

A Decade of Research on Customer and Consumer Engagement: A Review and Future Research Agenda

Autoria

Ricardo Limongi Franca Coelho - ricardolimongi@ufg.br
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração/PPGADM - Universidade Federal de Goiás
Outro - Outra

Sylvio Ribeiro de Oliveira Santos - sylvio.ros@gmail.com

Vinicius Andrade Brei - brei@ufrgs.br

Prog de Pós-Grad em Admin/Esc de Admin – PGA/EA - Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul
Outro - Outra

Agradecimentos

Grupo de Pesquisas sobre Marketing e Consumo (GPMC) da Universidade Federal de Goiás

Resumo

Customer engagement has been a marketing research priority throughout the decade, and several frameworks and models have tried to conceptualize the phenomenon. This article aims to summarize ten years of theoretical and practical studies on customer engagement and to propose directions for future studies. We conducted a broad review of articles on a customer, consumer, brand engagement, and discussed, aiming at the convergence between different perspectives about the phenomenon. This article offers different approaches to concepts such as psychological aspects to offer an overarching and rich insight as well as their attitudinal and financial effects. As a social and dynamic view of engagement, the term consumer engagement is more appropriate, after all, brand value comes not just from customers, but anyone who contacts as social media.

A Decade of Research on Customer and Consumer Engagement: A Review and Future Research Agenda

Abstract: Customer engagement has been a marketing research priority throughout the decade, and several frameworks and models have tried to conceptualize the phenomenon. This article aims to summarize ten years of theoretical and practical studies on customer engagement and to propose directions for future studies. We conducted a broad review of articles on a customer, consumer, brand engagement, and discussed, aiming at the convergence between different perspectives about the phenomenon. This article offers different approaches to concepts such as psychological aspects to offer an overarching and rich insight as well as their attitudinal and financial effects. As a social and dynamic view of engagement, the term consumer engagement is more appropriate, after all, brand value comes not just from customers, but anyone who contacts as social media.

Keywords: Customer engagement, Consumer engagement, Brand engagement, Engagement marketing, Digital marketing.

Introduction

Customer engagement has been one of the companies top priorities (Cognito, 2017) and in this sense marketing researchers investigate eagerly the phenomenon in the last decade, 2010-2019 (Verhoef et al., 2010), period in which the published articles numbers jumped from seven in 2011 to eighty-two in 2018. Originate from relationship marketing (Brodie, Hollebeek, Jurić, & Ilić, 2011; Vivek, Beatty, & Morgan, 2012) the customer engagement can be considered a customer management evolution (Pansari & Kumar, 2017), finding that customer value does not just come from their transactions, but also indirectly as knowledge and influence (Kumar et al., 2010). Therefore, customer engagement attracts a central place in marketing in the last decade among researchers and marketers (IBM, 2018; Patel, 2019).

However, the definition of customer engagement is not a consensus; while marketers use engagement to refer about behaviors, many academics also consider the psychological aspects of the phenomenon. According to Maslowska, Malthouse e Collinger (2016) the study of customer engagement can be divided into two groups. The first focused on behavioral aspects of engagement (e.g. word-of-mouth, cocreation and complaints) which has one-dimensional perspective (van Doorn et al., 2010; Groeger et al., 2016; Harmeling et al., 2017; Kumar et al., 2010; Pansari and Kumar, 2017; Verhoef et al., 2010); and the second group that is more focused on psychological aspects of engagement, viewing engagement as a multidimensional construct consisting of affective, cognitive and behavioral aspects (Brodie et al., 2011, 2013; Hollebeek, 2011; Hollebeek and Macky, 2019; Islam et al., 2019; Sashi, 2012; Vivek et al., 2012). Hence a variable (e.g., trust, commitment, satisfaction) can be an antecedent or a consequence depending on customer engagement definition. For example, Kumar et al. (2010) consider transaction engagement behaviors, but Sashi (2012, p. 254) disagrees and argues that high customer engagement involves the creation of intimacy bonds and long-lasting relationships based on co-creation, in other words, a multidimensional perspective. More about these different perspectives will be discussed further in this article. Despite the lack of consensus, most authors agree that customer engagement can be defined as “the level of a customer's cognitive, emotional and behavioral investment in specific brand interactions” (Hollebeek, 2011a, p.565).

