

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Connell, Cara, Marciniak, Ruth, Carey, Lindsey and McColl, Julie (2019) 'Customer engagement with websites: a transactional retail perspective. European Journal of Marketing.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/3622/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:
<https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1108/EJM-10-2017-0649>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorks.ac.uk



Customer engagement with websites: a transactional retail perspective

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-10-2017-0649.R4
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Customer engagement, Websites, Online retailing, Online consumer behaviour, Fashion, Environmental psychology

Customer engagement with websites: a transactional retail perspective

Abstract

Purpose – This paper focuses on customer engagement (CE) in the underexplored context of transactional retailing websites, providing insight into the drivers, **manifestations** and dimensionality of the construct. The website is viewed as a collection of environmental stimuli and focus is placed on identifying the website environmental cues that promote CE.

Design/methodology/approach – This focused study follows an exploratory research design. Twenty-two semi-structured interviews were conducted with one segment group: over 55 year-old female online shoppers in the most commonly purchased product category online, clothing. The Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) model forms the theoretical framework.

Findings – The unique findings identify that product-related **environmental cues** drive CE on a website suggesting that CE occurs at the level of the product as opposed to the website.

Research limitations/implications – **CE with websites exists beyond the customer-brand dyad with the website forming the third node in a triadic relationship between customer, brand (at level of the product) and website (at level of the product-related cues).**

Practical implications – This study **reveals the relationship between website environmental cues and the manifestation of CE providing insight to managers on how best to drive CE. Confirmation is provided that the website represents a vital touchpoint in the engagement journey of a retail customer.**

Originality/value – Websites as a focal object for CE are markedly under-researched. This study empirically supports the relevance of considering CE in this context **and reveals the influence online environments have on customer engagement.**

Keywords – Customer engagement, Websites, Online retailing, Online consumer behaviour, Environmental psychology, Fashion

Paper type – Research paper

1.0 Introduction

Customer engagement (CE) has been attracting increasing attention in recent marketing literature and has been said to generate enhanced sales growth, superior competitive advantage and profitability, consumer value and to promote emotional connections/attachment, customer loyalty, trust, commitment and satisfaction (Hollebeek, 2011b; Kumar et al., 2010a; Kumar et al., 2010b; Bowden, 2009). The rationale being that engaged customers contribute to the firm's marketing function (Harmeling et al., 2017) play a role in generating product or brand referrals and/or recommendations, contribute to new product or service development, co-create experiences (Hollebeek, 2013; Brodie et al., 2011a; Kumar et al., 2010a) and make purchases (Maslowska et al., 2016).

1
2
3
4
5 This has occurred against a backdrop of advances in online retailing. The online retail sector
6 has grown exponentially with yearly sales almost trebling since 2007, reaching **£59.7bn in**
7 **2017 (Mintel, 2018)**. In the UK, online retail now accounts for 18% of the total retail market
8 with sales predicted to rise (ONS, 2018). In the face of the value of the online market, as well
9 as the volume of competition that exists, many practitioners have begun to focus their efforts
10 on engaging customers online in a bid to attract and keep them (Solomon, 2016).
11
12
13
14

15
16 To date, extant research lacks consideration of customer engagement with transactional retail
17 websites. Jaakkola and Alexander (2014) note that CE research has considered the construct
18 in an online context, however, the principal locus for this research has been online brand
19 communities outwith the retailers' website, or the related domain of social media. This lack of
20 focus on websites is significant as not only is CE considered to be context specific (Dessart,
21 2017; Brodie et al., 2011b; Hollebeek, 2011b), but websites have been referred to as "the
22 cornerstone of internet activity for organisations" (Fill, 2013, p. 638) and is one of the few
23 communication channels that can be completely controlled by a brand (Melewar et al., 2017).
24 This article addresses the current gap in knowledge by focusing on CE in the context of
25 transactional retail websites, specifically, fashion retailing websites. We purposefully selected
26 this context as not only are clothing and fashion-related items the most commonly bought
27 product category online making up nearly **33%** of all online sales (Mintel, 2018), but it is a
28 highly competitive and volatile market sector where competitive advantage, which could be
29 achieved through CE, is advantageous. Through their websites, retailers can sell products,
30 provide information, facilitate two-way communication with customers, collect customer data
31 and promote their goods and services (Doherty & Ellis-Chadwick, 2009). With the website
32 representing such a critical customer touchpoint for brands, this paper argues that promoting
33 CE through this medium is a vitally important strategic objective for retailers.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 In addition, despite the growing scholarly attention that CE has generated, understanding
47 remains partial. Thus far, there is no consensus regarding a definition of CE, its
48 dimensionality i.e. what constitutes customer engagement, or the established concepts to
49 which it is related – including whether the act of purchase should be considered a
50 manifestation of CE or not. The theoretical lens through which CE should be viewed is also
51 uncertain. Among the various theories applied, some authors posit that the roots of CE lie in
52 the domain of relationship marketing (e.g. Dessart et al., 2016; Hollebeek, 2011b) or the
53 related theory of Service Dominant (S-D) logic (e.g. Bowden et al., 2017; Brodie et al.,
54 2011a), whilst others adopt a consumer behaviour perspective (e.g. Islam et al., 2018;
55 Gummerus et al., 2012). The theoretical perspective adopted when considering CE is
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important as a review of the existing body of literature reveals that it has a direct impact on its
4 conceptualisation. For example, under both relationship marketing theory and S-D logic, CE
5 is assumed to be highly interactive in nature (Hollebeek, 2011a) as customers are viewed as
6 active contributors to brand interactions opposed to passive receivers (Vargo & Lusch, 2008).
7 From a consumer behaviour perspective, CE is considered at the level of the individual and is
8 often conceptualised as a trait with the focus of scholars being on capturing the behaviour of
9 customers by tracing the process from individuals' motivations to act, to the act itself and to
10 the consequences of those actions (Islam & Rahman, 2016).
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 In studies that do consider the transactional retail website as the focal object of engagement,
18 Demangeot and Broderick (2016) adopt a dual relationship marketing and marketing
19 communications perspective of CE citing that the stimuli on a website activates both
20 communicational and relational responses in customers. Hyder and Bigné (2016) on the other
21 hand, consider CE from a technological perspective, concentrating on identifying how
22 customers engage online with websites as a digital medium. Whilst these studies provide
23 insight, we believe that a transactional retail website warrants a consumer behaviour lens to
24 be applied. A wide body of academic research (e.g. Hsieh et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2014) has
25 established that a website's atmospheric or environmental cues – defined as any constituent of
26 an online store within a shopper's perceptual field that stimulates the senses (Koo & Ju,
27 2010), influences the behaviour of online shoppers. With website stimuli activating
28 behavioural responses in customers and an established precedence to consider CE from a
29 consumer behaviour theoretical perspective, the adoption of this lens facilitates a
30 comprehensive understanding of the nature of CE in an online retail context. Specifically, by
31 considering the environmental cues on a website, **the nature of CE in this setting can be**
32 **determined.**
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 This study addresses three research areas: firstly, the question of how retail websites engage
45 customers **will be considered** with a specific focus on identifying the environmental cues that
46 stimulate CE. **Secondly, the nature of CE with websites will be established by identifying the**
47 **relationships between specific environmental cues and CE dimensions. Finally, insight will be**
48 **provided into the role of the website in a customer-brand engagement process.** Drawing from
49 literature on customer engagement and consumer behaviour and using an interpretive research
50 design, this article contributes to knowledge by **identifying the role of the website in the**
51 **customer-brand engagement dyad and establishing the nature of CE in this context** from a
52 hitherto unexplored theoretical perspective, namely consumer behaviour.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The paper is organised as follows. The next section proceeds with a literature review that
4 provides the theoretical background considering the construct of CE and the influence that
5 website environmental cues can exert on consumer behaviour. This is followed by an outline
6 and justification for the methodology and sampling frame adopted. The findings of the
7 empirical research are then reported. Finally the key theoretical and managerial implications
8 arising from the research are presented along with a future research agenda.
9
10
11
12

13 14 2.0 Customer engagement

15 2.1 The definitions, dimensionality and focal objects of CE

16 There is a lack of academic consensus regarding fundamental understanding of the definition
17 of CE and its dimensions. Some researchers posit that the construct is uni-dimensional e.g.
18 behavioural (e.g. Beckers et al., 2016; Dolan et al., 2016) whilst others take a multi-
19 dimensional perspective commonly viewing CE to consist of traditional tripartite cognitive,
20 affective and behavioural dimensions (e.g. Islam et al., 2018; Brodie et al., 2011a). Where
21 agreement is growing is that CE is context dependent (Dessart et al., 2016; Brodie et al.,
22 2011b). Some authors have attempted to provide general, empirically supported, definitions
23 of CE that can be applied to differing contexts or focal objects. Based on their systematic
24 literature review of CE research in marketing from 2005 to 2015, Islam and Rahman (2016)
25 define CE as:
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 *“The readiness of a customer to actively participate and interact with the focal object*
36 *(e.g. brand/organisation/community/website/organisational activity), [which] varies*
37 *in direction (positive/negative) and magnitude (high/low) depending upon the nature*
38 *of a customer’s interaction with various touchpoints (physical/virtual)” (p. 2019).*
39

