THE ROLE OF CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT BEHAVIOR IN VALUE CO-CREATION:

A SERVICE SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

Dr Elina Jaakkola

Postdoctoral Researcher

Department of Marketing and International Business

Turku School of Economics, University of Turku

FI-20014 University of Turku, Finland

E-mail: elina.jaakkola@utu.fi

Tel. +3582 3339 222, Fax: +3582 3338 900

Dr Matthew Alexander*

Senior Lecturer

Department of Marketing

University of Strathclyde

Sir William Duncan Building

130 Rottenrow

G4 0GE Glasgow

matthew.j.alexander@strath.ac.uk

Tel. +44 (0)141 548 3949, Fax: +44 (0)141 552 2802

THE ROLE OF CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT BEHAVIOR IN VALUE CO-CREATION: A SERVICE SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

Abstract:

Recent developments in marketing highlight the blurring of boundaries between firms and customers. The concept of customer engagement aggregates the multiple ways customer behaviors beyond transactions may influence the firm. However, the term is embryonic and academics and practitioners alike lack understanding on how customer engagement contributes to value co-creation. This paper marks the first attempt to conceptualize the role of customer engagement behavior (CEB) in value co-creation within a multi-stakeholder service system. We combine the theoretical perspectives of customer engagement and value co-creation research to the analysis of a rich case study of a public transport service system involving consumers, communities, businesses, and governmental organizations. Our findings describe drivers for CEB, identify four types of CEB, and explore the value outcomes experienced by various stakeholders. This paper proposes that CEB affects value co-creation by virtue of customers' diverse resource contributions towards the focal firm and/or other stakeholders that modify and/or augment the offering, and/or affect other stakeholders' perceptions, preferences, expectations or actions towards the firm or its offering. Through inducing broader resource integration, CEB makes value co-creation a system level process. We offer nine research propositions explicating the connections CEB has to value co-creation by focal customers, the focal firm and other stakeholders. Our research suggests that firms focus greater attention on the resources that customers can contribute, explore the potential to engage diverse stakeholders around a common cause and

employ organically emerging systems which provide opportunities for more extensive value

co-creation.

THE ROLE OF CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT BEHAVIOR IN VALUE CO-CREATION: A SERVICE SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Contemporary thinking in many domains suggests that the roles of customer and seller are becoming increasingly blurred: users participate in content creation and product development (Hoyer et al. 2010; Kristensson et al. 2004; Nambisan and Baron 2009); support each other in product use (Dholakia et al. 2009), and promote products, services and/or brands to other customers (De Bruyn and Lilien 2008; Libai et al. 2010). The concept of *customer engagement* (CE) is a recent attempt to aggregate multiple ways that customer behaviors beyond transactions might influence the firm (Brodie et al. 2011; Van Doorn et al. 2010; Verhoef et al. 2010).

There is considerable interest in the potential to engage customers and customer communities in "co-production" or "co-creation" to enhance business performance or customer value (Auh et al. 2007; Chan et al. 2010; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004). This importance is underlined by the Marketing Science Institute (MSI) declaring customer engagement a key research priority for the period 2010-2012 (MSI 2008), and the *Journal of Service Research* seizing the initiative with a *Special Issue* (2010, Vol. 13, No. 3) and *special section* with responses (2011, Vol. 14, No. 3). However, as yet, academics and practitioners alike lack sufficient understanding on how customer engagement contributes to the processes of value co-creation (Bolton 2011; Brodie and Hollebeek 2011; Brodie et al. 2011). Organizations face challenges in gaining insight into the resources customers contribute to value co-creation (Baron and Warnaby 2011), and the benefits and challenges resulting from customer contributions (Hoyer et al. 2010). Furthermore, the synergistic, iterative effects of

CE on value co-creation by multiple actors in a network setting is not yet sufficiently understood (Bolton 2011; Brodie et al. 2013) but arguably crucial as CE behaviors are reported to have implications beyond the customer-provider dyad, e.g. through collective dissemination of recommendations and information (De Bruyn and Lilien 2008; Dholakia et al. 2009); or through social practices in brand communities (Brodie et al. 2013; Schau et al. 2009).

The purpose of this paper is to *explore the role of customer engagement behavior (CEB) in value co-creation in a multi-stakeholder service system*. Specifically, the study examines the drivers for CEB, the resources that customers contribute through CEB, and the outcomes of CEB for different stakeholders in a service system. The study contributes to the domains of customer engagement and value co-creation research by combining these theoretical perspectives in the analysis of a rich case study that explores CEB at the level of a service system comprising multiple actors and their networks. We apply the conceptual thinking of service dominant logic (S-D Logic) (Gummesson and Mele 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2011; Vargo and Lusch 2008) to analyze value co-creation emerging through resource integration, and draw on previous research on CEB for insights into the broad range of resources customers may contribute through various CE behaviors, and the potential drivers and outcomes of such behaviors.

The main contribution of the paper is to conceptualize how customer engagement behavior affects value co-creation in a service system, formulated through a set of research propositions. This study also brings new knowledge on the types of customer engagement behavior, contributing to the discussion on the scope of the concept. Empirically, the paper provides a new perspective as it studies engagement in an offline environment, contrasting with previous empirical research on CE that has mainly addressed behaviors in virtual

environments (Brodie et al. 2013; Dholakia et al. 2009; Schau et al. 2009). Thereby we make a contribution to the research agenda set by Brodie et al. (2011).

The paper is organized as follows. First, the literature on customer engagement and value co-creation is briefly discussed. The paper continues by outlining the methodological approach and the case study setting for the research. The subsequent sections report the study findings, followed by the formation of research propositions, conclusions and implications for research and practice.

Theoretical background

Customer Engagement Behavior: Types, Drivers and Outcomes

Customer engagement is a psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive customer experiences with a focal agent/object such as a firm or brand (Brodie et al. 2011). This study focuses on the *behavioral manifestations* of customer engagement. We study customer engagement behaviors through which *customers make voluntary resource contributions that have a brand or firm focus but go beyond what is fundamental to transactions, occur in interactions between the focal object and/or other actors, and result from motivational drivers* (cf. Brodie et al. 2011; Brodie et al. 2013; Van Doorn et al. 2010).

Many extant concepts are close to yet distinct from customer engagement behavior. We distinguish CEB from co-production, which refers to the degree to which the customer is involved in producing the offering for themselves (e.g. Bendapudi and Leone 2003; Vargo and Lusch 2008). When co-production is an in-built element of the transaction (which is the case for example in many service settings, see Auh et al. 2007), it is not, to the same extent, a voluntary, extra-role behavior with a broader interactive character as is associated with CEB (cf. Brodie et al. 2011). Many traditional service frameworks such as the Servuction model

(Eiglier & Langeard, 1987) or Servicescape (Bitner, 1992) acknowledge how customer participation contributes to the service experience of themselves or other customers, but typically focus on customer actions elementary to the service transaction and the duration of the service encounter only. Furthermore, while CE encompasses many customer contributions previously referred to as voluntary or extra-role behaviors, it has a broader scope. Extra-role behaviors commonly refer to customers seeking to benefit the organization rather than acting out of self-interest (Ahearne et al, 2005). Other related concepts such as customer voluntary performance (e.g. Bettencourt, 1997) and customer citizenship behaviors (e.g. Rosenbaum and Massiah, 2007) focus on customer contributions to the service quality of a firm through benevolent behaviors that are consistent with the role assigned to the customers by the provider, the stance being that the customer is helping the firm according to the plans of the firm. The concept of customer engagement behavior in turn views customers exogenously, driven by their own unique purposes and intentions instead of those originating from the firm. Moreover, CE is considered to be manifest in behaviors which could be either beneficial or unbeneficial towards the firm (e.g. van Doorn et al. 2010; Brodie et al. 2013).