Therefore, this article proposes the term of use of consumer engagement for an approach more overarching and coherent with a society more connected and digital. As argued by Vivek et al. (2012, p.137) “relationships are not just between buyers and sellers, but between any combination of (and among) potential and existing customers, noncustomers, society in general, their extended relationships, and sellers.” That way, relationships between companies and individuals can exist in the absence of transactions. That conceptualization is supported by several models of customer engagement that do not consider buying as a requisite to the engagement (van Doorn et al., 2010; Eigenraam et al., 2018; Groeger et al., 2016; Hollebeek and Chen, 2014; Kunz et al., 2017; Maslowska et al., 2016; Vivek et al., 2012). In this sense, the purpose of this article is not to try to unify different perspectives, but offer a substantial review of the main engagement articles in the marketing area published between a decade, 2010 and 2019, for the reader to have his conclusions.

Method

For a bibliographic survey on the theme of customer and consumer engagement, we searched the Scopus database using two keywords: “customer engagement” or “brand engagement” between the keywords. We choose the keywords from an exploratory stage in which we sought to identify the most used words by the authors who investigated the theme and who were in different aspects of the article metadata, such as title and abstract. Thus, at the end of the survey of articles containing the keywords investigated, we identified 89 articles published in journals during the years 2010 and 2019, called the era (Pass, 2019).

The eras

The brand engagement era

The engagement is not a very discussed theme in marketing literature before 2010. Some events were essential to boost the theme: (a) the publication of several studies related to engagement in other areas (Higgins, 2006); (b) in 2008, the inclusion of customer engagement (henceforth CE) on the research priority list of Marketing Science Institute; (c) in 2010, the publication of the Journal of Service Research special edition dedicated to customer engagement. Most of the CE's first studies focus on direct customer engagement with the brands (e.g., product use, interaction with employees). Usually, those studies considered the customers started that engagement and answered by the company (Alvarez-Milán et al., 2018) in a unilateral relationship and with little or no interference from other actors.

CE can be defined in different ways Hollebeek (2011) uses the term CE with the brand and defines it as “the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral level in specific interactions with the brand.” Van Doorn et al. (2010) focused on behavioral dimension and defined CE as customer behavioral manifestations about the brand or the company besides the purchase. Brodie et al. (2011, p.260) offered a broader view and defined CE as “a psychological state that happens using interactive and co-creative experiences with the object.”

Antecedents engagement with the brand

Among the CE, the main antecedents are interaction, participation, and involvement, and can be easily confused. Interactions between brands and consumers are fundamental in marketing practice (Bolton and Saxena-Iyer, 2009) and use to start the engagement process (Vivek et al., 2012). Consumers interact with the brand, searching for hedonic and utilitarian values (Hamilton et al.,

2016). In the engagement context, hedonic value is related to an immersive and pleasant interaction. Immersive interactions take consumers to focus on *per se* experience and not on interaction evaluation, which is the case when consumers interact to obtain utilitarian values (e.g., get information, incentives). Immersive and satisfactory interactions are fundamental to the engagement process, serving as a basis for loyal customers, brand ambassadors, and collaborators (Hamilton et al., 2016).

As well as a consumer can be involved without participate, engagement can happen at the psychological level, too, without a behavioral manifestation. Therefore, CE includes both visible (behavior) as not visible (cognition, emotion) aspects (Brodie et al., 2013; Vivek et al., 2012). In this sense, Wallace, Buil, and Chernatony (2014) considered that see CE only as behavior is to see incompletely. Other CE antecedents were studied over the decade, between the most used were trust, satisfaction, commitment, and company actions.

