

Customer Engagement Behaviour in the Fashion Industry

Katarzyna Rupik

University of Economics in Katowice

katarzyna.rupik@ue.katowice.pl

B2C companies attempt to integrate an active consumer into their business processes. Among various concepts explaining the customers' activity in value co-creation process, the customer engagement behavior (CEB) emerges as one of the most holistic managerial approach. Since there is the diversity in the ways customer engagement has been interpreted, the purpose of this paper is to propose the pragmatic understanding of CEB in the field of marketing discipline and offer the classification of the CEBs. The case study research method was applied to identify the CEBs in the fashion sector. Fashion has the significant contribution to the ecommerce sales and is one of the most engaging product category due to high affective customer involvement. This paper contributes to the marketing theory and practice. It extends the present knowledge on CEB, its antecedents and managerial related concepts. It also offers new CEBs classification matrix practical in the further development of the firms' customer engaging strategies.

Key words: customer engagement behavior, value co-creation, fashion

JEL classification: M31.

1. Introduction

The concept of customer engagement behavior (CEB) has emerged from the body of knowledge on the phenomenon of the customer engagement in value co-creation process which is a vital component of relationship marketing (Vivek, Beatty & Morgan, 2012), and new perspective in customer management (Verhoef, Reinartz & Krafft, 2010). The scientific research into this emerging theoretical concept intensified in 2010, when Marketing Science Institute listed customer engagement as a key research priority for the period 2010-2012.

There are multiple theoretical sources of CEB in the marketing literature, including the concept of prosumption (Toffler, 1980), the service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Grönroos, 2006), and the enhanced (extended) competence network (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). The term 'engagement' has also been used extensively in many social science disciplines including psychology, sociology, political science, and organizational behavior (Hollebeek, 2011). Therefore there is the diversity in the ways customer engagement (behavior) has been interpreted. Consequently various customer engagement forms typologies exist in the literature, however they hardly exhaust a total CEB definition. Hence the purpose of this paper is to contribute to the marketing discipline by proposing the pragmatic understanding of CEB and offering the classification of the CEBs. This attempt is grounded on two general interpretations of the term 'engagement': (1) engagement as an arrangement to do something or go somewhere at a fixed time and (2) engagement as an arrangement to employ, action of engaging or being engaged (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 1989, p. 398). Those interpretations organize the exploration of CEB notion from the managerial perspective.

The paper is structured as follows. First we introduce the concepts of customer engagement and customer engagement behavior and investigate various interpretations of those phenomena. Next we discuss existing typologies of CEBs forms. Then we develop the new classification basing on research findings in fashion sector and we discuss research results and limitations. After that the concluding remarks are presented.

2. Conceptualizations of CEB

Since the term 'engagement' has been used extensively in many social science disciplines (including psychology, sociology, political science, and organizational behavior), there is the diversity in the ways engagement has been defined (Hollebeek, 2011). Customer engagement notion was introduced into the theory of corporate management in 2001, when the Gallup Institute formulated the Customer Engagement proposal (Appelbaum, 2001). According to The Economist Intelligence Unit, engagement is seen as a way

to create customer interaction and participation. It refers to the creation of a deeper, more meaningful connection between the company and the customer, and one that endures over time. It is also defined as building customer relationships that increase customer commitment to a company or brand (The Economist Intelligence Unit²⁰⁰⁷). Brodie et al. claim that the interpretations of the concept ‘engagement’ that have emerged in the literature are volitional and/or discretionary and include the notion of connection, attachment, emotional involvement and/or participation (Brodie et al., 2011, p. 254). Relatively few attempts at the systematic conceptualization of customer engagement have been observed in the marketing literature to date (the conceptualizations identified in a literature review are summarized in Table 1).