40 Interestingly, Islam and Rahman’s (2016) definition of CE fails to outline its dimensionality,
41 suggesting the nature of CE is indeed context specific and facilitating the generalizability of
42 their definition. What can be established from this definition is that CE is a form of
43 interaction with a brand, be that a specific brand touchpoint or activity that can be positively
44 or negatively orientated. This is supported by the work of a number of scholars working in
45 this field (e.g. Bowden et al., 2017; Hollebeek & Chen, 2014). Furthermore, CE can exist at
46 different levels of magnitude or intensity at different points in time – a view that is again
47 shared (e.g. Brodie et al., 2011b; Hollebeek, 2011b). We are conscious of the fact that to our
48 knowledge no studies to date have empirically established the dimensionality of CE in the
49 context of transactional retail websites. It is our position that this should not be assumed and
50 in this respect this paper shall take the lead from the work of Hollebeek et al. (2014) and
51 Dessart et al. (2015) who specifically address the dimensionality of CE within the context of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 their empirical research. Regardless, this general definition provides a valid starting point for
4 the consideration of CE with transactional retail websites.
5
6
7

8 With regards to the focal object of CE, one important stream of research to have emerged is
9 that of engagement with a brand itself (e.g. Hollebeek et al., 2014; Hollebeek & Chen, 2014;
10 Sprott et al., 2009). Considering engagement within the customer-brand dyad, customer brand
11 engagement is defined as a customer's "cognitive, emotional and behavioural investment in
12 specific brand interactions" (Hollebeek, 2011a, p. 555) where the brand can be conceived to
13 include product (Patterson et al., 2006). This is relevant as the website represents a vital
14 platform for retailers in facilitating and encouraging customer 'interactions' at both a brand
15 and product level. To our knowledge the role that a website plays in stimulating engagement
16 with a retailer's brand/product has not been considered. This study addresses this gap by
17 identifying the environmental cues that stimulate CE and by determining the role of the
18 website in the customer-brand CE dyad.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 2.2 Customer engagement: theoretical considerations

28 The theoretical lens through which CE is viewed has also contributed to the wide-ranging and
29 differing views regarding its dimensionality, definition and the constructs that it relates to.
30 Table I presents the CE studies in which a clearly specified theoretical stance is adopted. The
31 theoretical background assumed is outlined in the table, as is the focal locus of the study, the
32 nature of the research (conceptual/empirical) and whether or not a specific theory (from the
33 wider theoretical background) was applied. The studies are listed in chronological order and
34 grouped by the theoretical perspective they have adopted. From Table I, it is clear that
35 relationship marketing and the related 'Service Dominant' (S-D) logic are the principal
36 theoretical lenses through which CE has been viewed.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The concepts of interactivity and co-creation are central to CE from an S-D logic perspective
45 (e.g. Hollebeek et al., 2016; Breidbach et al., 2014) and a number of customer actions have
46 been identified as reflecting these concepts including: word-of-mouth activity, customer-to-
47 customer interactions and/or blogging (Brodie et al., 2011a; Brodie et al., 2011b; van Doorn
48 et al., 2010). However, it is our position that these behaviours (and arguably the concept of
49 co-creation) are specific to the context of social media or online brand communities – as has
50 been the principal focus of CE research to date. On most transactional retailing websites
51 today, there is little to no opportunity for customer-to-customer interaction as brand-operated
52 online 'chatrooms' have been removed by brands in favour of major social media platforms.
53 Despite this, S-D logic has been broadly utilised as the theoretical prism through which to
54 explore CE.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 [INSERT TABLE I NEAR HERE]
6
7

8 Table I illustrates that a body of work has continued to consider CE from a consumer
9 behaviour theoretical perspective viewing behavioural expressions of customers as
10 manifestations of CE. These behaviours have been conceptualised to include a range of
11 actions such as contributing to word-of-mouth communications, providing recommendations
12 or referrals, blogging and engaging in interactions with brands (Dolan et al., 2016; Kumar et
13 al., 2010a). It is important to note that whilst these behaviours are the same as those identified
14 from a relationship marketing/S-D logic perspective, it is the identification of the action or
15 behaviour itself that is significant in the consumer behaviour perspective not the opportunity
16 for co-creation to take place. Kumar et al. (2010a) argue that a behavioural view would be
17 incomplete without the inclusion of customer purchase behaviour as they submit that
18 purchase is a key way in which customers can interact or 'engage' with a firm. However,
19 Harmeling et al. (2017) observe that the general consensus among scholars is that CE is a
20 customer's behavioural response to a firm outwith the core economic transaction.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 This paper adopts a consumer behaviour perspective to explore CE with transactional retail
31 websites. We posit that this theoretical lens will support the identification of **the website**
32 **environmental cues** that stimulate CE and facilitate **the nature of their influence to be**
33 **determined**. Academic research has established that website environmental cues impact
34 customers' behaviour confirming the applicability of adopting a consumer behaviour
35 perspective in this study. This research shall be considered in the next section.
36
37
38
39
40

41 2.3 Consumer behaviour activated by retail websites

42 The discipline of consumer behaviour is concerned with how individuals (customers) spend
43 their resources – which go beyond financial resources to include time and effort – on
44 consumption-related items and processes (Solomon et al., 2016). Technological advances,
45 including the internet, have prompted a wealth of academic research into 'online consumer
46 behaviour' with a key stream of research considering the impact that website environmental
47 cues have. Demangeot and Broderick (2007) posit that research participants must be viewed
48 as consumers. This distinction is significant as consumption activity is moderated by specific
49 consumer motivations and goals that often supersede the acquisition of products such as
50 entertainment (Demangeot & Broderick, 2007). In viewing retail website users as shoppers,
51 consumer perceptions of the website as a shopping environment, rather than its technical
52 properties as a computer-mediated interface, emerge. Thus, we view the website as a key
53 strategic customer touchpoint through which retailers can sell goods and engage customers
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and posit that to establish the nature of CE with websites, the website environmental cues that
4 elicit CE, and have hitherto been ignored, must be explored.
5
6

7
8 Much of the extant literature pertaining to online consumer behaviour is focused on the
9 influence of website environmental cues at an individual level. Few attempts have been made
10 to consider the website as a holistic environment. For example, Kim and Lennon's (2008)
11 examination of online product presentation formats (visual/picture and verbal/text) and their
12 influence on purchase intention identified the more important role of verbal product
13 information over visual presentation. More recently Kim and Lennon (2010) found that a high
14 level of product detail reduced customers' perception of risk and increased their satisfaction.
15 Hou et al. (2017) studied both quantitative and qualitative features of online reviews and
16 noted that both were important predictors for creating online sales. Whilst Wu et al. (2014)
17 determined that website layout stimulates emotional arousal and positive attitude toward a
18 website increasing purchase intention. Whilst these studies have shown that individual
19 features have a direct influence on consumer behaviour, they fail to capture the influence of a
20 website in its entirety. This study adopts the view that a retail website is the totality of its
21 individual environmental cues and as such we did not identify a particular cue for
22 investigation but instead established those that impact CE, as well as the nature of this
23 influence, through primary research.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Scholarly enquiry has shown that a customer's online shopping motivation affects customer
36 behaviour. A body of research conducted across all product categories posits that the
37 orientation of a customer's motivation – specifically whether an individual is driven by
38 hedonic or utilitarian considerations, influences individual customer behaviour and attitudes
39 towards online shopping (e.g. Bridges & Florsheim, 2008; Childers et al., 2001). According
40 to Babin et al. (1994) hedonic motivations reflect a customer's desire for entertainment and
41 emotional connection and can be indicated by increased levels of arousal, involvement,
42 escapism and fantasy. As such they typically seek a pleasurable and entertaining experience
43 from a website (Wolfenbarger & Gilly, 2001). Utilitarian motivations are typically goal-
44 orientated and functional and involve a cognitive and rational response (Babin et al., 1994). In
45 contrast, utilitarian online shoppers are concerned with product-related features such as
46 quality, price and usability and have been found to be influenced by the task-related features
47 of a website (Wolfenbarger & Gilly, 2001).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 3.0 Theoretical framework for the study (S-O-R)

57 The Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) model (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974) has formed
58 the basis for many studies conceptualising behavioural intention. The S-O-R model posits that
59
60

1
2
3 the retail environment contains stimuli (S) that cause reactions or internal states in customers
4 or 'organisms' (O), that generate a response (R) that is often behavioural. Whilst
5 environmental psychology research has long established that retailers can manipulate the
6 atmosphere of the shopping environment to affect shopper reactions, it was Eroglu et al.
7 (2003) who validated the relevancy of the framework to online shopping.
8
9