Previous research primarily focuses on two types of CEB: customer involvement in product development and innovation, and customers' communication about the focal firm or brand. First, by providing feedback, ideas, and information (Kumar et al. 2010), or participating in product design or assembly (Hoyer et al. 2010; Kristensson et al. 2004), customers help improve or develop the firm's offerings. Second, customers may acquire new customers for the firm through firm-incentivized referral programs (Kumar et al. 2010), or influence other customers' perceptions on their own initiative through word-of-mouth, blogging and other forms of customer-to-customer interaction (Brodie et al. 2013; Libai et al. 2010).

Many studies discuss why customers engage in behaviors beyond those of a buyer or a user. Van Doorn et al. (2010) propose customer based drivers for CEB, including attitudinal factors such as satisfaction, brand commitment, and trust, as well as customer goals, resources and value perceptions. Empirical studies conducted in online contexts have shown that customers are motivated to engage in non-transactional behaviors because they expect benefits such as enhanced knowledge and reputation, social benefits, and economic benefits such as cost savings (Füller 2010; Nambisan and Baron 2009). Firms can facilitate CEB by providing effective platforms for information exchange and interaction (Baron and Warnaby 2011; Dholakia et al. 2009), and rewarding customers for their contributions (Füller 2010; Kumar et al. 2010).

The outcomes arising from CE may include customer loyalty to and satisfaction with the brand and community, empowerment, trust and commitment towards other members in the community (Brodie et al. 2013). Customer-to-customer interaction in brand communities has been identified as a source of value for the firm and the participants in such communities (Schau et al. 2009), and customer involvement in product development may increase product benefits and novelty (Hoyer et al. 2010; Kristensson et al. 2004). For the firm, outcomes of CEB may accrue directly or via other constituents, and the consequences may be positive (e.g. increased innovativeness and customer willingness to pay) or negative (e.g. unfavorable WOM) (Brodie et al. 2011; Gebauer et al. 2012).

While these contributions give an indication of the value implications of CEB, a holistic understanding on the contribution of CEB to value co-creation processes at the system level remains absent. A system perspective is needed to broaden the perspective to encompass the community around engaged customers, i.e. the citizens and organizations that are affected by, or affect the behaviour of the engaged customers. Furthermore, extant research mostly

discusses value as outcomes, without explicating how value emerges. We draw on the service-dominant logic perspective to conceptualize value co-creation on a system level.

CEB and value co-creation within service systems

Extant literature considers value a jointly created phenomenon that emerges in interaction, through the integration of resources (Grönroos and Voima 2012; Gummesson and Mele 2010; Vargo and Lusch 2008). Value co-creation does not require transactions, but actors may exchange a range of resources that go beyond goods and money (Michel et al. 2008). The value of resources exchanged is phenomenologically determined by the individual (Vargo and Lusch 2008), affected by their fit with unique value processes (Grönroos and Ravald 2011), individual, relational and collective goals (Epp and Price 2011) and context and social system (Chandler and Vargo 2011; Edvardsson et al. 2011).

The value literature has primarily focused on firm conditions required for successful value co-creation, emphasizing strong relationships (Jaworski and Kohli 2006; Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004), and high quality interactions and dialogue (Auh et al. 2007). CEB, on the other hand, are concerned with the resources provided by the customer. This paper argues that through non-transactional engagement behaviors, customers contribute a broad range of resources – for example time, money, or actions – that directly or indirectly affect the firm and the customers in varying degrees of magnitude and impact (cf. Van Doorn et al. 2010).

Recent developments in the S-D literature emphasize that value co-creation takes place in the context of complex and dynamic network structures, or service systems (Edvardsson et al. 2011; Maglio and Spohrer, 2008; Vargo and Lusch 2011). A service system is a value-creation configuration comprising the exchange parties (providers and customers) and their networks that indirectly influence value co-creation (Edvardsson et al. 2011; Vargo et al.

2008). Examples of service systems include cities, call centers, hospitals and universities; they constitute the configuration of people, technologies and other resources that as an integrated whole enable value co-creation (Edvardsson et al. 2011; Patricio et al., 2011). The service system concept emphasizes the permeable boundaries and dynamic network character of the service setting; considering value co-creation (i.e. resource exchange and integration) to take place between providers and customers that are embedded in networks of other providers, customers, partners, and stakeholders (e.g., Edvardsson et al. 2011; Maglio and Spohrer 2008; Vargo and Lusch 2011). Past research indicates that through CEB, customers may extensively contribute resources within their own networks, to actors beyond the provider-customer dyad (Nambisan and Baron 2009; Schau et al. 2009). Thereby CEB will inevitably affect value-creation processes at the system level.

As the current knowledge on the range of resources contributed through CEB, and their connection to value co-creation by different stakeholders is scant, empirical research was conducted to explore these issues. The next sections present the methodology and findings of our empirical study.

Methodology

Research approach and case description

We adopted an embedded case study approach which is well suited to exploratory investigations where phenomena are not well understood (Eisenhardt 1989; Halinen and Törnroos 2005; Yin 2003). The case study setting is 'Adopt a Station' scheme run by First ScotRail (hereafter ScotRail), the current operator of rail services in Scotland, UK. The focal firm ScotRail is a subsidiary of a large private sector transport firm FirstGroup. ScotRail runs rail services as a franchisee of 'Transport Scotland', a Scottish governmental body

responsible for transport services in Scotland alongside Network Rail, a UK body who own and operate much of the UK rail infrastructure.

The 'Adopt a Station' scheme is a partnership between ScotRail and groups of citizens invited to 'adopt' railway stations. The scheme allows local communities to occupy vacant accommodation within stations for the provision of services and other facility improvements. The focal customers in the study are these "adopters", i.e. private citizens or community groups such as charities, who engage in behaviors beyond those of traditional buyers or users of rail services. Nearly two thirds of all stations in Scotland are registered with the scheme, running projects including gardening, bookshops, cafes and community meeting places.

Other stakeholders in the studied station service system include other rail users, as well as organizations such as Passenger focus (an independent, consumer travel watchdog); The Railway Heritage Trust (charitable organization concerned with the preservation of historic railway buildings and infrastructure); and local councils who own the land around some of the stations and in some cases are responsible for buildings on stations. The case represents a service system where value co-creation involves consumers, communities, businesses, and governmental organizations.

Data collection and analysis

Our embedded design allowed us to explore how CEB were manifested within the geographically and socio-culturally diverse range of projects. First, site visits were undertaken to 10 stations, with four selected for further research, namely: Wemyss Bay, Uddingston, Pitlochry and North Berwick. These subcases well represented the diversity of activities adopters were involved in, and also constituted a mixture of urban and rural settings.