Authors	Definition
Patterson, Yu, and de Ruyter (2006)	The level of a customer’s various “presence” in their relationship with the organization. The presences include physical presence, emotional presence and cognitive presence. Customer engagement is conceived as a higher-order construct which consists of four components: vigor, dedication, absorption, and interaction.
Brodie et al. (2011)	A psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive, co-creative customer experiences with a focal agent/object (e.g., a brand) in focal service relationships. It occurs under a specific set of context dependent conditions generating differing CE levels; and exists as a dynamic, iterative process within service relationships that co-create value.
Vivek, Beatty, and Morgan (2012)	The intensity of an individual’s (i.e. current or potential customer) participation in and connection with the organization’s offerings and / or activities, which either the customer or the organization initiate. It is composed of cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and social elements.

Table 1. Conceptualizations of customer engagement in the marketing literature

Source: Patterson, Yu and de Ruyter, 2006, p.3; Brodie R., Hollebeek L., Jurić B., Ilić A., 2011, p. 260; Vivek S., Beatty S., Morgan M., 2012, p. 127-145.

Kumar et al. (2010) suggest that the value of customers engagement (CEV) is based on both customers’ purchases (transactions) and other, nontransactional customers’ behaviors. This view on customer engagement emphasizes behavioral manifestation of CE notion. As stated by Kumar et al., the value of CE is comprised of four dimensions:

- 1) Customer purchasing behaviour, including repeat purchases or additional purchases through up-selling and cross-selling (corresponding to customer lifetime value [CLV]).
- 2) Customer referral behaviour which relates to the acquisition of new customers through a firm initiated and incentivized formal referral programs (extrinsically motivated; corresponding to customer referral value [CRV]).
- 3) Customer influencer behaviour through customers’ influence on other acquired customers as well as on prospects (e.g., WOM activity that persuades and converts prospects to customers, minimizes buyer remorse to reduce defections, encourages increased share-of-wallet of existing customers; usually intrinsically motivated; corresponding to customer influencer value [CIV]).
- 4) Customer knowledge behaviour via feedback provided to the firm for ideas for innovations and improvements, and contributing to knowledge development (extrinsically or intrinsically motivated; corresponding to customer knowledge value [CKV]).

The idea of focusing on behavioral manifestations of customer engagement has been expanded by van Doorn et al. (2010) by introducing the term of ‘customer engagement behavior’ (CEB). Van Doorn et al. claim that numerous customer behaviors (as retention and cross-buying, word-of-mouth (WOM), customer recommendations and referrals, blogging and web posting and many other behaviors influencing the firm and its brands) are likely to be different manifestations of the customer engagement (van Doorn et al., 2010). The authors define customer engagement behaviors as a customer’s behavioral manifestations that have a brand or firm focus, beyond purchase, resulting from motivational drivers. This definition of CEBs in a customer-to-firm relationship focuses on behavioral aspects of the relationship and CEBs clearly go beyond transactions, i.e. CEBs include only nontransactional customer behaviors. This view is supported by Bijmolt et al. who posit that various forms of customer engagement behaviors affect the brand or firm in ways other than purchase. In other words, customer engagement includes behavioral manifestations of a customer with a rather indirect impact on firm performance. In contrast, direct customer outcomes are generally linked to its current and future transactions with the firm (Bijmolt et al., 2010). The abovementioned proposals of reducing customer engagement to nontransactional behaviors (which is also preferred in this paper) is quite contrary to the view held by Kumar et al. (2010), who stresses the

importance of including both transactional and nontransactional dimensions of CE behaviors.