10
11
12 Despite the lack of tactile, olfactory and often auditory cues online, Eroglu et al. (2003)
13 identified the existence of online 'atmospherics' that led to affective and cognitive internal
14 states and resulted in a behavioural customer response. These were categorised into high and
15 low task-relevant cues (Eroglu et al., 2003). High task-relevant cues refer to all the verbal and
16 visual content on a website that facilitates the task of shopping and therefore are central to the
17 achievement of utilitarian customer motivations. This includes product descriptions, product
18 images, price, terms of sale, delivery and returns policies, and website navigation aids. Low
19 task-relevant cues refer to the components of the website inconsequential to the completion of
20 the shopping task such as the colours, fonts, borders, patterns, animations, entertainment and
21 images other than product images. Ultimately, these are cues that support the hedonic
22 motivations of shoppers (Eroglu et al., 2003). Advances in technology since Eroglu et al.'s
23 (2003) seminal work, have resulted in new website features that can be added to those lists.
24 Product demonstration videos, customer reviews and live chat facilities can all be categorised
25 as high task-relevant cues. New low task-relevant cues include links to the retailer's pages on
26 social media platforms (termed social media 'plug-ins') and editorial content such as online
27 magazines and blogs.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 The S-O-R model has been utilised as a framework through which to operationalize the
40 construct of CE (Islam & Rahman, 2017; Demangeot & Broderick, 2016; Claffey & Brady,
41 2014; Mollen & Wilson, 2010). Significantly, both Demangeot and Broderick (2016) and
42 Mollen and Wilson (2010) consider CE with websites and identify cognitive and affective
43 organismic states and behavioural responses as typifying an engaged customer condition.
44 However, neither of these studies explicitly consider nor identify the environmental stimuli or
45 website cues that promote CE, nor do they identify the precise manifestations of these
46 cognitive, affective or behavioural CE responses. **By applying the S-O-R model at the level of**
47 **each identified cue (S), the customer's internal state (O) leading to customer engagement (R)**
48 **is determined. We posit that the individual application of the S-O-R framework facilitates a**
49 **level of consistency in the consideration of each cue – which is important as the cues differ**
50 **substantially in nature (i.e. verbal/visual etc.).** Empirical confirmation of the dimensionality
51 of CE with websites is also provided.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.0 Methodology

In light of the lack of extant research on CE with websites and based on the premise that CE is context specific (Dessart, 2017; Brodie et al., 2011b; Hollebeek, 2011b), this study took an overall exploratory approach within an interpretative research design. In-depth semi-structured interviews were used to establish the website cues that drive CE as well as the nature of this engagement. Purposive sampling was conducted with participants selected on the basis of their age, gender and prior experience of shopping for fashion online: specifically, over 55 year-old women who have browsed and bought fashion and fashion-related items online. The propensity among researchers from all disciplines to use student samples as they are accessible, convenient and cost effective has attracted widespread criticism due in large part to the limited generalizability such samples afford (Bello et al., 2009). In fact, authors considering online customer shopping behaviour have identified the use of student samples as a key limitation within the extant body of research, citing the fact that students are most likely to be more computer literate than other age groups, more comfortable shopping online (Doherty & Ellis-Chadwick, 2010; Demangeot & Broderick, 2007) and therefore not representative of the population as a whole. Supporting this, Chiu et al. (2014) found that older customers possess significantly more barriers to shopping online than their younger counterparts; thus suggesting that if they experience CE with a website then younger customers will too. In response to this, our study identified over 55 year-old women as the target sample. According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) the over-55s is the fastest growing demographic group in the UK leading market analysts Mintel to identify this customer group as one that represents a significant opportunity for fashion retailers (Mintel, 2016). Women were selected as they are significantly more likely than men to shop for fashion online (Mintel, 2017). Having prior experience of browsing and buying fashion online was an important criterion as we believe that for participants to contribute effectively, they need to have had experience of shopping for fashion online so that they might then offer insight into whether this has led to a state of CE.

To the best of our knowledge, no qualitative research has been conducted on CE in the context of retail websites and so this study will address this gap. This qualitative approach answers calls from Demangeot and Broderick (2016) who identified a need, through their own study considering website CE, for interpretative research considering how website attributes stimulate CE.

Twenty-two semi-structured interviews lasting on average 46 minutes were conducted with over 55 year-old women (specific age range being 55-78) who are members of a charity fundraising social group for women approaching and in retirement, based in a Scottish city.

1
2
3 Belonging to the same social group could be perceived as a niche sample frame, and
4 potentially viewed as a limitation of this study, thus it is important to highlight that the group
5 only share a common aim – this being to raise money for charity, in all other respects i.e.
6 level of education, income, careers/previous careers etc., the group are fragmented.
7
8
9

10
11 Participants were instructed to recall a fashion retailing website with which they felt they had
12 experienced CE when browsing or buying and were asked to describe their thoughts, feelings
13 and behaviours when in this engaged state. Initially, the research questions were open-ended
14 with participants encouraged to offer their own definition or particular expressions of CE with
15 a retail website. Further into the interview, participants were provided with Islam and
16 Rahman's (2016) definition of CE adopted by this study and terms drawn from literature
17 related to the cognitive, affective and behavioural aspects of CE, thus allowing their
18 experiences to be probed further and in line with previous academic enquiry. In particular,
19 respondents were asked to identify specific environmental cues that promoted their
20 engagement with the website (e.g. product images). The data was coded and recoded four
21 times and themes were identified in line with Bryman's (2016) procedure for conducting
22 thematic analysis which involved elaborating the codes into themes where possible; refining
23 the themes and testing the propositions; examining links and connections between the themes;
24 and writing up findings. Data saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was sought and achieved
25 after 22 semi-structured interviews.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 5.0 Findings

37
38 This section presents the findings of this study. Individual website environmental cues that
39 incite CE are identified and the nature of this relationship, in terms of the dimensions of CE
40 that are stimulated and their manifestations, are determined. The influence that a customer's
41 internal motivation exerts on the nature of CE they experience is also captured. Confirmation
42 is provided that CE with transactional retail websites comprises of cognitive, affective and
43 behavioural dimensions. Furthermore, the findings allow conclusions to be drawn on the role
44 that the website plays in the customer-brand engagement dyad.
45
46
47
48
49

50 5.1 Drivers of customer engagement with retail websites

51
52 Our analysis identifies that both internal and external influences drive CE. The orientation of
53 a customer's motivation, specifically, whether a customer is driven to shop online to fulfil
54 utilitarian or hedonic needs, is the internal influence that drives CE, whilst individual
55 environmental cues of the website act as external influences.
56
57
58
59

60 5.1.1 Internal influences

1
2
3 Interestingly, despite the fact that fashion and clothing as a product category prompts
4 customer behaviours that are driven by strong emotional as well as psychological responses
5 (Goldsmith & Flynn, 1992), our research revealed the majority of respondents were motivated
6 to shop online for utilitarian reasons:
7
8

9
10 *[Shopping online] “is a problem-solving thing for me when I need. For instance if I needed a*
11 *coat I would look for ‘black coat’ and I would actually type that in, I wouldn’t leisurely*
12 *browse”.* Customer 4.
13
14

15
16
17 What is significant from Customer 4’s response is that instead of visiting particular websites
18 based on prior knowledge of the retailer or brand, interaction with a retailing website is driven
19 at the level of the product. It is, in fact, the search for a particular product that leads the
20 customer to interact with a retailer’s website in the first place. This behaviour was
21 commonplace among respondents:
22
23
24

25
26 *“I will go on lots of different websites to look for say, a pair of trousers and I will look at just*
27 *that. I won’t look at anything else”.* Customer 1.
28
29

30
31 There is a precedent in scholarly enquiry considering brand engagement to consider product
32 as a brand (e.g. Patterson et al., 2006). However, the findings of this study suggest that in
33 terms of CE with transactional retail websites, there is a clear distinction between the brand
34 and product with CE occurring at the level of the product. In their study considering websites
35 as a vehicle for communicating brand value, Mollen and Wilson (2010) define brand
36 engagement as “the cognitive and affective commitment to an active relationship with the
37 brand as personified by the website” (p. 5). The implications drawn from this study with
38 regards to retail websites are that online retailers would need to foster an active relationship
39 between customers and their *products* to achieve and maintain brand engagement:
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 *“If I have seen something I like on Google or say a department store’s website, I often then*
47 *will go and look at that brand’s own website to see what else they have like it. If I like what*
48 *else they have then I’ll go back to that [brand’s] website in future”.* Customer 7.
49
50
51

52
53 These results extend the findings of Dwivedi (2015) who proposes that product category
54 involvement – i.e. the extent to which the consumer perceives a product category to meet
55 their particular needs, interest and values – has a positive impact on the manifestation of
56 brand engagement. However, we posit that it is not involvement with the product category in
57 general but with individual products that leads to positive CE with a brand, with a process
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationship existing between the two. This was equally as evident in the accounts of
4 participants who reported being engaged with a particular retail brand:
5
6

7
8 *“I often look at Next’s website because I have bought a lot from them and I know what size*
9 *fits me and I like their style”*. Customer 9.
10

11
12 Here CE with the retailer is driven and maintained at the level of the brand’s products with an
13 interplay evident between customer engagement with the product and with the brand – a
14 phenomenon that Bowden et al. (2017) refer to as a ‘spillover effect’. Thus, it is prior positive
15 engagement with the product that ‘spills over’ and drives continued engagement with the
16 brand.
17
18
19
20

21
22 Whilst most respondents were motivated to shop online for utilitarian reasons some did
23 express hedonic motivations such as the pursuit of enjoyment or leisure.
24

25
26
27 *“I shop for fashion online every Friday night with a glass of wine. I don’t always buy but I do*
28 *look”*. Customer 9.
29

30
31 Table II outlines the website environmental cues that were identified by participants as
32 stimulating their engagement.
33