Data were collected over a period of ten months with the full consent of the firm. We used a key informant (the manager responsible for overseeing the scheme) as a sounding board for case selection. Regular meetings were held with this individual throughout the process to cross check findings and/or themes emerging from the research. The primary data collection method for this study was in-depth interviewing (Fontana and Frey 1994). Altogether 42 interviews were held with adopters, representatives of ScotRail and other stakeholders who were involved with the scheme in some way; these included local council representatives and other funding bodies. Each site visit began through contact with a key informant from the adoption team who served as principle interviewee and also recruited other participants, sometimes interviewed in a group setting. Interviews were essentially unstructured but covered the 'story' of the adoption and motivations behind it; actions taken related to adoption, the relationship between the adopters and ScotRail; and the impact on the community. The interviewees were allowed free reign to express their views and raise new issues (Yin 2003). The interviews were transcribed verbatim, resulting in 97 pages of transcripts.

Consistent with a case study strategy we incorporated a range of other data relating to the scheme which helped to validate our findings (Eisenhardt 1989; Yin 2003) Observations taken at meetings of adopters and at the studied stations provided data for supportive analysis and validation. Wider understanding of the adoption scheme and verification of analysis was gained through a range of secondary data such as newspaper articles, presentations, reports and websites. In reporting the findings, the respondent's station or firm is used or secondary data identified using an appropriate tag.

To ensure reliability and validity of data we employed methods suggested by Creswell (2009)[1]. Typical of case study research, our goal was not to achieve scientific generalization but analytical generalization, where theoretical concepts are used as templates with which to compare the empirical results of a case (Yin 2003). Therefore we generalize on the theoretical notion of CEB by analyzing and reporting on the similarities and differences found among the phenomena of interest. Data analysis was guided by our conceptualization of CEB as customer resource contributions beyond those fundamental to transactions (i.e. money and participation required for service delivery) directed to the focal firm and/or other stakeholders. Principal themes centered on CEB behaviors and related resource contributions, factors driving CEB, and the resulting value outcomes for the various stakeholders. We did not impose any *a priori* categories but allowed themes to arise inductively.

Analysis was undertaken in two stages. First, all transcripts, notes and documents were examined by each researcher independently using an open coding approach (Strauss and Corbin 1998), which allowed some initial themes to emerge. Themes were then subjected to selective coding in the second stage to explore commonalities between data sources. We used QSR NVivo9 to aid the tracking of themes that were developed. Data analysis aimed to identify factors that affected station adopters' engagement behaviors; the contributions of adopters to the service system; and the implications of CEB as experienced by different stakeholders.

Findings

Drivers of customer engagement behavior

Our analysis identified CEB drivers related to the focal firm ScotRail, the adopters themselves, and other stakeholders. It was evident that the focal firm ScotRail influenced

---

[1] We used independent coding, multiple sources of data for triangulation, independent judging of findings via our key informant, a prolonged time in the field (10 months) and peer debriefing.

CEB in various ways. A central factor driving the adopters' engagement was the *access* provided by ScotRail whose approach was to welcome communities and make involvement in the service system as easy as possible:

> *"Sometimes a member of the public saying 'can I use that' has concentrated our minds...do we really need all these rooms?" (J, ScotRail)*

ScotRail perceived that collaboration with the community was desirable, and facilitated involvement whilst avoiding barriers that might discourage adopters. While all adopters undertake a certain level of safety training and are required to liaise with station staff, for the most part adopters recognized that it was "*just a good common sense approach, if there was too much bureaucracy people wouldn't do it*" (S, North Berwick). This easy to access policy is evidenced within the documentation ScotRail use to promote the scheme where they state that "*safety requirements when sensibly interpreted need not be unduly onerous*" and "*gardening need only be low-maintenance in order to achieve a worthwhile impact*" (ScotRail Presentation).

The engagement with adopters also required the firm to *cede a certain amount of control* and appreciate that this could result in a source of differentiation across stations:

> *"By buying into Uddingston or whatever we are making this look a bit different and we are not saying, sorry, you can only have purple flowers. We are inviting people to inspire and explore in their own way" (J, ScotRail).*

This freedom was seen at Wemyss Bay station which escaped a corporate rebrand as the adopters were concerned that the new color scheme would have affected the authentic appearance of the station. Many stations on the line have a highly customized appearance and functions; for instance old signal boxes converted to potting sheds, and station masters flats used by model railway clubs; demonstrating the firm relinquishing some control to groups of customers.

The data indicate that another key driver for CEB was the adopters' sense of *ownership* of the project and, in some cases, the station itself. Ownership was seen by one adopter as being "*at the heart of everything*" (S, North Berwick) and was fostered by the rail company who identified communities as being a constant feature within a periodically changing ownership and management landscape:

> *"Ten years ago this would have been a RailTrack station, funded by the 'strategic rail authority', with services operated by National Express ScotRail. Now, all those bodies have gone, replaced by Network rail, Transport Scotland and First ScotRail. Chances are in 10 years' time it will be another set of bodies, the only question then is whose is it? By having community involvement we are making it clear that it* [belongs to] *the good people who buy the tickets and pay taxes to keep it going....that is the most important message I think" (J, ScotRail).*

A sense of ownership was instrumental to addressing specific needs or taking action at the station. The adopters were motivated by *needs for improvements* both at the individual and collective level. For example, one passenger opened a coffee shop as she was *"fed up with not being able to get a coffee"* (M, Uddingston) at the station. At another station, two community members sold second-hand books '*from a cardboard box in the corner*' (N, Pitlochry) and following ScotRail involvement took over two vacant rooms in the station and quickly raised over £20,000 for charity. In other cases ownership was more closely related to specific motivations to make improvements to the local community at a collective level, as described by a representative of ScotRail:

> *"It's very post-industrial; these are communities seeking identity in a world where it is no longer generated by the local factory if you like...also people are living longer, and looking for activities to keep them going" (J, ScotRail).*

One resident explained that adoption was driven in part by uncertain council funding: "*given recent cuts it was important to maintain the pride of the town through community involvement*" (S, Carnoustie). In another case, a ScotRail representative made a potential adopter realize that "*it was my environment and I was sick of it looking like this ...the inside*

of the station was in a dreadful state, that's one of the reasons why we got together in the first

place"(N, Weymss Bay).