3. Review of CEB forms

According to van Doorn et al. CEBs include a vast array of behaviors as WOM activity, recommendations, helping other customers, blogging, writing reviews, and even engaging in legal action (2010, pp. 253-254). Van Doorn et al. also posit that customer engagement encompasses customer co-creation. According to Lusch and Vargo co-creation involves the customer participation in the creation of the core offering itself and can occur through shared inventiveness, co-design, or shared production of related goods (2006, p. 284). Therefore, according to van Doorn et al., behaviors such as making suggestions to improve the consumption experience, helping and coaching service providers, and helping other customers to consume better are all aspects of co-creation, and hence customer engagement behaviors (van Doorn et al., 2010, pp. 253-254). This contrasts with the view held by Jaakkola and Alexander that CEB should be distinguish from co-production, which refers to the degree to which customers are involved in producing the offering for themselves. Therefore the co-production is an in-built element of the transaction and is not, to the same extent, a voluntary, extra-role behavior with a broader interactive character as is associated with CEB (2014). While identifying the forms of customer engagement behaviors, van Doorn et al. also refer to the exit and voice components of Hirschman's model. Within this model, customer may choose to exercise voice (communication behaviors designed to express their experience) or exit (behaviors designed to curtail or expand their relationship with the brand). In this conceptualization, it is loyalty (the attitudinal relationship with the brand) that may drive a customer's choice of behaviors. The continuum of behaviors includes pure voice (complaint behavior, positive or negative recommendation, positive or negative WOM) to pure exit (decrease of consumption, nonrenewal of a contract) and many behaviors in between. Basing on the abovementioned proposals of CEBs forms, two essential conclusions may be drawn. First, regarding the CEBs effects to the firm, one should realize that they may be both positive (i.e., posting a positive brand message on a blog) and negative (i.e., organizing public actions against a firm) (van Doorn et al., 2010; Kumar et al., 2010). Second, regarding the subjects of CEBs interactions, it should be emphasized that even though CEBs have a brand/firm focus, they may be targeted to a much broader network of actors including other current and potential customers, as well as suppliers, general public, regulators, and firm employees (van Doorn et al., 2010).

In the further exploration of CEBs and its typologies, the proposition of five dimensions of CEB (van Doorn et al. 2010), explaining the customer engagement behavior nature, is crucial. These dimensions includes: (1) valence, (2) form / modality, (3) scope, (4) nature of impact and (5) customer goals. Form and modality of customer engagement refers to the ways in which it can be expressed by customers, therefore it provides the ground for systematization of CEBs. There are three customer roles related to main forms of CEBs:

1) In customer role (traditional role): in-role behaviors typically occur within parameters defined by an organization, e.g., complaint behavior; (complain, purchase, return);

2) Outside customer role (help others): extra-role behaviors are discretionary activities that customers may choose to engage as offering useful suggestions to other customers, informing staff in a store that the price on some products displayed is incorrect;

3) Elective customer role (suggest innovation): elective behaviors are those that consumers engage in to achieve their consumption goals, e.g., calling a toll-free number to seek help with the consumption of the product or making suggestions to the company for product improvement and enhancements (van Doorn et al., 2010, Lemon, 2010). With regard to the abovementioned roles of engaged customers and forms of CEBs, the synthesizing proposition of Bijmolt et al. seems to be supportive. The authors distinguish three general manifestations of customer engagement: (1) customer complaining behavior, (2) word-of-mouth (WOM), and (3) customer co-creation behavior (Bijmolt et al., 2010). A similar stance is taken by Jaakkola and Alexander (2014, p. 249) who distinguish two general types of customer engagement behaviors:

1) Customers' communication about the focal firm or brand: CEB implies that customer may acquire new customers for the firm through firm-incentivized referral programs, or influence other customers' perceptions on their own initiative through word-of-mouth, blogging and other forms of customer-to-customer interactions.

2) Customer involvement in product development and innovation: signifies that customers help

improve or develop the firm's offerings by providing feedback, ideas, and information, or participating in product design or assembly.

Apart from the aforementioned propositions of CEBs systematization, there are also few attempts in the marketing literature to classify the customer engagement forms according to certain criteria. Below we discuss two approaches that represent different perspective on customer engagement classification: the consumer perspective (Vivek, Beatty and Morgan, 2012) and the managerial perspective (Nuttavuthisit, 2010).