34
35
36 [INSERT TABLE II NEAR HERE]
37

38 39 5.1.2 External influences

40 Website environmental cues, specifically high task-relevant cues, which capture all the verbal
41 and verbal content on a website that facilitates the task of shopping (Eroglu et al., 2003), are
42 the external driver of CE. Product images, product information regarding washing
43 instructions and fabric composition, i.e. the percentage mix of fibres the fabric contains,
44 product demonstration videos, ease of navigation around the website and customer reviews
45 are all cues on a website that customers engaged with regardless of whether they possessed
46 utilitarian or hedonic motivations (see Table II). Significantly, all customers demonstrated a
47 lack of interest in any design or entertainment features of a retail website. This finding
48 contradicts the seminal work of Eroglu et al. (2003) who posit that low task-relevant cues e.g.
49 colour, font, music – or the components of a website that are surplus to the achievement of
50 the shopping task – support the goals of hedonic shoppers. In fact, the findings of this study
51 indicate that low task-relevant cues play no role in driving CE. This is reflected by Customers
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 9 and 17 who, despite predominantly exhibiting hedonic motivations for shopping, were not
4 interested in any form of entertainment offered by a retail website:
5
6
7

8 *“For me it is product driven, I’m not looking for an experience from the website at all”.*
9 Customer 9.
10

11
12
13 *“The websites I like are plain and simple. I can’t stand things that pop-up, pop-down, move*
14 *about, play music”.* Customer 17.
15

16
17 Demangeot and Broderick (2007) identified that online shopping environments were
18 perceived in a more cognitive manner than offline environments and as such, it may be that -
19 hedonic considerations such as the design of a website, wield little influence. It may also be
20 the case that in the intervening years since Eroglu et al.’s (2003) seminal work, expectations
21 of websites have changed and customers now simply assume a good level of aesthetic quality.
22 An observation that was made by a number of respondents was that most websites today look
23 the same, opting for white backgrounds and clear, easy to read fonts, so it may be that Eroglu
24 et al.’s (2003) low task-relevant cues are no longer relevant as they have become uniform.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 5.2 The impact of website environmental cues on the manifestation of CE

32 Analysis of the interviews confirms that CE is composed of three dimensions: cognitive,
33 affective and behavioural. This not only provides support for the conceptualisation of CE as a
34 construct consisting of these tripartite dimensions (e.g. Bowden et al., 2017), but importantly
35 deepens our understanding of them in this context as the rich online shopper data reveals that
36 individual website environmental cues (as identified in Table II) activate particular
37 dimensions of CE. This relationship is somewhat modified by the internal motivation
38 (utilitarian/hedonic) of the customer and is captured in Table III.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The cognitive dimension captures CE as an active state of mind experienced in relation to the
46 focal object of engagement (Islam & Rahman, 2016; Vivek et al., 2012) and is manifested in
47 the form of attention (Bowden et al., 2017; Dessart et al., 2015) on the part of the customer
48 defined as the dedication of cognitive activity on a particular stimulus (Huang, 2003). The
49 affective dimension of CE with websites relates to the emotions a customer will experience in
50 relation to their focal object (Vivek et al., 2012) and is captured by a state of positive affect
51 (Bowden et al., 2017; Hyder & Bigné, 2016). The behavioural CE dimension reflects the
52 resources – in terms of energy, effort and/or time – that a customer expends on interactions
53 with the focal object (Hollebeek, 2011a) and is expressed by activation (Bowden et al., 2017;
54 Hollebeek, 2011a).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 [INSERT TABLE III NEAR HERE]
6
7

8 Website environmental cues were found to stimulate cognitive and/or affective dimensions of
9 CE. Participants expressed their cognitive CE through statements that revealed their
10 concentrated thought (Huang, 2003) when interacting with a website cue:
11
12

13
14 [Cue: Fabric composition/product specification] *“I don’t like fitted clothes I like oversized*
15 *clothes so I’ll look at how it sits on the model and I’ll go down to the product description and*
16 *see if it uses words like ‘long’, ‘floating’, ‘oversized’ and I’ll also try and identify the fabric*
17 *because I don’t like tight fabric with Lycra in them”*. Customer 13.
18
19

20
21
22 Affective CE was captured in interviewees’ expressions of positive emotion (e.g. like,
23 enjoyment, excitement) induced by a website cue:
24
25

26
27 [Cue: Product images] *“There are some websites that stage their clothes really well. Like*
28 *they’ll have a model wearing summer holiday clothes next to a pool. It helps me get in the*
29 *mood for holiday”*. Customer 15.
30
31

32
33 The internal utilitarian/hedonic motivation of the customer was found to have a modifying
34 effect on these relationships albeit a limited one as the engagement dimensions stimulated by
35 each website cue were the same for all customers. What was impacted was the order in which
36 the dimensions were stimulated when both cognitive and affective facets were experienced
37 (indicated by the arrows in Table III). For example, hedonically motivated customers reported
38 an initial affective reaction (such as liking or excitement) on seeing product images and
39 product demonstration videos that engaged them, which was followed by a cognitive response
40 (such as the move to find out more information):
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 [Cue: Product demonstration video] *“With clothes it is really good to see how they will fit.*
48 *You can almost learn more about how the fabric will look from them than reading what it is*
49 *made of as not all polyester, for instance, is the same”*. Customer 9.
50
51

52
53 Customers motivated by utilitarian means also experienced both cognitive and affective
54 reactions to product image and video cues but in contrast the cognitive response was
55 stimulated first:
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *“I would say that to be engaged with a website it is first of all functional; like ‘I need*
4 *something new for work’, but once you are on that website I think it becomes an emotional*
5 *experience as you start to feel as there’ll be things you like and things that you don’t like”.*
6
7 Customer 2.
8
9

10
11 Despite the fact that Customer 2 does not explicitly refer to the website environmental cues
12 that she interacted with, CE existing at the level of the product which is stimulated by the
13 product-related cues of a website is strongly evidenced here. Further support for this is
14 provided from Customer 14:
15
16

17
18
19 *“If I am looking for something that is it; I will keep searching until I find it, all night if I have*
20 *to”.* Customer 14.
21
22

23
24 The sentiment expressed here points to the existence of a level of duality in terms of product
25 engagement. Here, the respondent is displaying high levels of product engagement (with the
26 desired product) whilst encountering, perhaps vast quantities of, non-engaging products.
27 Hollebeek et al. (2014) observe that customers exhibit “a substantially lower willingness to
28 exert cognitive, emotional or behavioural activity” (p. 152) with non-engaging brands. These
29 results support this in the context of non-engaging products as respondents recounted
30 experiences of “scrolling through” (Customer 3), “scanning” (Customer 14) or “glancing
31 over” (Customer 8) non-engaging products when shopping online. Interestingly, whilst these
32 customers were exhibiting limited cognitive, affective or behavioural responses with much of
33 the products they encountered, they were in fact simultaneously experiencing a heightened
34 state of engagement with their desired product and the resultant search.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Navigation, specifically ease of navigation, was the only environmental cue identified by
44 participants that can be classified as relating to the website (opposed to the product). The
45 importance of ease of navigation in inducing positive customer attitudes to online shopping
46 among both utilitarian and hedonic customers has been documented (Childers et al., 2001) but
47 the role that it assumes in stimulating, or perhaps even more vitally maintaining, CE is
48 revealed here:
49
50
51

52
53
54 *“When the website doesn’t take you to where it should – argh!”.* Customer 12.
55
56

57
58 Difficulty in navigating a website was found to induce intensely negative cognitive and/or
59 affective responses among the research participants with sentiments of irritation, annoyance,
60

1
2
3 frustration and impatience all expressed and typically leading to disengagement with the
4 website.
5
6
7

8 5.3 Behavioural CE responses

9 A number of behavioural responses of CE with retail websites were identified outwith the
10 core economic transaction (Harmeling et al., 2017). These include: leaving the website with
11 the intention to return at a later date, leaving the website to visit the retailer's physical stores
12 (if available), engaging with the retailer through other communication channels and engaging
13 with loyalty schemes. Disengagement or a less permanent but related state of 'dormancy' was
14 identified as being part of the CE process.
15
16
17
18

19
20 A number of participants highlighted that they would actively choose to leave the website in
21 favour of visiting that retailer's physical store:
22
23

24
25 *"I like to touch and feel and see the fabrics and clothes – and try them on. So I'll do a lot of*
26 *research online and then I'll physically go and look at them in stores".* Customer 1.
27
28
29

30 Whilst this particular behaviour could be attributed to the nature of the product category
31 under discussion, as research has established that apparel consumers will often base their
32 purchasing decisions on sensory interaction with the products (Underhill, 1999), this response
33 suggests that CE with a website is part of a wider nomological network or 'ecosystem'
34 (Maslowska et al., 2016; Breidbach et al., 2014). Here the customer remains in a state of CE
35 after they have left the website as they choose to interact again with the product, and arguably
36 with the brand (Hollebeek et al., 2014), through another touchpoint. This is further supported
37 by the other behavioural responses identified such as interacting with other communication
38 channels. For example, several participants reported signing up to direct marketing mailing
39 lists and seeking out discounts or catalogues from that retailer. Interestingly, very few
40 participants considered social media as a further communication channel through which to
41 interact with retailers, and even less actually used them:
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *"I use Facebook, Pinterest, What's App; but not to look at shops or clothes. Absolutely not. It*
51 *is for keeping in touch with family and friends".* Customer 18.
52
53
54