The consequences of engagement with the brand

The engagement main motivational is related to the value that actors hope to obtain from the interaction (Vivek et al., 2012). Based on social exchange theory (SET), consumers and companies engage as long as the cost-benefit relation be positive. SET is grounded on reciprocity norms; as a consequence, it must have a balanced perception of the contributions made to that a profit relationship (Hamilton et al., 2016). Based on that, it can be said that consumers are most likely to give suggestions and talk good about the brands if they realize that their relationship with the company is beneficial and reciprocal. In this sense, engagement can be robust metrics since it helps to calculate the consumer value besides his purchases (Kumar et al., 2010). That way, an individual who never paid for a product, but influenced others, may be more valuable to the company than an occasional customer.

Positive engagements take to a more significant commitment and to more long-lasting relationships, too, but it is not necessarily more intimate (Vivek et al., 2012).

According to Bendapudi and Berry (1997) customers can keep a relationship due to necessary, not because they desire it. When a customer is committed to the company because it does not have a choice or change, the company is too expensive and has a “calculating commitment.” When the reason to maintain the relationship is derived from the creation of emotional, trust, and reciprocity bonds, it has an “affective commitment.” A high level of calculating commitment may take to the loyalty, whereas a high level of affective commitment may take to the delight (Sashi, 2012). Thus, satisfaction is for trust is for commitment, and they are fundamental constructs to consumer engagement, although not always is easy to identify if precede or follow the engagement. Although trust and commitment are more accepted as engagement consequences (Vivek et al., 2012), satisfaction may come before or after as a form of constant analysis of interactions (Bowden et al., 2015; Brodie et al., 2013; Hamilton et al., 2016; Sashi, 2012). That is why Maslowska et al. (2016) called the satisfaction of intrusive measures, advising against using it to measure customer engagement.

Such ambiguity does not happen with the WOM, after all, the consumer engagement provide main results (Bijmolt et al., 2010; Hollebeek and Chen, 2014). Customers highly satisfied and committed are more likely to do a positive WOM marketing and become the brand ambassadors. However, dissatisfaction and commitment can take to a negative word of mouth marketing as well.

Brands must create actions to avoid negative engagements, because the higher the intensity and value of engagement is extracted from the interaction (Higgins and Scholer, 2009), and negative interactions use to be more intense than the positives one. That explains why loyal customers and committed with the company may engage in retaliations due of a failure. Despite that, customers may continue with the company after get negatively engage due to external factors (Hollebeek and Chen, 2014). In this sense, Sashi (2012) proposes that customer engagement is a cycle with seven phases: connection, interaction, satisfaction (with the interaction), retention, commitment, advocacy, and engagement. The commitment would be only the affective and not the calculating (since there is no deterrent to ending the relationship), and the retention would be based on the affective bonds built and not on the product quality.

Maslowska et al. (2016) proposed an engagement ecosystem with four ways of how people get engaged: brand consumption, customer brand experience, dialogue behaviors, shopping behaviors. Those four ways affect each other, reflecting the interactive nature, non-linear, and engagement dynamics that equally affect consumers, the brand, and *stakeholders*. None of the four ways purchase the product. Although the focus on customers, Kumar et al. (2010) mentioned that theoretically, it is possible to attribute the influence value to not customers, but the company will need to find a way to measuring through their social media.

The social media engagement era

Lamberton and Stephen (2016) called the first half of the last decade of “the social media era” resulting in more than a decade of social to a digital transformation whereby the internet changed people’s lives. The bidirectional communication of social media is compatible with two-way nature of relationships and CE (Alvarez-Milán et al., 2018; Vivek et al., 2012), thus, social media are an excellent opportunity to increase the CE (Sashi, 2012). More engaged, consumers won power and started to be seen as pseudo marketers (Harmeling et al., 2017). Eigenraam et al. (2018) propound that consumers engage in the digital environment to have fun, learn about the brand, talk about the brand, give feedback, and work for the brand. Each behavior has cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions.