Vivek, Beatty and Morgan (2012) propose classification of the foci of customer engagement (2012) using two dimensions: (1) interaction with offerings versus more general activities and (2) initiation by customer versus provider. This classification refers to the customer engagement (CE) concept, having broader meaning than CEB, as mentioned previously. CE conceptualization proposed incorporates not only behavioral elements but also the social (i.e. participation by individuals with the brand or product both within and outside of the exchange situations) and the cognitive and emotional (i.e. experiences and feelings of individuals, irrespective of the exchange). Consequently 2x2 classification matrix provides the four derived categories of customer engagement foci (see Table 2). Vivek, Beatty and Morgan focus on CE from the customers' perspective and aim to identify what engages the customers. Therefore the classification of the foci of CE refers to very broad spectrum of current consumers and noncustomers behaviors beyond the purchase. It also includes the consumer behaviors that are not related to any focal firm or brand (as for example yard sales, hobbies) and therefore goes beyond the definition of customer engagement suggested by Patterson, Yu, and de Ruyter (2006) and Brodie et al. (2011). On the other hand, the traditional in-role customer behaviors as complaint behavior is absent in this classification, so it does not exhaust all the possibilities of customer engagement.

	Provider initiated	Customer initiated
Offering initiated	Engagement initiated with goods, services, brands by organizations. Offerings that allow the customer to play an active role in creating a unique experience or receiving intrinsic value from an offering. Examples: - digital video recorders, cell phones, sewing machines (can be engaging for the customer because they allow customer to use his imagination and meet individual needs) - super-premium brands (can engage individuals by their status value) - philanthropic brands or political parties (can engage individuals by their humanitarian or social value).	Engagement initiated by certain consumers offerings that engage other customers. Examples: - yard sales, garage sales, flea markets (engage customers in large numbers and over time, visiting this markets is like a ritual because customers meet and socialize with others) - online sites that are customer initiated.
Activities initiated	Engagement initiated by the provider with programs or events that go beyond the firm's offerings. This category derives heavily from customer participation in activities such as skill development and creative events with the firm, often on the Internet. Examples: - customer participation in innovation and product development (Nokia invited customers to design a cell phone for themselves) - events at malls and retail stores - experiential in-home marketing events by customers of direct marketing businesses (such as Tupperware and Avon) - attendance at various company-sponsored seminars.	Engagement initiated with activates by consumers. These activities involve firm offerings but the activity is the focus and initiation point and the use of a firm's offering follows. Examples: - window shopping and browsing - hobbies such as photography, gardening, fishing.

Table 2. Classification of the foci of customer engagement

Source: Based on Vivek, Beatty and Morgan, 2012, p. 132-133.

On the other hand Nuttavuthisit (2010) proposes typology of consumer co-creation practices from the firm's perspective. There are two dimensions in this typology: (1) consumer participation versus creation and (2) co-creation for self versus for others. According to Nuttavuthisit, consumer participation refers to consumer's cooperation with the company invitation to actively engage in the value co-creation

process (i.e. is initiated by the company). Consumer creation is mainly determined by consumers who become proactive in co-creating value, and they take initiatives using a variety of resources and information. Co-creation for self means that consumers acquire value for themselves in a variety of forms (lower costs, better fit, faster time, more convenience or greater differentiation or psychological benefits of enjoyment and confidence from their ability to co-create for themselves). Co-creation for others may in turn results in perceived value of sharing exhibited in the forms of social bonds, revival of rituals or traditions, a sense of moral responsibility, and economic rewards from the shared resources and developments. 2x2 typology proposed by Nuttavuthisit consists of four categories of consumer co-creation practices (see Table 3). The typology of consumer co-creative practices proposed by Nuttavuthisit is consistent with CEB concept because it includes various forms of customers' behaviors in the process of value co-creation. Nevertheless, similarly to the previous classification by Vivek, Beatty and Morgan, the typology proposed by Nuttavuthisit does not exhaust all the possibilities of customer engagement. This results from emphasizing rather online customers' behaviors (and overlooking the offline customer engagement forms), as well as omitting the traditional in-role customer behaviors (i.e. complaint behavior). However this proposition contributes to the managerial perspective on CEB understanding, since the four Cs strategies to engage and interact with consumers are recommended by Nuttavuthisit. These are the strategies of: choice, complement, cause and communality. "From the well-established strategies of choices such as customization and self-service to the further developments of complement (e.g. DIY strategies), cause (e.g. buzz marketing), and communality (e.g. brand community), these proposed strategies enhance the deeper involvements of consumers in the co-creative process" (p. 323).