55 The age of the interviewees in this study may factor in this result as worldwide research has
56 established that younger consumers – specifically those aged 18-24 – are more likely to
57 interact with brands on social media than other age groups (Statista, 2014). Interestingly, a
58 number of participants did state that advertisements on social media would often prompt them
59
60

1
2
3 to visit a retailer's website indicating that interaction, and potentially CE, would flow from
4 social media platforms to the website **within an engagement ecosystem**:
5
6
7

8 *"I often see something on Facebook and I like the look of it so I'll go to the website".*

9 Customer 3
10

11
12 The majority of participants indicated that they viewed participation in loyalty schemes as a
13 manifestation of CE:
14
15

16
17 *"For me to be engaged with a retailer it would be where I have been on their website and*
18 *signed up for their emails or their [loyalty] cards. I've signed up then, I'm engaged, I'm in".*

19 Customer 3.
20
21
22

23
24 The relationship between CE and customer loyalty has been empirically supported in a
25 number of studies (e.g. Fehrer et al., 2018; Hollebeek, 2011a), which is not surprising in light
26 of the relationship marketing lens commonly adopted in the consideration of CE.
27 Interestingly, this study also supports the link from a consumer behaviour perspective, as here
28 customers perceive the act of enrolling onto brand loyalty schemes as a manifestation of CE.
29
30
31

32
33 **These unique findings indicate that the website, physical stores, direct marketing, social**
34 **media and loyalty schemes all act as 'engagement platforms' (Breidbach et al., 2014) for**
35 **retailers within a broader nomological engagement network.**
36
37
38

39
40 The final behavioural responses identified were dormancy or disengagement. In their article
41 considering CE in virtual brand communities, Brodie et al. (2011b) distinguish between the
42 states of dormancy and disengagement based on permanency defining dormancy as, "a
43 temporary state of inactive, passive engagement by individual consumers who have been
44 more actively engaged" (p. 110). Disengagement, on the other hand, is indicative of a longer
45 lasting or more permanent cessation of engagement (Brodie et al., 2011b). In the context of
46 transactional retail websites, analysis of the data reveals that dormancy is reflective of
47 customers who leave a website accompanied by a neutral cognitive and affective internal state
48 whereby the states of **attention and positive affect** are not present but neither are any
49 negatively-valenced states:
50
51
52

53
54 *"If I don't see anything I'll leave there and go elsewhere... usually back to the search engine*
55 *search and look at the other items that have come up". Customer 16.*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In this aspect it differs from customers leaving the website with the active intention to return,
4 as positive cognitive and emotional states of CE were found to be present in these cases. In
5 contrast, disengagement is often accompanied by negative thoughts and emotions on the part
6 of the customer:
7
8
9

10
11 *“To be disengaged with a website would be to be irritated or frustrated by it. I would just*
12 *come off and I wouldn’t go back. Why bother?”* Customer 18.
13
14

15
16 The negative cognitive and affective responses expressed here mirror the findings of Bowden
17 et al. (2015) who established a link between the non-fulfilment of customers’ hedonic or
18 utilitarian motivations and the construct of disengagement. From the analysis of the results in
19 this study, it is evident that to reach a state of dormancy or disengagement, a customer would
20 bypass positive cognitive and affective CE states, experiencing either neutral or negatively-
21 valenced states. Essentially, this means that should a customer’s internal state not be
22 expressed positively, they would move straight to a state of dormancy (accompanied by a
23 neutral response) or disengagement (accompanied by a negative response) thereby leaving the
24 website. This process could take just a matter of minutes to occur.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 It is important to note that when asked to identify the consequences of their engagement with
33 a retail website respondents repeatedly discussed the act of purchase:
34
35

36
37 *“I would say I’ve been engaged with the White Stuff website – I’ve bought a lot from them”.*
38 *Customer 14.*

39
40 *“[To be engaged] is to buy something”.* Customer 21.

41
42 *“When I actually part with my money”.* Customer 7.
43

44
45 In line with the general scholarly consensus that CE exists “beyond financial patronage”
46 (Harmeling et al., 2017, p. 316) this study has focused on individuals’ behavioural responses
47 outwith the core economic transaction. However, the results here suggest that this is not
48 necessarily reflective of the thoughts, feeling and opinions of customers.
49
50
51

52 6.0 Discussion

53 6.1 Theoretical implications

54
55 This study examines customer engagement in the underexplored context of transactional retail
56 websites. Responding to calls for further research into CE with individual customer
57 touchpoints (Fehrer et al., 2018) and specifically for interpretivist research into CE with
58 websites (Demangeot & Broderick, 2016), this study employed a qualitative methodology
59
60

1
2
3 consisting of 22 in-depth semi-structured interviews. The findings identify the website
4 environmental cues that stimulate CE and provide insight into these relationships.
5 Furthermore they indicate that the website represents an important CE touchpoint within a
6 wider CE ecosystem.
7
8
9

10
11 The findings reveal that CE with transactional retail websites can be conceptualised as a
12 phenomenon beyond dyadic customer-brand interactions, supporting the work of Fehrer et al.
13 (2018). However in contrast, this study finds that it is not other customers who form the third
14 node of a triadic relationship structure in this context but the website itself. There is a body of
15 CE research that draws on the principles of social psychology to consider the influence of
16 customer-to-customer interaction on the engagement process (e.g. Dessart et al., 2015; Brodie
17 et al., 2011b). The unique findings of this study identify the effect that website environmental
18 cues have on the manifestation of CE and confirm the validity of considering CE through the
19 lens of environmental psychology. Previous CE studies that have considered the website as
20 the focal object of engagement (e.g. Demangeot & Broderick, 2016; Claffey & Brady, 2014;
21 Mollen & Wilson, 2010) have not considered the website at the level of its individual
22 environmental cues, which is significant as this study has revealed and empirically supported
23 that this is where CE with a retail website occurs. Specifically, within the customer-brand-
24 website triadic relationship, CE with a retail brand exists at the level of the product and is
25 driven by the website at the level of high task-relevant cues (Eroglu et al., 2003).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 This finding is significant, as recent scholarly enquiry has begun to move from considering
37 CE with single focal objects, such as an online brand community (Dolan et al., 2016) to
38 multiple engagement objects such as the online brand community *and* the brand (e.g. Bowden
39 et al., 2017; Gummerus et al., 2012) in order to capture a holistic understanding of the
40 phenomenon. This has been facilitated by the vast body of work that considers CE in the
41 context of social media/online brand communities whereby it has been empirically
42 established that the brand community as well as the brand itself, represent focal objects for
43 CE. In contrast the limited consideration of websites in CE research has meant that until now
44 the focal engagement objects relevant to a website i.e. product/high task-relevant website
45 environmental cues, have not been revealed.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Considering product as a focal object of CE presents considerable theoretical implications for
55 the development of understanding of the construct, as much of the extant literature considers
56 CE within the broader context of firms moving from a product-centric to a customer-centric
57 approach (e.g. Sashi, 2012; Vivek et al., 2012). It is this that has largely driven the theoretical
58 lenses through which CE is viewed, with the principal perspectives adopted being relationship
59
60

1
2
3 marketing and S-D logic – where service provision rather than just goods is central (Vargo &
4 Lusch, 2004). The results of this study suggest that this product-to-customer paradigmatic
5 shift may not best foster CE; that said, it is important to highlight that the results do not
6 indicate that the marketing function requires a re-orientation back solely around product.
7 Instead, we posit that this study has highlighted the importance of product, particularly in
8 light of the positive ‘spillover effect’ (Bowden et al., 2017) of CE from product to brand, and
9 suggest this represents a potentially important locus for future CE research.
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 Analysis lends support for the conceptualisation of customer engagement existing as part as
17 of a wider nomological network or ‘ecosystem’ (Maslowska et al., 2016; Breidbach et al.,
18 2014). The positive behavioural CE responses whereby customers leave the website to visit a
19 physical store or engage with the retailer via alternative touchpoints such as other
20 communication channels or loyalty schemes, indicates that CE with the website is one
21 component in a dynamic, non-linear process (Fehrer et al., 2018; Brodie et al., 2011a). The
22 fact that engaged customers were found to leave the website with the intention to return at a
23 later date further confirms the conceptualisation of the process of CE to be an iterative one
24 (Brodie et al., 2011b). However, whilst this study provides support for previous
25 understanding of the construct it also provides unique insight into a previously underexplored
26 touchpoint in a customer’s engagement journey with a retail brand – the website. The website
27 represents a vital component of the current (and conceivably, future) ‘omni-channel’
28 shopping environment where customers can engage with retail brands through a multitude of
29 channels: website, physical retail stores, social media, apps, direct marketing etc. (Verhoef et
30 al., 2015). Fehrer et al. (2018) posit that “practitioners should pay attention to specific
31 ‘engagement’ antecedents and consequences when implementing engagement ecosystems”
32 (p. 605) highlighting the importance of understanding the nature of CE with each customer
33 touchpoint. A body of research has emerged identifying the nature of CE along with the
34 drivers and consequences in various online contexts – most commonly social media or online
35 brand communities (Maslowska et al., 2016), but this extant research has failed to consider
36 the transactional retail website in any depth. Acknowledging that CE is context specific
37 (Dessart et al., 2016), this study provides valid and important insight into CE with this retail
38 setting that could be drawn upon alongside findings from CE studies with other focal objects
39 e.g. social media, as part of a holistic approach to understanding the engagement ecosystem in
40 an omni-channel retail business structure.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 The results of this study have allowed us to draw a clear distinction between a dormant state
58 of CE and disengagement (Brodie et al., 2011b) revealing the valence of the cognitive and
59 affective state accompanying each. Whilst both involve a behavioural response i.e. leaving
60