The success of the adoption projects also required *a positive relationship* between the

adopters and the focal firm. Adopters' actions were facilitated by frequent *communication*

between adopters and ScotRail's external relations manager (J, ScotRail) who acted as a kind

of key account manager between the firm and adopters. A high level of trust and positive

dialogue between the firms and adopters enabled the swift resolution of issues and provided

adopters with a fixed point of contact:

> *"If I have a problem, I get in touch with (J, ScotRail) and the problem is solved - that's a good relationship" (S, North Berwick).*

Adopters also built up positive relationships with members of staff at the stations. For

instance, the station manager of one of the studied stations played an active role in the

'friends' organization, and at another station, a local resident who used the station as '*an*

extension of his back garden' had developed good collaboration with the staff member:

> *"You might have thought that Gary, the staff member, would have said, this is exploitation this unpaid person coming in here and doing gardening work, it is outrageous. Instead of which, he said he had tried but it was difficult on his own. He now supplies Peter with cuttings from his garden and Peter waters while Gary sells tickets so there is no animosity there at all" (J, ScotRail).*

Alongside factors related to ScotRail and the adopters, we found the *support of other*

stakeholders an essential driver for CEB. Local businesses supported the adopters e.g. by

providing plants for gardening or technical assistance such as in setting up websites for

adopter groups. Also connections with local government were considered important, as

denoted by one adopter: "we *are fortunate to have three councilors who come to our*

meetings who are very supportive of us" (I, Uddingston). Another adopter who had opened up

a coffee shop in her local station reported how the growing community involvement appeared

to encourage other investment: "*South Lanarkshire (council) and Strathclyde Passenger*

Transport were more than happy to invest in extending the car parks" (M, Uddingston). For organizations such as the Railway Heritage Trust, adopter engagement acted as a conduit through which specific projects relating to the preservation of a station's architectural features could be secured. To further facilitate customer engagement behavior, Transport Scotland created the Station Communities Regeneration Fund (SCRF) which allows community groups to apply for funds to support the redevelopment of station areas for small business and community use. ScotRail identified that the fund was indicative of the generally supportive atmosphere towards adoption:

> *"Everybody judge's Adoption as a heart-warming, not a heart-rending, experience... and the proof of that was the [SCRF] scheme" (J, ScotRail)*

In sum, drivers for CEB in the Adopt a Station context were found to originate from the focal firm, focal customers and other stakeholders, who all appear to contribute to creating conditions which foster CEB. These drivers are summarized in Table 1. The behaviors that are manifested as a result of these conditions are discussed in the following section.

Please insert Table 1 here

Types of Customer Engagement Behaviors

A range of CEB behaviors was evident in the studied cases. Perhaps the primary form of CEB in the station scheme was adopters implementing improvements and augmentations to the stations' services and facilities, for example, by doing gardening and running and maintaining additional services on the station premises. Through such actions, the adopters contributed considerable amounts of time, physical labor, skills and knowledge. One community group who opened a charity bookshop explained:

> *"The deal, which is a fair one, is that we can use the space but we had to decorate it, we had to clean it out, that's fair enough...we don't pay rent and that is a wonderful addition" (N, Pitlochry).*

One adopter's passion for his local line has led him to travel extensive distances to five remote stations to tend flowers and gardens, requiring a 12 hour round trip several days a week. This work requires considerable time investment, some adopters spending several hours a day at the station during the growing season. In some stations, adopters had opened small businesses such as charity bookshops, operating in one case with 23 volunteers who keep the bookshop running with a waiting list for others wishing to get involved. These actions can be labeled *"augmenting behavior"* as customers contributed resources that directly added to ScotRail's offering. Through their work, the adopters implemented improvements to the facilities and appearance of the station which made it more appealing for themselves and other rail users.

We also identified behaviors related to *co-developing* the station and rail services. Co-developing behavior involved offering ScotRail help, ideas, and information that the focal firm could take into consideration when developing their services. With company support, adopters contributed time, labor, and knowledge to take initiative in solving problems that occurred at the station. One adopter explained:

> *"Last year we had great problems with litter bins, seagulls were going in and spreading the contents, so we contacted ScotRail and arranged to have new bins which are seagull proof and working very well" (S, North Berwick).*

For some adopters the co-development behavior extended to empowerment to address other perceived problems, making the adopters an important partner of the focal firm. For example, at a meeting of one station adoption group, when ScotRail highlighted the annual cost of fines related to quality control infringements, the chair of the adopters' liaison group remarked "*we must be able to help you avoid that*" (P, Pitlochry).

Another type of engagement behavior evident in our data was that of *influencing behavior,* where adopters used their knowledge and experience to affect others' awareness and perceptions. Adopters recognized this role observing that the scheme was "*about the community representing itself*" (Field Notes, Bishopton) but also concerned with "*changing people's perceptions*" (Field Notes, Garrowhill). ScotRail harness these influencing behaviors with some adopters becoming ambassadors for the scheme:

> "*We are doing our best to put the word out there, we go around doing presentations on what we do in Uddingston, what we do at the station, so if anybody wants to adopt a station then they go out to them and maybe have a presentation and see what they might do in a station*" (P, Uddingston).

At times these influencing behaviors were precursors to more direct action where adopters used resources such as time and social relationships to mobilize others to do something for ScotRail and the adoption scheme. These *mobilizing behaviors* involve the direct recruiting and organizing of networks of volunteers to contribute time and labor, as is illustrated in the following quotes:

> "*We have a lot of people we can call on ...we are putting in 1,000 bulbs in and they will be okay, we get people who help all the time*" (S, North Berwick).

> "*We operate six days per week and we do morning shift and afternoon shift so that is a dozen plus one or two who will fill in and things like that. We are never really stuck for volunteers but just lately somebody has broken a leg, somebody else is ill, so suddenly you need to find another couple of people*" (Norman Pitlochry).

Mobilizing behavior was also evidenced through fundraising where contributions to the scheme came in the form of financial donations. When one group set up their 'friends' group: "*We had a public awareness day, we had about 100 people sign up to become friends and that gave us some money (£6000)...it really was surprising, a lot of local support*" (N, Weymss Bay). Other groups were involved in charity fundraising or encouraging other local businesses to support the work of the adoption groups.

In sum, our data reveal a wide range of CEB which contribute to the service system. Through these behaviors the focal customers, e.g. adopters, develop and augment the offering of the focal firm ScotRail, and influence and mobilize other stakeholders. The outcomes of these CE behaviors are reported in the following section.

Value outcomes of customer engagement behaviors

Our data reveals how the CEB of station adopters affected the value processes of different groups of stakeholders in the service system. The interviews indicated that the provision and acceptance of resources by different participants was motivated by the value that each party anticipated gaining through the adoption scheme.

The main benefit of CEB highlighted by the adopters was the improvement to the stations and their services. They also noted affective benefits such as positive recognition, improved experiences, and community regeneration:

> *"The adopter from Falkirk highlighted the improvements to self-esteem noted amongst those who were involved and how the adoption contributed to a growth in pride in the community" (Field Notes, Adopt a Station Annual Lunch).*

Adopters keenly discussed the appreciation and sense of accomplishment they experienced through adoption. One adopter described how *"people stop me when I am watering or doing the garden, passengers who really appreciate what the station looks like"* (I, Uddingston). In other words, other customers who were able to enjoy the benefits of the improvements resulting from CEB by adopters, further motivated the adopters with their appreciation. Some adopters felt that the increased effort even brought a sense of expectation from the community, as one interviewee explained: '*we get complaints if things drop off like the litter bins but mostly we get the compliments*' (S, North Berwick).

Involvement in adoption projects also gave groups legitimacy within the community, enabling them to acquire further support from other stakeholders and external bodies:

"I think it gives you leverage in that you have a relationship with ScotRail, that you are not coming as 'Mr Angry' out of left field. You have an established relationship where you can make suggestions (and demands), and you are seen as reasonable people, rather than rabid activists" (N, Pitlochry).