	Creation	Participation
For others	<p>IV. Creation-for-others</p> <p>It is motivated by consumers' devotion to an idea or belief and to the process of working with others toward their common interests (solving a problem, sharing information, promoting group identity). Individuals initiate, do and share things with others, often via online communities where members gather with others who share similar goals and interests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consumers generate and disseminate content online (news, ideas, videos) among themselves - consumers group offline in the real word (e.g. Harley-Davidson Owners Group). 	<p>III. Participation-for-others</p> <p>It is based on the consumer's intention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - share with other customers both positive and negative experiences which might help them in their buying decisions (e.g. spreading information about a company's promotion to the peers) - to support the company (e.g. acting as innovators who like to "test-drive" pilot pre-releases of products and communicate and exchange the ideas among consumers and with parent company)
For self	<p>II. Creation-for-self</p> <p>It is driven mainly by the DIY culture that encourages people to find their own niches. Consumers want to be heard, rather than be spoken to. They enjoy creating value by and for themselves, using their own knowledge and skills, complemented by the company (e.g. consumers creating their own deals on eBay, while hosting company work to facilitate the transactions).</p>	<p>I. Participation-for-self</p> <p>Consumer engages in a tailor-made process to achieve unstandardized products or services usually at a higher cost (e.g. video-on-demand subscription)</p> <p>or participate in a transfer of work from company to the consumer to reduce costs, time and energy (e.g. conducting banking transaction via Internet instead of visiting the service counter).</p>

Table 3. Typology of co-creative practices

Source: Based on Nuttavuthisit, 2010, p. 317-319.

Both discussed propositions of systematization (classification of foci of customer engagement and typology of customer co-creative practices) do not refer directly to CEB conceptualization and therefore some customer behaviors are not included. However the proposed criteria range may be contributive to the more precise classification of CEBs. The first crucial criterion is the subject who initiates the customer engagement behaviors (customer - creation or firm - participation). Other criteria, referred to the object that initiates the involvement (product or other firm activities) and for whom the value is co-created (for self and for other customers), are also very important in further CEBs classification.

4. Classification matrix of CEBs in the fashion industry

In the CEBs classification development also other criteria should be considered, for example the objects of interaction in which value is co-created (one-to-one or many-to-many). Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the customer involvement, which is one of the customer engagement antecedent (Vivek, Beatty and Morgan, 2012, pp. 134-135), is dependent on the product category. Consequently, the CEBs may be determined by the product category. Based on the involvement grid proposed by Foote, Cone and Belding (FCB) (Lambin, 1998) four types of product categories are distinguished depending on the customer involvement levels (high vs. low) and different forms of this involvement (intellectual vs. affective manner). Fashion goods, which are the high and affective customer involvement products in the FCB involvement grid, belong to the most engaging product category in offline and online environments. For example in Poland, fashion is the fourth the most popular category followed on Facebook (Sotrender, 2014). At the same time fashion products have the significant contribution to the ecommerce sales. For example in the US, online apparel sales continue to capture a greater share of US retail ecommerce sales. According to eMarketer, apparel and accessories are best-performing online category which register the highest sales CAGR (Compound Annual Growth Rate) of 17.2% in 2012-2017 (eMarketer, 2013). Therefore, in this paper we adopt the sectoral approach in developing the CEBs classification and we focus on the CEBs forms in the fashion industry. The case study research method was applied to identify the CEBs in the fashion sector. This research method is useful in CEB exploration and description within its real-life context since the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Yin 1984, p. 23). Four cases (companies) were selected to in-depth exploration. These are Nike, Threadless, Spreadshirt and John Fluevog, the pioneers and leaders in the customer engaging practices in the fashion market. The multiple sources of evidence were used including firms' websites, brochures, presentations, blogs as well as the supplementary online interviews with the firm's staff. The case research findings were also complemented by the review of traditional (offline and online) customer behaviors.