1
2
3 the website, dormancy is accompanied by a neutral cognitive and affective response.
4 Disengagement is typified by exiting with a negative internal state such as annoyance or
5 frustration. Following our support for the existence of an engagement ecosystem we posit that
6 to fully capture an online retail customer's engagement journey, dormancy and
7 disengagement must be considered alongside the positive behavioural expressions of CE with
8 a website.
9
10
11
12
13

14 6.2 Managerial implications

15 Analysis has shown that in the context of transactional retail websites CE occurs at the level
16 of the product rather than the brand with CE with the former potentially leading to the latter.
17 Whilst the positive relationship between product involvement and brand engagement had
18 been previously identified (Dwivedi, 2015) the process nature of this relationship whereby
19 brand engagement occurs as a direct consequence of product engagement had not. The
20 implications of this are significant for managers as they suggest that product, and product-
21 related website cues, should be viewed as a gateway to brand engagement and as such,
22 represent an opportunity for retail brands to communicate their personality and/or values.
23 Brand managers today already use their company website to communicate this information
24 (Melewar et al., 2017) but often this occurs away from product listings/cues. The results here
25 suggest that incorporating brand messages where possible into the high task-relevant cues
26 found to stimulate CE, could better foster brand engagement. For example visual and verbal
27 cues should capture the brand's values, image and ethos. Furthermore, when incorporating
28 brand messages managers should draw upon the findings regarding the CE dimension
29 triggered by each cue.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The results reveal that the website represents an important touchpoint within a larger
42 engagement ecosystem and that online retail customers will move between touchpoints (e.g.
43 website, social media, physical stores, loyalty schemes) throughout their engagement
44 'journey' with a brand. We mirror the recommendations of Breidbach et al. (2014) that brand
45 managers should configure their operations to create the ideal engagement ecosystem to foster
46 CE. Nevertheless, we would extend this. The unique findings of this study have identified the
47 triadic nature of CE with a transactional retail website with a relationship existing between
48 the customer, the brand (at the level of the product) and the website (at the level of
49 environmental cues). Studies conducted in other contexts have similarly revealed multiple
50 focal engagement objects – but these differ. For example in their consideration of online
51 brand communities, Bowden et al. (2017) identify CE existing between the customer, the
52 brand and other customers. Therefore we posit that the engagement ecosystem should be
53 viewed as a macro level construct with each customer touchpoint representing a micro
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 element requiring its own individual in-depth consideration and configuration. To this end we
4 suggest that managers use our research in conjunction with that conducted in other contexts
5 e.g. social media, to effectively foster CE with each touchpoint in a brand's engagement
6 ecosystem.
7
8
9

10 11 6.3 Limitations and further research

12 This research represents a first attempt to conceptualise CE with retail websites from a
13 consumer behaviour perspective, drawing upon environmental psychology theory to identify
14 the website environmental cues that drive CE. However, we acknowledge that limitations
15 exist and recommend some areas of further research. The relatively small sample size could
16 be viewed as a limitation of this study and whilst the point of data saturation (Glaser &
17 Strauss, 1967) was reached, future study could work towards validating these results through
18 further empirical research.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Future research could replicate this study in other product categories or across all product
26 categories. Equally, the consumer demographic group considered could be widened. Over 55
27 year-old women were selected for this study due to their propensity to shop for fashion online
28 and to avoid the criticisms levelled at studies that employ student samples to consider
29 computer-related interfaces due to the high level of their computer literacy. Whilst we believe
30 that this has provided a good foundation for the understanding of CE with retail websites, a
31 wider demographic sampling frame may offer new insights into the phenomenon.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The findings show that CE with a transactional retail website occurs within a wider ecosystem
39 of engagement consisting of various off and online customer touchpoints of which the
40 website is one. The findings suggest that physical stores, direct marketing, social media and
41 loyalty schemes represent other key touchpoints for retail customers, and whilst social media
42 has been a commonly considered context within CE enquiry, we posit that the others warrant
43 further dedicated consideration to identify the process through which they foster CE. With the
44 development of technology making omni-channel retailing inevitable (Brynjolfsson et al.,
45 2013) this provides a rich backdrop to future enquiry.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Within extant CE literature there is a lack of agreement regarding whether the act of purchase
53 is a manifestation of CE. Some academics view purchase as a key method through which
54 customers can engage with a firm (Kumar et al., 2010a) others posit that CE takes place
55 outwith the core economic transaction (Harmeling et al., 2017; van Doorn et al., 2010). Yet
56 the act of purchase forms a vital stage in the shopping process (Kim & Eastin, 2011; Chen &
57 Chang, 2003) and to omit this from consideration through the lens of customer engagement
58
59
60

1
2
3 may mean that engagement with the full shopping journey is not being captured. Moreover,
4 the respondents of this study repeatedly referred to purchase as a manifestation of their
5 engagement with a retailer and their website. Therefore we posit that further consideration of
6 the relationship between purchase and CE is important to the development of understanding
7 of CE in a retail context. Nevertheless, from this vantage point, this study has contributed
8 important insight not only into the underexplored area of CE with websites, but into online
9 consumer behaviour in general.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Babin, B., Darden, W. and Griffin, M. (1994), "Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 644.
- Beckers, S.F.M., Van Doorn, J. and Verhoef, P.C. (2016), "Economic outcomes of customer engagement: Emerging findings, contemporary theoretical perspectives, and future challenges", in Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D. and Conduit, J. (Ed.), *Customer Engagement: Contemporary issues and challenges*, Routledge, Abington, Oxon, pp. 21-52.
- Bello, D., et al. (2009), "From the Editors: Student samples in international business research", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 361-364.
- Bowden, J.L.H., Gabbott, M. and Naumann, K. (2015), "Service relationships and the customer disengagement - engagement conundrum", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 31 No. 7-8, pp. 774-806.
- Bowden, J.L. (2009), "The Process of Customer Engagement: A Conceptual Framework", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 63-74.
- Bowden, J.L et al. (2017), "Engagement valence duality and spillover effects in online brand communities", *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 877-897.
- Breidbach, C.F., Brodie, R. and Hollebeek, L. (2014), "Beyond virtuality: from engagement platforms to engagement ecosystems", *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 592-611.
- Bridges, E. and Florsheim, R. (2008), "Hedonic and utilitarian shopping goals: The online experience", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 61 No. 4, pp. 309-314.
- Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Juric, B. and Ilic, A. (2011a), "Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research" *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 252-271.
- Brodie, R.J., Ilic, A., Juric, B. and Hollebeek, L. (2011b), "Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 105-114.
- Bryman, A. (2016), *Social research methods*, 5th ed, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Brynjolfsson, E., Hu, Y.J. and Rahman, M.S. (2013) "Competing in the age of omnichannel retailing", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Cambridge, MA.
- Chen, S. and Chang, T. (2003), "A descriptive model of online shopping process: some empirical results", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*. Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 556-569.
- Childers, T.L., Carr, C.L., Peck, J. and Carson, S. (2001), "Hedonic and utilitarian motivations for online retail shopping behavior", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 77 No. 4, pp. 511-535.
- Claffey, E. and Brady, M. (2014), "A model of consumer engagement in a virtual customer environment", *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 325-346.

1
2
3 Demangeot, C. and Broderick, A.J. (2007), "Conceptualising consumer behaviour in online
4 shopping environments", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 35
5 No. 11, pp. 878-894.

6
7 Demangeot, C. and Broderick, A.J. (2016), "Engaging customers during a website visit: a
8 model of website customer engagement", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution
9 Management*, Vol. 44 No. 8, pp. 814-839.

10
11 Dessart, L. (2017). "Social media engagement: a model of antecedents and relational
12 outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 33 No. 5-6, pp. 375-399.

13
14 Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C. and Morgan-Thomas, A. (2016), "Capturing consumer
15 engagement: duality, dimensionality and measurement", *Journal of Marketing Management*.
16 Vol. 32 No. 5-6, pp. 399-426.

17
18 Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C. and Morgan-Thomas, A. (2015), "Consumer engagement in online
19 brand communities: a social media perspective", *The Journal of Product and Brand
20 Management*, Vol. 24 No.1, pp. 28.

21
22 Doherty, N.F. and Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2009), "Exploring the drivers, scope and perceived
23 success of e-commerce strategies in the UK retail sector", *European Journal of Marketing*,
24 Vol. 43 No. 9/10, pp. 1246-1262.

25
26 Doherty, N.F. and Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2010), "Internet retailing: the past, the present and the
27 future", *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*. Vol. 38 No. 11, pp. 943-
28 965.

29
30 Dolan, R., Conduit, J. and Fahy, J. (2016), "Social media engagement: a construct of
31 positively and negatively valenced engagement behaviours", in Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D.
32 and Conduit, J. (Ed.), *Customer Engagement: Contemporary issues and challenges*,
33 Routledge, Abington, Oxon, pp. 102-123.