Several interviewees from different stakeholder groups noted that adoption behaviors made the station safer. For the adopters and their communities the benefits of an improved environment were likened to 'broken windows', the notion that if an environment is respected and cared for then anti-social behavior and crime is reduced and the environment becomes a more positive one, as explained by a representative of ScotRail:

"Some people say 'oh I wouldn't do gardening, there's bound to be vandalism...well there is no vandalism...this is a public space which is yours and you have the decency and kindness to take care of it. [as a result] Passengers are less grumpy, more relaxed, they turn up early to have a coffee or to read the newspapers... the station becomes de-stressed by having a more pleasant place to wait." (J, ScotRail)

These benefits exemplify how CEB could impact stakeholders both directly and indirectly involved with the service system. Indeed, in the studied case the value implications of CEB were extensive and spread beyond any dyadic interaction between the focal firm and the community, as noted by a government minister:

"We have already seen good examples of this funding, used for businesses such as cafes and heritage centers, creating win-win situations. Passengers are benefitting from improved facilities at stations while new opportunities for job creation and community involvement are opened up" (Transport Minister, Scotland, SCRF).

One local councilor proposed that adopted stations better "*reflect the communities where they are located*" (A, Glasgow City Council) and identified a connection between adoption and the protection of buildings owned by the council (available to ScotRail on lease) with listed, historical, status. He described a community project that planned to offer bicycle hire at a station near a large city park. By allowing a small community business use of the building for a 'peppercorn rent' the building became "*protected by occupation*" (A, Glasgow

City Council). This idea of station protection extended into the notion of improved perceptions of station safety, as illustrated by a member of Passenger Focus:

> *"An environment which looks uncared for, tends to attract trouble ... stations are notorious for people loitering about...so anything that makes a station look cared for does a lot to calm the background. We know there are something like 15% more journeys that rail passengers would make if they felt more confident about fear of crime and the more stations and trains look cared the more you will attract people on to the system, confident that this is a safe place to travel from" (J, Passenger Focus).*

Improved perceptions of the station also fitted a much wider agenda to promote rail travel and expand park and ride schemes to include retail outlets and other facilities.

The interviewees also noted benefits accrued specifically to ScotRail. One adopter acknowledged the strength of support from ScotRail but was astute in recognizing that they were "*doing ScotRail quite a lot of favors as well*" (N, Wemyss Bay). For ScotRail, involving the local community represented an opportunity to improve public perceptions:

> *"At times when there is nothing else happening, no positive stories because cycles of investment have run their course and so on, this is a kind of state of steady advance not related to recessions or electoral cycles or anything, as the word spreads the more people wish to get involved with adoption" (J, ScotRail).*

ScotRail also noted financial benefits related to CEB. Transport Scotland, the franchisor, conducts a monthly quality audit of each station, and ScotRail can receive substantial fines (up to £1 million) as a result. The CEB by station adopters can contribute to a reduction in those fines by improving station appearance:

> *"If [the inspector] comes along and the sun is shining and everyone's happy and there's some flowers or the buildings are in use, they might think hey this is not a bad place, I'll move on" (J, ScotRail).*

In sum, the evidence within the data suggests that CEB can provide a wide range of benefits for the focal customer, firm and other stakeholders. A summary of the identified value outcomes is shown in Table 2.

Please insert Table 2 here

Conceptualizing the role of CEB in value co-creation

By assimilating the findings of the empirical study with the literature on CE and value co-creation, we conceptualize the role of CEB in value co-creation as *the customer provision of resources during non-transactional, joint value processes that occur in interaction with the focal firm and/or other stakeholders, thereby affecting their respective value processes and outcomes.*

We elaborate on this conceptualization by presenting definitions for the four types of CEB identified in this study, and offering propositions on the connection of CEB to value co-creation in a service system, where the value outcomes of CEB emerge for each party in their respective value processes (cf. Grönroos and Voima 2012). The propositions are generated on the basis of our empirical findings and a reflection on earlier research in the scattered areas where different forms of CEBs have been studied. A definition and summary of the four CEBs identified – augmenting, co-developing, influencing, and mobilizing are presented in Table 3 alongside a list of our propositions.

Please insert Table 3 here

First, we define *augmenting behavior* as *customer contributions of resources such as knowledge, skills, labor, and time, to directly augment and add to the focal firm's offering beyond that which is fundamental to the transaction.* In our study, adopters who undertake

gardening or deliver additional services at stations on their own initiative exemplify augmenting behavior. A wider example of augmenting behavior might include customers posting content in social media or inventing and sharing alternative product uses not intended or realized by the firm (e.g. Schau et al, 2009).

Our results show that the adopters sought to enhance the focal firm's offering to better fit their particular needs. As the value of an offering is determined by how well it fits the customer's goals and needs (Epp and Price 2011; Gummesson and Mele 2010), augmenting affects the offering's value potential. In the studied case, augmenting behavior made stations more appealing to other customers. We therefore propose that allowing customers to utilize their own resources to augment the firm's offering delivers benefits that can be dyadic and, importantly, can also spread into the wider service system and influence the behavior of other stakeholders towards the firm. Although not witnessed in this study, the influence of augmenting behavior on value co-creation might however be negative. As augmenting behavior perceives the customer to be in charge of realizing the modification of an offering, customers can make modifications in a manner not intended or preferred by the focal firm (Berthon et al. 2008; Gebauer et al. 2012), or appreciated by other community members (Schau et al. 2009).

We put forward the following propositions regarding the connection between augmenting behavior and value co-creation:

> *P1: The customer enacted augmentation to the firm's offering affects its value potential for the focal customer and, potentially, other stakeholders.*

> *P2: The customer enacted augmentation to the firm's offering influences other stakeholders' propensity to contribute resources towards the focal firm.*

The second CEB identified in this study is *co-developer behavior,* which we define as *customer contributions of resources such as knowledge, skills, and time, to facilitate the focal*

firm's development of its offering. In our study, adopters directed ScotRail's attention to specific problems that needed to be addressed at stations (e.g., seagull proofing the litter bins); however, co-developer behavior could also describe a wider range of customer contributions to a firm's product/service development or innovation such as the common practice of using customers to beta-test new software.