In the final proposition of CEBs classification two dimensions are proposed: (1) engagement initiator subject (customer or firm may initiate the CEBs) and (2) subjects of value co-creating interaction (the value may be co-created in one-to-one interaction between firm and customer or in the interactions many-to-many between customers). Consequently 2x2 classification matrix provides the four derived categories of CEBs (see Table 4). This is explored in depth, next.

Subjects of value co-creating interaction Engagement initiator subject	Firm – customer	Customer - customer
	Customer	I
Firm	II	IV

Table 4. Classification of CEBs

I. CEBs are initiated by the customer himself (current or potential) and the value is co-created in the interaction one-to-one, between the firm and the customer. CEBs related to the traditional role of customer as complaint behavior are included here. Also elective customer role behaviors such as making suggestions to the company for product improvement or enhancements are included in this class of CEBs. These CEBs may occur in both offline and online environments. From the managerial perspective, these CEBs' effects are positive for a firm since customer delivers valuable knowledge that may be transformed into the new/augmented product developments or enhancing the customer service etc. For example, a customer may complain about the poor quality of clothes he bought and the firm may analyze the reasons of this problem and eventually to recall this product and avoid potential complaints by other customers.

II. CEBs are initiated by the firm and the value is co-created in the interaction one-to-one, between the firm and the customer (current or potential). These CEBs result from integrating the individual customer into the firm's business processes (e.g. product design, ad design). These CEBs are stimulated by information technology and occur mainly in online conditions. Customer may participate in product personalization using online product generator. For example Nike offers product customization ("Customize with NIKEiD"). Customer may buy customized shoes and accessories (e.g. gears) online. The customer selects colors and patterns for various product elements (lining, lace, midsole, body, zips, strips) and adds his own personal ID (6 text characters) on the product. Customer may also customize the clothes by design any clothes prints. For example Spreadshirt customer may select colors and adds any text and photos he wants to have printed on the product (t-shirts, hoodies, sweatshirts and aprons). Customers may also act as the product designers in the open innovation model. For example John Fluevog has its forum for customers to submit their shoe design ideas (Fluevog "Open Source Footwear"). Every year the firm chooses a design that is made and adds it to the collection (it is named after a designer and a pair of shoes is sent to him). Customer may also act as copywriter and design promotion instruments for a firm. For example, John Fluevog asks its customers to submit ad designs for active briefs published online (so called "Fluevog Creative"). The best ad designs are selected by the firm and appear in magazines as Fluevog advertising. The best ad designers may win a prize of 1000 USD. From the managerial perspective, these CEBs' effects are positive for a firm since some business processes are performed by the customer instead of being executed by firm's employees or commercial suppliers. The customer acts as prosumer and the firm may reduce the costs of business processes related to testing the customer product preferences or subcontracting advertising campaign to specialized agency.

III. CEBs are initiated by the customer himself (current or potential) and the value is co-created in the interactions many-to-many between the customers. These CEBs include mainly customers' communication about the focal firm, brand or product category through word-of-mouth (WOM). Usually fashion bloggers and communities represent these CEBs. From the managerial perspective, these CEBs' effects may be positive or negative for a firm. Positive WOM may improve firm's customer acquisition and retention. However negative communication about the firms' products or unethical activities resulting in consumer boycotts or legal actions may be disruptive for a firm.