The social engagement is an essential kind of engagement that was, for a while, neglected by customer engagement literature. Hollebeek et al. (2016) expanded the fundamental assumptions of engagement of Brodie et al. (2011), including a social dimension in addition to cognitive, emotional, and behavioral. Aiming to offer a unique framework of why consumers relate to brands, Schmitt (2012) considered the social engagement as the most complex and deep engagement level, after experiential engagement and functional engagement, the simplest among the three. Therefore, the social engagement era differs from the era of engagement with the brand by facilitating interactions related to the brand, and not only with the brand, keeping people with common interests together (not only customers).

Brand communities (e.g., Facebook pages) are used on engagement studies, and social media greatly facilitated the studies (Brodie et al., 2013; Hollebeek et al., 2014). Muniz and O’Guinn (2001) define brand communities as a community between users of a brand based on social relations, not geographically restricted. A phenomenon that illustrates the engagement relevance about the brand among consumers is the unboxing, a widespread practice on the internet with over 123 million videos just on YouTube and practiced by at least 1 in 5 consumers (Google, 2014).

According to customer experience literature, this type of contact with the brand is considered an indirect experience (Meyer and Schwager, 2007), conception supported by the non-paying customer's engagement model proposed by Groeger et al. (2016).

Likes, shares, and comments are ways to measure the digital engagement, but also ways of consumers express their inner self (i.e., as I see myself) or social self (i.e., as others see me) (Wallace et al., 2014). Thus, a consumer may like a brand page on Facebook only to create an online identity or to feel part of a group, i.e., improve the social self but not participate in other ways of engagement. Wallace et al. (2014) show that to page fans talk about the brand it needs to reflect the inner self.

In one of the first consumer's engagement studies on social media, Chu and Kim (2011) showed that hemophilia does not positively relate to eWOM, indicating that consumers do not receive or pass on only similar people information. On the other hand, trust turned out essential for information exchange between users. The Chu and Kim (2011) results showed that people give information to all their contacts, which is understandable, once it is more convenient to publish information to all contacts than to only a part of them; but repost or ask for information only from close people. Such finding is consistent with the idea that weak bonds are important to increase the message range (Brown and Reingen, 1987). Finally, Chu and Kim (2011) showed that consumers are essential by both the expectations and social norms of others, i.e., what others are buying, using or talking about (normative influence); as for the value of the information and the authority of who is giving some information (informational influence).

Other behavior facilitated by social media is co-creation between companies and consumers. Cocreation behaviors are based on value generation and S-D logic (Hollebeek et al., 2016). For the behavior to occur depends on the nature of the activity, the motivation of the parts, integration of necessary resources, and knowledge sharing (Hollebeek et al., 2016; Kunz et al., 2017). In a co-creation process, mutual value is only generated if, and only if, there is a perception of the balance parts of contributions and adaptation to trust and reciprocity norms (Bowden et al., 2015; Sashi, 2012). Kunz et al. (2017) suggested four activity groups of cocreation engagement that cover different investment levels (e.g., money, time, effort) of the parts and, thus, different value levels, starting from low investment activities of both parts (e.g., discount coupons, exclusive offers, pages on social networks) to a high investment level, and, therefore, high value (e.g., ideas competition, online community created by the company, webinars and wearables). Other activities have a higher value only to one part, leading to more significant investment by the relevant part. According to Kunz et al. (2017), some high-value activities to the consumer and low value to the company are online reviews, UGC, content aggregation via hashtag and online communities created by the consumer. Examples of high-value activities to the company e low value to the consumers are gamification, corporate blogs, e-mails marketing, and video channels.

Engagement on a post-digital era

In the post-digital era, traditional marketing and digital marketing fuse (Lamberton and Stephen, 2016). Besides that, this is the semantics web era (Web 3.0), a new online environment powered by machine learning and artificial intelligence that connects data to objects, extracting a new meaning able to meet the needs better and create better experiences for consumers. A smarter online environment, where users data are used as feedback to improve tools and applications

continually, it has generated new possibilities for companies. By the end of the last decade, consumer experience was (and probably still is) the main priority of the marketing activity (Cognito, 2017; Pemberton, 2018).