By involving customers and their resources in product/service development, firms can adjust their offerings to better fit their customers' needs, situation, and context (Grönroos and Ravald 2011; Hoyer et al. 2010). When integrated with firm resources, these customer resources impact the value potential of the offering to the focal customer and also other stakeholders of the firm (cf. Jaworski and Kohli 2006). Unlike augmenting, co-development behavior concerns customer contributions that are utilized by the firm to the extent it chooses: the firm is in charge of realizing the development, and might or might not take customers' contributions into account. Our data show that ScotRail's supportive attitude and willingness to respond to adopters' suggestions was closely linked to value outcomes for both the customers and the firm itself. Furthermore, Gebauer et al. (2012) demonstrated that customer perceived fairness of the firm and satisfaction with the firm's actions in relation to customers' co-development behavior were important triggers for positive or negative outcomes. These findings indicate that the value co-creation process between the firm and the customer is affected by the firm's attitude towards the customer's co-development behavior. We make the following propositions:

> *P3: Integration of customer resources into offering development improves the offering's fit to the focal customer's value process.*

> *P4: Integration of customer resources into offering development influences other stakeholders' propensity to contribute resources towards the focal firm.*

> *P5: A firm's willingness to integrate customer resources into offering development affects the joint value co-creation process between the firm and its customers.*

The third type of CEB identified is *influencing behavior,* defined as *customer contributions of resources such as knowledge, experience, and time, to affect other actors' perceptions, preferences, or knowledge regarding the focal firm.* In the studied case, engaged customers became ambassadors for the scheme, and generated wider interest from community members to become active in other stations. Positive word-of-mouth made rail travel a more appealing option for other people, who were therefore willing to buy tickets and potentially contribute other resources that would result in additional improvements to stations. By sharing their experiences through word-of-mouth or recommendations, customers influence and adjust the expectations of others (e.g., Bansal and Voyer 2000; Dholakia et al. 2009). These lived experiences serve to calibrate the expectations of new customers to a more realistic level. This is likely, over time, to affect other stakeholders' interpretation of the value of the offering (Zeithaml et al. 1993) and willingness to buy (Adjei et al., 2010). Therefore we propose the following:

> *P6: Influencing behavior affects other stakeholders' propensity to contribute resources towards the focal firm.*

> *P7: Influencing behavior calibrates other stakeholders' expectations towards the firm/offering, which affects their value interpretations.*

The fourth type of CEB identified in this study is *mobilizing behavior* that occurs when engaged customers not only affect other stakeholders' perceptions, but also induce concrete actions towards the focal firm. The term mobilization has been employed with reference to how firms utilize and reconfigure relationships with other actors to connect resources (cf. Chou and Zolkiewski 2012). We define mobilizing behavior as *customer contributions of resources, such as relationships and time, to mobilize other stakeholders' actions towards the focal firm.* In our case, the station adopters were able to encourage other people or firms to perform physical labor at the stations or donate money to the scheme. Other example could include consumer activists organizing a campaign to pressure authorities to ban certain

products, or inducing shoppers to buy the products or services of selected companies in order to reward these firms for behavior consistent with the goals of the activists (e.g. Friedmann, 1996). When engaged customers mobilize other stakeholders to contribute resources to the focal firm, new value co-creation processes emerge between these parties. We make the following propositions to link mobilizing behavior to value co-creation:

> *P8: Mobilizing behavior affects other stakeholders' resource contributions towards the firm.*

> *P9: Mobilizing behavior may initiate new value co-creation processes between the firm and other stakeholders.*

Contribution, implications and limitations

Main contributions

This paper explored the role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation in a multi-stakeholder service system. We contribute to the emerging CE literature with one of the first empirical studies on the implications of customer engagement in value co-creation, thereby responding to the call by Brodie et al. (2011), Brodie and Hollebeek (2011) and Bolton (2011). To our knowledge, this paper marks the first attempt to conceptualize the connection between CEB and value co-creation, thereby creating new knowledge in both domains.

Previous research has proposed antecedents and types of CEB, but does not discuss their implications on value co-creation. This paper proposes that CEB affects value co-creation by virtue of customers' diverse resource contributions towards the focal firm and/other stakeholders that modify and/or augment the offering itself, and/or affect other stakeholders' perceptions, knowledge, preferences, expectations or actions towards the firm or its offering. Thereby CEB affects value processes between the focal customer and firm, and also

indirectly value co-creation between the firm and other stakeholders. Through inducing broader resource integration, *CEB makes value co-creation a system level process*. We offer nine propositions explicating the connections CEB has to value co-creation by focal customers, the focal firm and other stakeholders.

Drawing on an exploratory, empirical study, we identified four primary types of CEB: *augmenting, co-developing, influencing and mobilizing behavior*. By providing empirically induced definitions of the types and extent of CEB, this study contributes to the emerging literature on CE that has remained rather fuzzy on the scope of customer behaviors that should be considered manifestations of CE. Our definitions capture the types of CEB previously indicated in the CE literature – influencing others through referrals and WOM, and participating in product development (e.g. Kumar et al. 2010; Hoyer et al. 2010), and also deepen and refine current understanding on the scope of CEB by introducing two new types of CEB, *augmenting* and *mobilizing* behaviors. Our study highlights that besides information, engaged customers may contribute a broader range of resources including physical labor, skills and relationships. It seems plausible that different types of physical contribution are prominent in offline settings such as our case. We also discuss the conceptual scope of CE in relation to closely linked concepts co-production, CVP and extra-role behaviors. Thereby, this paper adds to the ongoing discussion on the conceptual distinctiveness and scope of the customer engagement behavior concept (e.g. Brodie et al. 2011).

Our study also identified factors that drive CEB. Our research conducted in a physical service system supports and enriches earlier findings on the antecedents of customer engagement drawn in a range of virtual communities focused around brands and product innovation. We found that the customers' sense of ownership of the focal firm's offering and empowerment in the service system are key drivers of CEB, supported by the focal firm's provision of access and willingness to cede some control to the community. Similar drivers

have been evidenced also by several studies on virtual communities (Schau et al. 2009; Baron & Warnaby 2011). Further, we found that engagement behaviors are motivated by the focal customers' need to extend and improve the offering, either for personal or collective purposes. Our study also lends support to earlier studies conducted in virtual communities (Dholakia et al, 2009; Schau et al, 2009) by demonstrating that other stakeholders in the service system may provide engaged customers with recognition, legitimacy and/or resources which further encourage these behaviors. Reflection of our findings against extant research conducted in very different contexts and consumer groups indicates that certain universal drivers for CEB originate from the customers themselves, the firm, and other stakeholders.

This study demonstrated that the drivers, manifestations and outcomes of CEB are iterative and cyclical, as the positive outcomes for each party further motivate them to engage in or support CEB. Customer satisfaction, trust and commitment may be both drivers and outcomes of CEB, and customers' motivation to engage relates to their expectation of value outcomes. These findings provide empirical refinement to earlier theoretical models for CEB (e.g. Van Doorn et al. 2010) and increase understanding on the cyclical nature of CEB, thereby responding to a call by Brodie et al. (2013).

Our research also contributes to literature on value co-creation that has predominantly focused on firms facilitating the customer's value process, while the resources contributed by the customer to the firm and other stakeholders have received less attention (e.g. Vargo and Lusch 2008). Our study demonstrates that through CEB, customers can contribute a range of resources beyond dyadic exchange, contributing to enhanced offerings and value outcomes at a wider service system level. Our study indicates that CEB may activate an iterative process where a wider service system might gradually take ownership of the focal firm's offering as a growing number of stakeholders contribute their resources to it (cf. Arnould et al. 2006). Thereby CEB may underpin the expanding resource integration process within the service

system. These findings increase our current understanding of the synergistic value co-creation processes in service systems (Edvardsson et al., 2011; Vargo et al. 2008). We suggest that customer engagement underpins the blurring of roles within contemporary service exchanges.

Managerial implications

For practitioners, the findings of this study demonstrate the multiple ways in which CEB may affect the organization. We particularly draw attention to the effect that CEB has on the firm and its offering, and on other stakeholders' knowledge, preferences and actions towards them. We urge firms to evaluate the importance of each CEB type to their business and take that into consideration when assessing the value potential of their customer base.