IV. CEBs are initiated by the firm and the value is co-created in the interactions many-to-many between the customers (current or potential). These CEBs refers to the crowdsourcing and engaging online communities to perform some firm's business processes (designing the products and analyzing the market perception, promoting and selling the firm's products or even financing the production). For example Threadless asks the customers (artists) to submit designs (prints), the Threadless community scores each design and the best of the best are printed and sold. New designs are chosen for print every week and the winning artists can profit for their designs, and in some cases, also win cash prizes from special themed design challenges. The designers may also use the Threadless forums to collaborate with others on their designs or ask for a critique. The customers may also sell the products using the firm resources (platforms). For example Threadless invites customers to create their shops ("Artist shop"), upload their art designs, and collect earnings on each sale. Threadless buys the inventory, ships the orders, and services customers who buy in these "Artist shops". Spreadshirt has similar selling policy and invites its customers to sell their designs through Spreadshirt marketplace or to create their own online shops in the firm's domain (shopname.spreadshirt.com). Threadless also introduced the funding option for the customers. Funding is like voting on Threadless design submissions with the customer's wallet. If the customer likes a design that is open for scoring, he can fund it by entering his credit card info, shipping address, and size like he would any purchase. If the design gets fully funded, Threadless print it and ship to the customer. From the managerial perspective, these CEBs' effects are positive for a firm since some business processes are performed by the customers (or communities) instead of being executed by firm's employees or commercial suppliers.

It may be noticed that managerial perspective predominates in the proposition of the CEBs classification matrix in the fashion industry. We posit that firms may manage the customer engagement behaviors whether they are initiated by the firms or by the customers. The latter requires the stimulation of the customer in-role and elective behaviors by providing the interactive communication infrastructure (quarter I) and moderation of the many-to-many customer communication, also the negative WOMs

(quarter III).

However it should be emphasized that the sectoral case research provides very little basis for scientific generalization since we used a small number of subjects. That is the main limitation of this research. On the other hand, the fashion suppliers (both producers and retailers) represent the most advanced customer engagement practices as fashion belongs to the high affective involvement product category and then is one of the most engaging category in offline and online environments. Also the cases selected for the research are the pioneers and leaders in the customer engaging practices in the fashion market. So the entire range of CEBs in this market is likely to be included. Although some CEBs specific to other industries may be absent, for example co-creation the products by hacker communities in the quarter III (Pronto, Lego Mindstorms).

The research findings and the CEBs matrix presented in this paper implicate the future research directions. Firstly, the customer engaging strategies should be designed basing on the CEBs classification matrix. Recommendations on how to increase the positive effects and reduce the negative effects of the customer engagement behaviors should be developed in the future research. The previous achievements within the strategies of mass customization, crowdsourcing, WOM and brand communities that constitute the broader CEB strategy, should be considered regarding the recommended customer engaging strategies. Secondly, more sectoral insights are necessary to explore the potential of customer engagement behaviors regarding the product categories from each part of the involvement grid by Foote, Cone and Belding (FCB). In other words, the relationships between the customer involvement levels (high vs. low) and different forms of this involvement (intellectual vs. affective manner) should be explored and explained in future research.

5. Conclusion

The customer engagement behavior concept is still in its developing phase. Our exploration and description of the customer engagement behavior in the fashion sector and the research findings contribute to the better understanding of the CEB phenomenon in marketing discipline. We support van Doorn et al. (2010) and claim that CEB is the customer's behavioral manifestations that have a brand or firm focus, beyond purchase, resulting from motivational drivers. There are three general types of CEBs including customer complaining behavior, word-of-mouth, and customer co-creation behavior. We propose 2x2 classification matrix providing the four derived categories of CEBs to understand the complexity of the general CEB types. Two classification dimensions are proposed: (1) engagement initiator subject (customer or firm may initiate the CEBs) and (2) subjects of value co-creating interaction (the value may be co-created in one-to-one interaction between firm and customer or in the interactions many-to-many between customers).