34
35 Dwivedi, A. (2015), "A higher-order model of consumer brand engagement and its impact on
36 loyalty intentions", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. Vol. 24, pp. 100-109.

37
38 Eroglu, S.A., Machleit, K.A. and Davis, L.M. (2003), "Empirical testing of a model of online
39 store atmospherics and shopper responses", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 139-
40 150.

41
42 Fehrer, J., Germelmann, C. and Brodie, R. (2018), "Dynamics and drivers of customer
43 engagement: within the dyad and beyond", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 29 No. 3,
44 pp. 443-467.

45
46 Fill, C. (2013), *Marketing communications: brands, experiences and participation*, 6th ed,
47 Pearson, Harlow.

48
49 Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967), *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for
50 qualitative research*. Sociology Press.

51
52 Goldsmith, R. and Flynn, L.R. (1992), "Identifying innovators in consumer product markets",
53 *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 12, pp. 42-55.

1
2
3 Gummerus, J., Liljander, V., Weman, E. and Pihlström, M. (2012), "Customer engagement in
4 a Facebook brand community", *Management Research Review*, Vol. 35 No. 9, pp. 857-877.

5
6 Harmeling, C., Moffett, J., Arnold, M. and Carlson, B. (2018), "Toward a theory of customer
7 engagement marketing", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp.
8 312-335.

9
10 Hollebeek, L.D. (2011a), "Exploring customer brand engagement: definition and themes",
11 *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 7, pp. 555-573.

12
13 Hollebeek, L.D. (2013), "The customer engagement/value interface: An exploratory
14 investigation", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 21 No.1, pp. 17-24.

15
16 Hollebeek, L.D. (2011b), "Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty
17 nexus", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 27 No. 7, pp. 785-807.

18
19 Hollebeek, L.D., Glynn, M.S. and Brodie, R.J. (2014), "Consumer Brand Engagement in
20 Social Media: Conceptualization, Scale Development and Validation", *Journal of Interactive
21 Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 149-165.

22
23 Hollebeek, L.D., Srivastava, R.K. and Chen, T. (2016), "S-D logic-informed customer
24 engagement: integrative framework, revised fundamental propositions, and application to
25 CRM", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*.

26
27 Hollebeek, L.D. and Chen, T. (2014), "Exploring positively- versus negatively-valenced
28 brand engagement: a conceptual model", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 23
29 No. 1, pp. 62-74.

30
31 Hou, F., Li, B., Chong, A.Y., Yannopoulou, N. and Liu, M.J. (2017), "Understanding and
32 predicting what influence online product sales? A neural network approach", *Production
33 Planning & Control*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 225-236.

34
35 Hsieh, J., Hsieh, Y., Chiu, H. and Yang, Y. (2014), "Customer response to web site
36 atmospherics: Task-relevant cues, situational involvement and PAD", *Journal of Interactive
37 Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 225-236.

38
39 Huang, M. (2003), "Designing website attributes to induce experiential encounters",
40 *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 425-442.

41
42 Hyder, A. and Bigné, E. (2016), "Website engagement", in Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D. and
43 Conduit, J. (Ed.), *Customer Engagement: Contemporary issues and challenges*, Routledge,
44 Abington, Oxon, pp. 152-168.

45
46 Islam, J.U. and Rahman, Z. (2017), "The impact of online brand community characteristics
47 on customer engagement: An application of the Stimulus-Organism-Response paradigm",
48 *Telematics and Informatics*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 96-109.

49
50 Islam, J.U. and Rahman, Z. (2016), "The transpiring journey of customer engagement
51 research in marketing: A systematic review of the past decade", *Management Decision*, Vol.
52 54 No. 8, pp. 2008-2034.

53
54 Islam, J.U., Rahman, Z. and Hollebeek, L.D. (2018), "Consumer engagement in online brand
55 communities: a solicitation of congruity theory", *Internet Research*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 23-45.

1
2
3 Jaakkola, E. and Alexander, M. (2014), "The Role of Customer Engagement Behavior in
4 Value Co-Creation: A Service System Perspective", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 17 No.
5 3, pp. 247-261.
6

7
8 Kim, M. and Lennon, S. (2008), "The effects of visual and verbal information on attitudes
9 and purchase intentions in internet shopping." *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp.
10 147-178.
11

12 Kim, S. and Eastin, M.S. (2011), "Hedonic tendencies and the online consumer: an
13 investigation of the online shopping process", *Journal of Internet Commerce*, Vol. 10 No. 1,
14 pp. 68-90.
15

16 Kim, J. and Lennon, S.J. (2010), "Information available on a web site: effects on consumers'
17 shopping outcomes", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International*
18 *Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 247-262.
19

20 Koo, D. and Ju, S. (2010), "The interactional effects of atmospherics and perceptual curiosity
21 on emotions and online shopping intention", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 26 No. 3,
22 pp. 377-388.
23

24 Kumar, V., Aksoy, L., Donkers, B., Venkatesan, R., Wiesel, T. and Tillmanns, S. (2010a),
25 "Undervalued or Overvalued Customers: Capturing Total Customer Engagement Value",
26 *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 297-310.
27

28 Kumar, V., Petersen, J.A. and Leone, R.P. (2010b), "Driving Profitability by Encouraging
29 Customer Referrals: Who, When, and How", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 74 No. 5, pp. 1-17.
30

31 Lian, J. and Yen, D.C. (2014), "Online shopping drivers and barriers for older adults: Age and
32 gender differences", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 37, pp. 133-143.
33

34 Maslowska, E., Malthouse, E.C. and Collinger, T. (2016), "The customer engagement
35 ecosystem", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 32 No. 5-6, pp. 469-501.
36

37 Mehrabian, A. and Russell, J.A. (1974), *An approach to environmental psychology*. M.I.T.
38 Press, Cambridge, MA.
39

40 Melewar, T.C., Foroudi, P., Gupta, S., Kitchen, P.J. and Foroudi, M.M. (2017), "Integrating
41 identity, strategy and communications for trust, loyalty and commitment", *European Journal*
42 *of Marketing*, Vol. 51 No. 3, pp. 572-604.
43

44 Mintel. (2018), "Online Retailing – UK – July 2018", available at:
45 <http://academic.mintel.com.gcu.idm.oclc.org/display/859337/#> (accessed 21st November
46 2018).
47

48 Mintel. (2017), "Fashion Online - UK - June 2017", available at:
49 [http://academic.mintel.com/homepages/rps/main/#12_21902_201601_1_1_0](http://academic.mintel.com/homepages/rps/main/#12_21902_201601_1_1_0;); (accessed 30
50 June 2017).
51

52 Mintel. (2016), "Womenswear - UK - May 2016", available at:
53 http://academic.mintel.com/homepages/rps/main/#12_21902_201601_1_1_0 (accessed 14
54 July 2016).
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Mollen, A. and Wilson, H. (2010), "Engagement, telepresence and interactivity in online
4 consumer experience: Reconciling scholastic and managerial perspectives", *Journal of*
5 *Business Research*, Vol. 63 No. 9, pp. 919-925.
6
7
8 ONS. (2018), "Retail Sales, Great Britain: May 2018", *Office for National Statistics*,
9 available at:
10 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/retailindustry/bulletins/retailsales/may2018>
11 (accessed 28 June 2018).
12
13 Patterson, P., Yu, T. and De Ruyter, K. (2006), "Understanding Customer Engagement in
14 Services", in *Australia-New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference in Brisbane, Australia,*
15 *2006*.
16
17 Sashi, C.M. (2012), "Customer engagement, buyer-seller relationships, and social media",
18 *Management Decision*. Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 253-272.
19
20
21 Solomon, M. (2016), "Going above and beyond customer service to achieve true customer
22 engagement", *Forbes*, available at:
23 [http://www.forbes.com/sites/micahsolomon/2016/01/04/going-beyond-customer-service-to-](http://www.forbes.com/sites/micahsolomon/2016/01/04/going-beyond-customer-service-to-achieve-customer-engagement/#673e4769312e)
24 [achieve-customer-engagement/#673e4769312e](http://www.forbes.com/sites/micahsolomon/2016/01/04/going-beyond-customer-service-to-achieve-customer-engagement/#673e4769312e) (accessed 11 July 2016).
25
26 Solomon, M.R., Bamossy, G.J., Askegaard, S.T. and Hogg, M.K. (2016). *Consumer*
27 *behaviour: a European perspective*, 6th ed, Pearson, New York.
28
29
30 Sprott, D., Czellar, S. and Spangenberg, E. (2009), "The importance of a general measure of
31 brand engagement on market behavior: Development and validation of a scale", *Journal of*
32 *Marketing Research*. Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 92-104.
33
34 Statista. (2014), "Global consumer interactions with retail brands on social media as of
35 September 2014, by age", *Statista*, available at:
36 [https://www.statista.com/statistics/411895/consumer-social-media-interactions-with-brands-](https://www.statista.com/statistics/411895/consumer-social-media-interactions-with-brands-age/)
37 [age/](https://www.statista.com/statistics/411895/consumer-social-media-interactions-with-brands-age/) (accessed 30 June 2018).
38
39 Underhill, P. (1999), *Why we buy: the science of shopping*, Texere, London.
40
41 Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K.N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P. and Verhoef, P.C.
42 (2010), "Customer Engagement Behavior: Theoretical Foundations and Research Directions"
43 *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 253-266.
44
45 Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008), "Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution",
46 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
47
48 Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004), "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing",
49 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
50
51
52 Verhoef, P.C., Kannan, P.K. and Inman, J.J. (2015), "From multi-channel retailing to omni-
53 channel retailing: Introduction to the special issue on multi-channel retailing", *Journal of*
54 *Retailing*, Vol. 91 No.2, pp. 174-181.
55
56 Vivek, S.D., Beatty, S.E. and Morgan, R.M. (2012), "Customer Engagement: Exploring
57 Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol.
58 20 No. 2, pp. 122-146.
59
60