Our study demonstrates that organizations can improve and differentiate their offering by incorporating the broad range of resources that customers and other stakeholders are willing to invest through co-developing or augmenting behaviors. The expanding customer roles and the growing importance of customer communities suggests that firms might not be able to create products, services or brands alone. There is evidence for firms increasingly 'inviting' the community into their operations, whether in the form of a community noticeboard in Starbucks or, as in the UK, voluntary and charitable groups being given access to vacant premises by local authorities, particularly during a period of economic downturn where a lack of use might lead to a lack of care and eventually deprivation. We suggest that firms should give greater consideration to how communities of customers can be involved within the tangible assets of the firm, enabling greater customization and augmentation of the firm's offering. Firms should also explore how existing customers' resources can be enhanced to enable them to operate as proactive collaborators with the firm.

Our research suggests that when customers feel empowered, with passion and a sense of ownership of the offering, they are willing to contribute extensively for the benefit of the firm

and the broader service system. Firms need to learn about their customers' wants and needs outside of normal exchange processes to uncover the value customers seek, and the roles they expect themselves and the firm to play. We recommend that firms explore the potential to engage diverse stakeholders and their networks of relationships around a common cause and make use of organically emerging service systems.

We found that through influencing and mobilizing behaviors, engaged customers impact other stakeholders' willingness to engage with the focal firm and thereby offer a valuable channel to new customer and stakeholder relationships. An increasing reliance on customer influencing and mobilizing behaviors necessitates that firms will seek customers whose needs and preferences are a good fit with the resources and capabilities of the firm and, crucially, its stakeholders. Firms could identify key stakeholders and seek to foster relationships with them through engaged customers.

This study shows that firms can encourage CEB by being open, accessible and adaptive to customers' resource contributions, but it requires that they to some extent cede control over the offering to the engaged customers and other stakeholders. Firms should, therefore, also be prepared for the potentially negative effects of a loss of control: when integrated with customer resources, the offering and its brand may take a direction not planned by the firm. This outcome means that consideration should be given to measures through which a firm can retain some kind of jurisdiction over customer engagement behavior. We advise firms to consider CEB management as a strategic matter that requires careful planning and implementation throughout the firm, and to acknowledge that CEB has the inevitable effect of the firm no longer having complete control over its value proposition.

Limitations and Future Research

As with any study we recognize that our research has limitations. First, case study research is often seen as limited in that universal generalizability cannot be achieved, although this is not an aspiration of the method. Instead, the goal is one of analytic generalizability where results (and the similarities and differences therein) are generalized to a theory rather than a larger population (Yin 2003). Second, we acknowledge that the context of the study will limit the generalizability of the findings. A railway station is perceived as a common cause for many stakeholders and it enjoys a near monopoly status. Our case may be most analogous with other public sector contexts where resources are limited, and common causes can be more easily fostered within communities. In other contexts, the range of offerings is broader and interest in them more fragmented. However, we see no reason why the findings should not apply to any community of stakeholders connected by an interest in a certain offering. To test this assumption, and to build on the empirical research presented here, further research is needed to explore both CEB and its outcomes for firms, focal customers and other stakeholders in a range of contexts.

We urge researchers to elaborate further on interplay between the drivers for CEB, and its outcomes at the system level. The propositions formulated in this paper offer ways forward to study the connection between CEB and value co-creation. Our study has examined the connections between value co-creation and CEB from a broad perspective, and many actor level details are yet to be studied. For example, many studies suggest that increasing customer participation can have negative outcomes for firms' employees (e.g., Auh et al. 2007; Chan et al. 2010), whereas our study provided evidence of CEB having a positive effect on the relationship between adopter and staff. The value outcomes of CEB at the employee level is therefore one important area for future consideration. Researchers could also develop models to test how the identified drivers operate. It may be that some of the

drivers are antecedents for CEB (for example, need for improvements), while others moderate their influence on CEB (for example, "access")[2].

This paper identified four types of CEB that provide important potential for future research; understanding the dynamics of these types of CEB will be essential for firms who wish to benefit from customer voluntary contributions.

1. *Augmenting behavior* envisages customers employing their resources to extend and add to a focal firm's offering. Recent research has identified that the overall service experience by a customer is often delivered by multiple service providers (Tax et al. 2013) and channels (Patricio et al. 2011). Our study indicates that future research on such service delivery networks should study not only formal service providers but also customers as informal suppliers. Furthermore, our research context saw the firm cede a high level of control over its offering to communities. Extant research (e.g. Fournier and Avery 2011) suggests that losing control can result in customers hijacking a brand, which raises a number of questions: What mechanisms should be used to ensure that augmenting behavior does not damage the integrity of offerings/brands, or other customers' perceptions of them? How is brand identity affected by the firm ceding control of tangible elements of a brand to customers?

2. *Co-developing behavior* sees customers contributing resources such as knowledge, skills and time to facilitate the development of the focal firm's offering. Future research may consider how the firm's approach to stimulating and integrating customer resources into product development affects its relationships with the customer and other stakeholders. Should firms reward co-developing behavior? How would this change the dynamics of the relationship? Is customers' propensity to engage in co-developing behavior related to their engagement in other types of CEB?

---

[2] We thank the anonymous reviewer for suggesting this point.

3. *Influencing behavior* is associated with customers using their resources and skills to affect other actors' perceptions, preferences or knowledge towards the focal firm. We propose that influencing behavior can both help stakeholders choose offerings and affect their willingness to engage, but will also calibrate their expectations. Future research might wish to explore the impact of focal customers' 'mediation' role in the firms' B2B and B2C relationships. How can firms best make use of their existing customers' experiences to demonstrate their value potential to new customers? How should firms respond to potentially negative influencing behavior? To what extent should influencing behavior be formalized or remain, as in our case study, organically emerging?

4. *Mobilizing behavior* refers to customers using resources and time to mobilize other stakeholders' actions towards the focal firm. Our study suggests that mobilizing behavior offers the enticing prospect for a firm of initiating value co-creation opportunities beyond existing relationships. However, the outcomes of this behavior could be positive or negative. Future research could elaborate on the implications of mobilizing behavior. Do customers more easily engage in negative or positive mobilizing behavior? How does mobilization affect the relationships between the focal customer and mobilized stakeholders?

Our research reveals a service system where all stakeholders identified (primary and secondary) contribute resources and benefit from involvement. The study, as yet, has not identified stakeholders who choose not to participate or who have dropped out for any reason. Future research might consider what firm or customer level factors might deter stakeholder/customer engagement.

From a methodological perspective, future research could seek to test hypotheses derived from our propositions with communities of customers that exhibit CEB or across

firms/sectors. However, our study benefitted from the richness and depth of insight associated with qualitative approaches and time spent in the field, and on that basis ethnographic work in alternative contexts would enhance our understanding of the role of CEB and further verify our CEB and propositions. Our study explores one particular CE scheme, which appears to deliver benefits to a wide range of stakeholders. Future research adopting longitudinal approaches could explore how the relationship between firms, customers and stakeholders changes over time, and the cumulative effects of CEB on each party.

List of References

Adjei, Mavis T., Noble, Stephanie M. and Noble, Charles H. (2010), "The influence on C2C communications in online brand communities on customer purchase behavior," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38, 634-653.