Engagement marketing seems to be the most appropriate strategy for a connected, interactive world and customer experience is the primary source of value. It can be defined as “a firm's deliberate effort to motivate, empower, and measure a customer's voluntary contribution to the firm's marketing functions beyond the core, economic transaction” (Harmeling et al., 2017, p. 312). Engagement marketing is an evolution of relationship marketing (Pansari & Kumar, 2017), considering relationships beyond the customer-company. That way, interactions can no longer happen linearly, but networked and more dynamically and interactively (Brodie et al., 2011; Vivek et al., 2012). The engagement marketing breaks with traditional marketing, based on the value of economic transactions, to include value generated by non-economic contributions (Harmeling et al., 2017). In this way this article discusses three rising issues in the market that can contribute to engagement-based marketing strategy, and that deserves attention from researchers in the next decade.

Consumer engagement measurement

The pressure of upper management and investors is constant for marketing to demonstrate economic value generated by its high investments (Hanssens and Pauwels, 2016; Pemberton, 2017). Nevertheless, marketers still using unimportant metrics of little importance to other company departments, like awareness, satisfaction, and ROI (Pemberton, 2018). The combination of soft metrics (challenging to measure, e.g., awareness) and hard (easy to measure, e.g., sales revenue) (Hanssens and Pauwels, 2016) is essential to measure the marketing activity performance, because different types of metrics have low correlation, and technology has facilitated both data collection and analysis. Added to that, consumer engagement has been a promising marketing measure (Harmeling et al., 2017; Kumar et al., 2010; Kumar and Reinartz, 2016) for capturing consumer value beyond their purchases. However, measuring engagement is not that simple, and attempts so far use self-report attitudinal measurements or digital interests (e.g., likes, and comments) (Vivek et al., 2014).

As a result, future studies must seek to combine soft and hard measures to capture behavioral and attitudinal dimensions of consumer engagement. Two aspects than may assist future studies. First, the engagement value to the company comes from consumers' financial and non financial resources (i.e., time, knowledge, skills, equipment, influence, creativity, etc.) spend on interactions with the company (Harmeling et al., 2017; Hollebeek et al., 2016; Kumar et al., 2010). Often, these resources contribute to marketing functions. Second, feedback loops may be used to evaluate relationships, from interactions between different engagement ecosystem actors (Maslowska et al., 2016). This feedback loop is essential to account for the dynamic nature of consumer engagement (Kunz et al., 2017). Areas like business analytics and machine learning will be increasingly important and can analyze big data, including real-time, allowing for faster strategy adjustment and content personalization, improving engagement ROI.

Digital content marketing

According to Hollebeek and Macky (2019) and consistent with Hamilton et al. (2016), consumers interact with content for hedonic, functional, or authenticity reasons. All three motives produce different types of engagement. Cognitive engagement is motivated by functional and authenticity

aspects, and results in brand sense-making (i.e., creation of mind maps about the brand). Emotional engagement is motivated by hedonic and authenticity aspects, and results in brand identification. On the other hand, behavioral engagement originates from functional and hedonic motives with content, which can lead consumers to help the company, giving ideas or influencing others. The three types of engagement resultant from DCM will increase brand confidence and attitude and may lead to increased brand equity, an essential source of competitive advantage (Barney 1991), and company value.

Influencer marketing

Companies are highlighted an increasing share of their marketing budget for digital influencers (Contestabile, 2018), which can be defined as social media users whose influence allows high engagement with their followers, can be used by companies as valuable assets to promote their brands, goods and services (Chu and Kim, 2011). Based on Harmeling et al. (2017), it can be said that this influence results from one or more of the following factors: contact network size, influence capacity, accumulated knowledge, and creativity. That way, influencers can engage immediately, profoundly and enduringly than brands (van Doorn et al., 2010). Besides that, just like digital content, influencers seem to convey greater sincerity and honesty (Human et al., 2018), combating today's consumer skepticism.