1
2
3 Wolfinbarger, M. and Gilly, M.C. (2001), "Shopping online for freedom, control, and fun",
4 *California Management Review*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 34-55.
5

6 Wu, W., Lee, C., Fu, C. and Wang, H. (2014), "How can online store layout design and
7 atmosphere influence consumer shopping intention on a website?", *International Journal of*
8 *Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 4-24.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

European Journal of Marketing

Study	Theoretical background	Locus of focus	Paper Type	Specific theoretical perspective taken:
Relationship Marketing				
Bowden (2009)	Relationship Marketing	Service brand	Conceptual	
Hollebeek (2011b)	Relationship Marketing	Brand	Conceptual	
Sashi (2012)	Relationship Marketing	Brand	Conceptual	Commitment-trust theory
Vivek et al. (2012)	Relationship Marketing	Organisational offering or activities	Empirical qualitative	
Dessart et al. (2016)	Relationship Marketing	Online brand communities	Empirical qualitative followed by quantitative	
Beckers et al. (2016)	Relationship Marketing	Online brand communities/social media	Conceptual	Transaction cost economies; The resource-based view; Social exchange theory
Dessart et al. (2017)	Relationship Marketing	Online brand communities	Empirical quantitative	
Relationship Marketing and Service Dominant (S-D) logic				
Brodie et al. (2011a)	Relationship marketing and Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Brand	Conceptual	S-D Logic
Hollebeek (2011a)	Relationship marketing and Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Brand	Empirical qualitative	Social exchange theory
Brodie et al. (2011b)	Relationship marketing and Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Online brand communities	Empirical qualitative	S-D Logic
Vivek et al. (2014)	Relationship marketing and Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Brand, organisational offering or activities	Empirical qualitative followed by quantitative	S-D Logic
Dessart et al. (2015)	Relationship marketing and Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Online brand communities	Empirical qualitative	
Service Dominant (S-D) logic				
Breidbach et al. (2014)	Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Engagement platforms	Conceptual	
Hollebeek et al. (2016)	Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Customer Relationship Management	Conceptual	
Bowden et al. (2017)	Service Dominant (S-D) logic	Online brand communities	Empirical qualitative	
Consumer Behaviour				
Calder et al. (2009)	Consumer behaviour	Media context (website)	Empirical quantitative	Uses and gratifications theory
Mollen & Wilson (2010)	Consumer behaviour	Brand personified by the website	Conceptual	Stimulus Organism Response (S-O-R) model
Kumar et al. (2010a)	Consumer behaviour	Brand/organisation	Conceptual	
van Doorn et al. (2010)	Consumer behaviour	Brand	Conceptual	
Gummerus et al. (2012)	Consumer behaviour	Online gaming community	Empirical quantitative	
Claffey & Brady (2014)	Consumer behaviour	Virtual customer environment (social media)	Empirical quantitative	Stimulus Organism Response (S-O-R) model
Bitter et al. (2014)	Consumer behaviour	Social media	Empirical quantitative	Theory of planned behaviour & Social practice theory
Dolan et al. (2016)	Consumer behaviour	Social media	Conceptual	

1					
2	Islam et al. (2018)	Consumer behaviour	Online brand communities	Empirical quantitative	Congruity theory: self congruity/ value congruity
3	Dual Perspectives				
4	Demangeot & Broderick (2016)	Relationship marketing and marketing communications	Website (transactional: books)	Empirical quantitative	
5					
6					
7	Maslowska et al. (2016)	Service marketing and consumer behaviour	Brand	Conceptual	Uses and gratifications theory; Elaboration Likelihood model
8					
9	Technological				
10	Hyder & Bigné (2016)	Technological engagement	Website (transactional: travel)	Empirical quantitative	
11					
12					
13					

Table I: Theoretical perspectives through which customer engagement has been studied

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Customer	Age	Retailer	Primary motivation to shop online	Website environmental cues consumers perceive to promote customer engagement						
				Product images	Product demonstration video	Fabric composition/product specification	Washing instructions	Navigational filters	Ease of navigation	Customer reviews
Customer 1	60	John Lewis	Utilitarian	X		X	X	X		
Customer 2	69	Next	Utilitarian	X		X	X	X	X	
Customer 3	59	Marks & Spencer	Utilitarian	X	X	X	X			X
Customer 4	63	Amazon	Utilitarian	X		X			X	
Customer 5	56	Finery	Hedonic	X		X			X	
Customer 6	66	Fat Face	Hedonic	X	X	X				X
Customer 7	65	Toast	Utilitarian	X		X				
Customer 8	58	John Lewis	Utilitarian	X				X	X	X
Customer 9	63	Next	Hedonic	X	X	X	X		X	X
Customer 10	74	Debenhams	Utilitarian	X			X	X		X
Customer 11	61	Boden	Hedonic	X		X	X			X
Customer 12	78	Marks & Spencer	Utilitarian	X	X		X			X
Customer 13	55	Simply Be	Hedonic	X					X	X
Customer 14	64	White Stuff	Utilitarian	X		X	X			X
Customer 15	70	House of Fraser	Hedonic	X				X	X	
Customer 16	73	Marks & Spencer	Utilitarian	X	X	X	X			X
Customer 17	59	Joe Browns	Hedonic	X		X	X	X		
Customer 18	56	Zara	Utilitarian	X		X	X	X	X	X
Customer 19	62	Evans	Utilitarian	X			X			X
Customer 20	55	Marks & Spencer	Hedonic	X	X	X	X			
Customer 21	68	John Lewis	Utilitarian	X			X	X		X
Customer 22	77	Next	Hedonic	X		X	X		X	X

Table II: Website environmental cues identified as stimulating customer engagement

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Cue	Hedonically-motivated customer		Utilitarian-motivated customer	
	Cognitive	Affective	Cognitive	Affective
Product images	<p>“Once I’ve seen an item I like I think about how it will look on me. Whether it will suit me. What else I already have that I can wear with it.” (Customer 5)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">←</p>	<p>“I like certain colours and shapes and when I see those I can’t help myself but click on the picture to look further.” (Customer 9)</p>	<p>“If I am looking for something that is it; I will keep searching until I find it, all night if I have to.” (Customer 14)</p>	<p>“I do get that feeling when I find something I really like, you know, you think, ‘jackpot!’” (Customer 19)</p> <p style="text-align: left;">→</p>
Product demonstration video	<p>“The models in those videos are obviously not the same size as me so I have to stop and really think about whether it will look as good on me as it does on them.” (Customer 13)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">←</p>	<p>“I really love to see how the fabric moves and sits on the body – I think you get a good sense of how the item will be in real life and how you will feel wearing it.” (Customer 9)</p>	<p>“I do watch those videos quite carefully as I think they are useful in giving you an idea of what the fabric, the cut, even the quality is like. I think they can give a more honest representation than photos which can be altered.” (Customer 3)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">→</p>	<p>“I like those videos, they bring it all to life a bit.” (Customer 14)</p>
Fabric composition/ Product specification	<p>“I only wear natural fibres in the summer so what the fabric is made from is very important to me. I really pay attention to that.” (Customer 20)</p>		<p>“I do look at this, I don’t always know what it means – I don’t totally know what fabric is what if I’m honest – but I have a look in case it is a fabric that I do know and then I feel like I have a bit more information to help me make up my mind.” (Customer 8)</p>	
Washing instructions	<p>“I always study the washing instructions. Everything has to go in the washing machine and preferably the tumble dryer. I won’t buy anything that is dry clean only.” (Customer 9)</p>		<p>“I pay attention to it definitely. I don’t want to keep having to pay to get the thing dry cleaned.” (Customer 18)</p>	

Navigational filters	“On sites where they have hundreds and hundreds of items they really stop me getting fed up because I can just narrow it down to the things that I know I’ll like or that they definitely have in my size.” (Customer 11)		“I use them. I use garment type. I use size. I use colour. It cuts down on having to look at a load of things that you will never buy.” (Customer 1)	
Ease of navigation		“I feel a bit stupid when I can’t find things or get a bit lost. I’m not brilliant with computers, I do try, but I’m not all that competent.” (Customer 22)		“If I’m on a website and it’s difficult to use: it’s slow or clunky or confusing, I leave. I don’t have time for that.” (Customer 1)
Customer reviews	“I do look but I don’t always listen to them. I will take a judgement on whether to go ahead and order the thing anyway – especially if I really like it.” (Customer 6)		“Any negative comments about the fabric or fit really put me off buying. I read the reviews quite carefully actually.” (Customer 10)	

Table III: Illustrative quotes – facets of positive cognitive and affective responses to website environmental cues

*Arrows denote the direction of engagement between cognitive and affective dimensions when both are stimulated