer engagement quote (brands)	Dimension (sub-dimension) expressed
Sam M, 29, Pakistan	89	Pakistan Cricket Board, M&S	[The people on the page] are like a family for me; I am too involved!	Affective (enthusiasm)
Sandra F, 27, Belgium	176	Esprit	When you become a fan of the page on Facebook, you always see information about the brand [...] you are updated about what they do	Behavioural (learning)
Sophia F, 23, Pakistan	104	The Body Shop, Zara, Prada, Gucci	I follow them to know which products they are launching it's an engagement of the mind!	Behavioural (learning) Cognitive
Steven M, 27, Belgium	225	Ricky Gervais, Norman fait des videos, Apple	I follow him because I am interested in what he does and his career; I pay attention to what he posts and unconsciously, I have created a community of friends who are interested in the same things	Cognitive (attention) Behavioural (sharing)
Expert informants (pseudonyms)		Consumer engagement approach		Underlying (sub) dimension
Agentia, Belgium		If I had to translate engagement into another word, I would say 'being an actor'		Behavioural
GreenSocial, India		Emotions are a great part of engagement. The extent of behavioural modification through branding also matters while measuring the depth of engagement		Affective
F-Industry, Belgium		With engagement, you start by thinking about it, then you really become active, up to the point of sharing the message		Behavioural
SmartForest, Belgium		Customer engagement is the 'level' of connection a customer has with a brand, which results in showing this publicly		Cognitive
IronValley, Canada		Engaging consumers means reducing the distance between your brand and them, and creating strong brand ambassadors		Behavioural