Based on Alvarez-Milán et al. (2018) digital influencers can be considered mid-users, while customers are end-users. One of the few attempts to calculate the influence of a single source, Groeger, and Buttle (2014), calculated the total number of brand-related conversations generated from a small event promoted by one person. The results showed that each person attending the event generated an average of 1,529 unique online and offline conversations. Although the study did not use digital influencers, it is an exciting indicator of the engagement multiplier. Also, most conversations were between people with strong bonds. In the digital field, it is expected that influencers reach a large number of people with weak bonds, increasing the message's spreading power but not persuasion (Chu & Kim, 2011). Another significant advantage of using influencers as company communication channels is that they change the functional value of traditional advertising to social value. For this, brands need to know and find a way to meet the social and self-esteem needs of the influencer. Only then will companies be able to deliver social rather than purely functional value (Chatterjee, 2011). This is especially important for companies that rely heavily on influence to promote their business (Hamilton et al., 2016), such as small business or experience services that are difficult to evaluate based on attributes; or companies that do not have a high reputation and are considered unreliable. In this sense, Cho, Huh, and Faber (2014) showed that when a reliable person sends a viral advertisement, the criterion used by the receiver to assess the degree of trust is who sent it, not the creator of the advertisement. Thus, digital influencers work as a guarantee regarding the quality and reliability of the message content.

To conclude, a way to implement digital influencers strategy is offered by Kilgour et al. (2015), with minimal adjustments: 1) identify key-influencers for the target audience who have a positive relationship with the brand; 2) determine the value influencers receive from their followers and find out how the company can help them increase that value; 3) identify opportunities to integrate new values into the influencers' communication process; 4) evaluate and refine the messages.

Finally, in Table I, we list proposed topics for future research for each era that we discuss during the article.

Table I.

Proposed Topics for Future Research

Thematic Era	Proposed Topics
The Brand Engagement Era	<p>The relevance of content creation by consumers in local and international brands.</p> <p>Consumer trust and satisfaction in the offline environment in consumer engagement in the online environment.</p> <p>The impact of engagement across social media platforms on the bottom line.</p>
The Social Media Engagement Era	<p>The impact of engagement across social media platforms on the financial performanc.</p> <p>The relationship of exclusive use of digital content in small business engagement metrics.</p> <p>The use of different posting typologies at engagement levels across different social media platforms.</p>
Engagement on a Post-digital Era	<p>Consumer engagement with brands during the customer journey.</p> <p>The impact of digital influencers on companies' financial performace.</p> <p>The use of machine learning techniques in digital content generation and the impact on engagement metrics.</p>

Conclusion

It can be said that studies of customer/consumer behavior are still in the context of justification, requiring the theory's evaluation and improvement. The various conceptual models developed at the beginning of the decade still require empirical evidence. Therefore, the purpose of this article was to review the existing literature, relating different conceptualizations and theoretical perspectives of the last 10 years of consumer engagement, broadening the theme from a broader perspective, considering current and future changes from a more dynamic context, based on knowledge and power in the consumer's hand to contribute to theory as well as to marketing practice.

In this sense, considering that customer engagement represents cognitive, emotional, and behavioral levels (Hollebeek, 2011), it is relevant to develop this theme as a multidimensional construct. In this sense, as presented in this article, engagement studies must be increased, especially in electronic environments, like social media. After all, platforms, for example, change

different stimuli and influence the engagement by users, so marketers and academia can develop models to provide a better comprehension about the behavior of users and increase the engagement metrics such as likes, comments, and ewom with a machine learning and data science techniques. Another recommendation it is proposed models that abroad different perspective, primarily through a nomological network considering antecedents and consequences that encompass involvement, trust, social media, and firm-generated as antecedents, and value, satisfaction, brand attitude, and others as a consequence.