With regard to the theoretical value added, the proposed CEBs classification indicates the CEB related managerial categories as customization, customer integration and crowdsourcing and implies the holistic approach to the CEB (as the superior category) in the further in-depth research. Moreover, the theoretical studies revealed that the customer engagement (CE) concept, broader than CEB, refers to cognitive and emotional antecedents of the customer engagement behaviors. Concerning the practical value added, by offering the pragmatic understanding of CEB forms, some managerial implications are proposed. The CEBs are manageable whether they are initiated by the firms or by the customers. Therefore the firms should develop the strategies for CEB enhancement depending on the CEBs class.

Acknowledgments

The work was financially supported by the National Science Centre in Poland, project no 2014/13/B/HS4/01614.

References

- APPELBAUM A. 2001. The Constant Customer, *Gallup Business Journal*, June 17, <http://businessjournal.gallup.com/content/745/constant-customer.aspx#1> [14.05.2014].
- BIJMOLT T.H., LEEFLANG P.S., BLOCK F., EISENBEISS M., HARDIE B.G., LEMMENS A., SAFFERT P., 2010. Analytics for Customer Engagement, *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3).
- BRODIE R., HOLLEBEEK L., JURIC B., ILIC A. 2011. Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain,

- Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research, *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3).
- FISK R., GROVE S., JOHN J. 2008. *Interactive Services Marketing*, 3rd Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.
- GRÖNROOS C. 2006. Adopting service logic for marketing, *Marketing Theory*, 6(3).
- HOLLEBEEK L. 2011. Demystifying Customer Brand Engagement: Exploring the Loyalty Nexus, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27 (7–8).
- JAAKKOLA E., ALEXANDER M. 2014. The Role of Customer Engagement Behavior n Value Co-Creation. A Service System Perspective, *Journal of Service Research*, 17(3).
- JAVORNIK A., MANDELLI A. 2012. Behavioral perspectives of customer engagement: An exploratory study of customer engagement with three Swiss FMCG brands, *Database Marketing & Customer Strategy Management*, 19 (4).
- KUMAR V., AKSOY L., DONKERS B., VENKATESAN R., WIESEL T., TILLMANN S. 2010. Undervalued or Overvalued Customers: Capturing Total Customer Engagement Value, *Journal of Service Research* 13(3).
- LAMBIN J-J., 1998. *Strategic Marketing Management*, Mc-Graw-Hill France.
- LEMON K. N., 2010. *Customer Engagement Behavior: Inputs, Triggers and Consequences*, Marketing Science Institute, Conference Presentations.
- LUSCH R., VARGO S. 2006. Service-Dominant Logic: Reactions, Reflections and Refinements, *Marketing Theory*, 6, September.
- OXFORD ADVANCED LEARNER'S DICTIONARY, Oxford University Press, 1989.
- PATTERSON P., YU T., DE RUYTER KO, 2006. *Understanding Customer Engagement in Services*, Proceedings of ANZMAC 2006 Conference, Brisbane, 4-6 Dec.
- PRAHALAD C., RAMASWAMY V. 2004. *The Future of Competition: Co-Creating Unique Value With Customers*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- THE ECONOMIST INTELLIGENCE UNIT, 2007. *Beyond loyalty. Meeting the challenge of customer engagement*. A report from the Economist Intelligence Unit sponsored by Adobe Systems. Part I.
- TOFFLER A., 1980. *The Third Wave: The Classic Study of Tomorrow*, New York, NY: Bantam.
- VAN DORN, J., LEMON K.N., V. MITTAL, NASS S., PICK D., PIRNER P., VERHOEF P.C., 2010. Customer Engagement Behavior: Theoretical Foundations and Research Directions, *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3).
- VARGO S., LUSCH R., 2004. Evolving To a New Dominant Logic for Marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1).
- VIVEK S., BEATTY S., MORGAN M., 2012. Customer Engagement: Exploring Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, vol. 20, no. 2.
- VERHOEF P, REINARTZ W., KRAFFT M., 2010. Customer Engagement as a New Perspective in Customer Management, *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3).
- YIN, R. 1984. *Case Study Research: design and methods*, Sage Publications, Thousands Oaks.