References

- Bagozzi, R.P. and Dholakia, U.M. (2006), “Antecedents and purchase consequences of customer participation in small group brand communities”, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2006.01.005>.
- Bijmolt, T.H.A., Leeflang, P.S.H., Block, F., Eisenbeiss, M., Hardie, B.G.S., Lemmens, A. and Saffert, P. (2010), “Analytics for customer engagement”, *Journal of Service Research*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375603>.
- Bowden, J.L.H., Gabbott, M. and Naumann, K. (2015), “Service relationships and the customer disengagement – engagement conundrum”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Routledge, Vol. 31 No. 7–8, pp. 774–806.
- Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Jurić, B. and Ilić, A. (2011), “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.D. (2013), “Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis”, *Journal of Business Research*, Elsevier Inc., Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 105–114.
- Brown, J.J. and Reingen, P.H. (1987), “Social Ties and Word-of-Mouth Referral Behavior”, *Journal of Consumer Research*.
- Chu, S.C. and Kim, Y. (2011), “Determinants of consumer engagement in electronic Word-Of-Mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites”, *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 47–75.
- Eigenraam, A.W., Eelen, J., van Lin, A. and Verlegh, P.W.J. (2018), “A Consumer-based Taxonomy of Digital Customer Engagement Practices”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Direct Marketing Educational Foundation, Inc. dba Marketing EDGE, Vol. 44, pp. 102–121.
- model”, *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Routledge, Vol. 24 No. 3–4, pp. 190–209.
- Hamilton, M., Kaltcheva, V.D. and Rohm, A.J. (2016), “Social Media and Value Creation: The Role of Interaction Satisfaction and Interaction Immersion”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Marketing EDGE.org., Vol. 36, pp. 121–133.
- Hanssens, D.M. and Pauwels, K.H. (2016), “Demonstrating the Value of Marketing”, *Journal of Marketing*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0417>.
- Higgins, E.T. and Scholer, A.A. (2009), “Engaging the consumer: The science and art of the value

- creation process”, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2009.02.002>.
- Hollebeek, L.D. (2011), “Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty nexus”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2010.500132>.
- Hollebeek, L.D. and Chen, T. (2014), “Exploring positively- versus negatively-valenced brand engagement: A conceptual model”, *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 62–74.
- Hollebeek, L.D., Glynn, M.S. and Brodie, R.J. (2014), “Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002>.
- Hollebeek, L.D. and Macky, K. (2019), “Digital Content Marketing’s Role in Fostering Consumer Engagement, Trust, and Value: Framework, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Elsevier Inc., Vol. 45, pp. 27–41.
- Hollebeek, L.D., Srivastava, R.K. and Chen, T. (2016), “S-D logic–informed customer engagement: integrative framework, revised fundamental propositions, and application to CRM”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, pp. 1–25.
- Kumar, V., Aksoy, L., Donkers, B., Venkatesan, R., Wiesel, T. and Tillmanns, S. (2010), “Undervalued or overvalued customers: Capturing total customer engagement value”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 297–310.
- Lamberton, C. and Stephen, A.T. (2016), “A Thematic Exploration of Digital, Social Media, and Mobile Marketing: Research Evolution from 2000 to 2015 and an Agenda for Future Inquiry”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 80 No. 6, pp. 146–172.
- Pemberton, C. (2017), “2017-2018 CMO Spend Survey Highlights Demand for Results”, *Gartner*, available at: <https://www.gartner.com/smarterwithgartner/2017-2018-cmo-spend-survey-highlights-demand-for-results/> (accessed 25 January 2019).
- Pemberton, C. (2018), “8 top findings in Gartner CMO spend survey”, *Gartner*, available at: <https://www.gartner.com/smarterwithgartner/8-top-findings-in-gartner-cmo-spend-survey-2018-19/> (accessed 25 January 2019).
- Schmitt, B. (2012), “The consumer psychology of brands”, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Society for Consumer Psychology, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 7–17.
- Verhoef, P.C., Reinartz, W.J. and Krafft, M. (2010), “Customer engagement as a new perspective in customer management”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 247–252.
- Vivek, S.D., Beatty, S.E., Dalela, V. and Morgan, R.M. (2014), “A Generalized Multidimensional Scale for Measuring Customer Engagement”, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, available at:<https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679220404>.
- Vivek, S.D., Beatty, S.E. and Morgan, R.M. (2012), “Customer Engagement: Exploring Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase”, *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 122–146.