Ahearne, M., Bhattacharya, C. B., & Gruen, T. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of customer-company identification: expanding the role of relationship marketing. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90(3), 574.

Arnould, Eric J, Linda L Price and Avinash Malshe (2006), "Toward a Cultural Resource-Based Theory of the Customer," in *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate and Directions*, Robert F Lusch and Stephen L Vargo, eds, 320-33.

Auh, Seigyoung., Simon J Bell, Colin S McLeod and Eric Shih (2007), "Co-Production and Customer Loyalty in Financial Services," *Journal of Retailing*, 83 (3), 359-70.

Bansal, Harvir S. and Peter A. Voyer (2000), "Word-of-Mouth Processes within a Services Purchase Decision Context," *Journal of Service Research*, 3 (2), 166-177

Baron, Steve and Gary Warnaby (2011), "Individual Customer's Use and Integration of Resources: Empirical Findings and Organizational Implications in the Context of Value Co-Creation," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40 (2), 211-218.

Bendapudi, Neeli and Robert P. Leone (2003), "Psychological Implications of Consumer Involvement in Co-Production," *Journal of Marketing*, 67 (1), 14-28.

Berthon, Pierre, Leyland Pitt and Colin Campbell (2008), "Ad Lib: When Customers Create the Ad," *California Management Review,* 50 (4), 6-30.

Bettencourt, Lance. A. (1997). "Customer voluntary performance: customers as partners in service delivery" *Journal of Retailing,* 73 (3), 383-406.

Bitner, Mary .J. (1992). 'Servicescapes: the impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees'. *The Journal of Marketing* 56: 57-71.

Bolton, Ruth N. (2011), "Comment: Customer Engagement," *Journal of Service Research*, 14 (3), 272-4.

Brodie, Roderick J. and Linda D. Hollebeek (2011), "Response: Advancing and Consolidating Knowledge About Customer Engagement," *Journal of Service Research*, 14 (3), 283-4.

Brodie, Roderick J., Linda D. Hollebeek, Biljana Jurić and Ana Ilić (2011), "Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research," *Journal of Service Research*, 14 (3), 252-71.

Brodie, Roderick J., Ana Ilic, Biljana Juric and Linda Hollebeek (2013), "Consumer Engagement in a Virtual Brand Community: An Exploratory Analysis," *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (1), 105-14.

Chan, Kimmy .W., Chi.Kin. Yim and Simon.S.K. Lam (2010), "Is Customer Participation in Value Creation a Double-Edged Sword? Evidence from Professional Financial Services across Cultures," *Journal of Marketing*, 74 (3), 48-64.

Chandler, Jennifer D and Stephen L Vargo (2011), "Contextualization and Value-in-context: how Context Frames Exchange," *Marketing Theory*, 11 (1), 35-49.

Chou, Hsin-Hui. and Zolkiewski, Judy (2012),"Managing resource interaction as a means to cope with technological change, "*Journal of Business Research*, 65 (2), 188-195.

Creswell, John W (2009), *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

De Bruyn, Arnaud and Gary L Lilien (2008), "A Multi-Stage Model of Word-of-Mouth Influence through Viral Marketing," *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 25 (3), 151-63.

Dholakia, Uptal M, Vera Blazevic, Caroline Wiertz and René Algesheimer (2009), "Communal Service Delivery: How Customers Benefit From Participation in Firm-Hosted Virtual P3 Communities," *Journal of Service Research*, 12 (2), 208.

Edvardsson, Bo, Bård Tronvoll and Thorsten Gruber (2011), "Expanding Understanding of Service Exchange and Value Co-Creation: A Social Construction Approach," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39 (2), 327-39.

Eiglier, Pierre. and Langeard, Eric. (1987), *Servuction, le marketing des services*. Paris: McGraw-Hill.

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M (1989), "Building Theories From Case Study Research," *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (4), 532-50.

Epp, Amber M, and Linda L Price (2011), "Designing Solutions Around Customer Network Identity Goals," *Journal of Marketing*, 75 (2), 36-54.

Friedman, Monroe (1996), "A positive approach to organized consumer action: The "buycott" as an alternative to the boycott," *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 19 (4), 439-451.

Fontana, Andrea and James H Frey (1994), "Interviewing: the Art of Science," in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Norman and Yvonna Lincoln. Denzin, ed. London: Sage Publication, 361-76.

Fournier, Susan and Jill Avery (2011), "The Uninvited Brand," *Business Horizons*, 54, 193-207.

Füller, Johann (2010), "Refining Virtual Co-Creation From a Consumer Perspective," *California Management Review*, 52 (2), 98-122.

Gebauer, Johannes, Johann Füller and Roland Pezzei (2013), "The Dark and the Bright Side of Co-Creation: Triggers of Member Behavior in Online Innovation Communities," *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1516–1527.

Grönroos, Christian and Annika Ravald (2011), "Service as Business Logic: Implications for Value Creation and Marketing," *Journal of Service Management*, 22 (1), 5-22.

Grönroos, Christian and Päivi Voima (2012), "Critical Service Logic: Making Sense of Value Creation and Co-Creation," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 41 (2), 133-150.

Gummesson, Evert and Cristina Mele (2010), "Marketing as Value Co-creation Through Network Interaction and Resource Integration," *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4 (4), 181-98.

Halinen, Aino and Jan-Åke Törnroos (2005), "Using case methods in the study of contemporary business networks," *Journal of Business Research*, 58 (9), 1285-97.

Hoyer, Wayne D., Rajesh Chandy, Matilda Dorotic, Manfred Krafft and Siddharth S. Singh (2010), "Consumer Cocreation in New Product Development," *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3), 283-96.

Jaworski, Bernard and Ajay K Kohli (2006), "Co-Creating the Voice of the Customer," in *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate and Directions*, Robert F Lusch and Stephen L Vargo, eds. Delhi: Prentice-Hall India, 109-17.

Kristensson, Per, Anders Gustafsson and Trevor Archer (2004), "Harnessing the Creative Potential Among Users," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21 (1), 4-14.

Kumar, V., Lerzan Aksoy, Bas Donkers, Rajkumar Venkatesan, Thorsten Wiesel and Sebastian Tillmanns (2010), "Undervalued or Overvalued Customers: Capturing Total Customer Engagement Value," *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3), 297-310.

Libai, Barak, Ruth Bolton, Marnix S. Bügel, Ko de Ruyter, Oliver Götz, Hans Risselada and Andrew T. Stephen (2010), "Customer-to-Customer Interactions: Broadening the Scope of Word of Mouth Research," *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3), 267-82.

Maglio, Paul P. and Spohrer, Jim (2008), "Fundamentals of service science," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science,* 36 (1), 18-20.

Michel, Stefan, Stephen W Brown and Andrew S Gallan (2008), "Service-Logic Innovations: How to Innovate Customers, not Products," *California Management Review*, 50 (3), 54-66.

MSI (2008), "*2008-2010 Research Priorities*," Vol. 2010: Marketing Science Institute.

Nambisan, Satish and Robert A Baron (2009), "Virtual Customer Environments: Testing a Model of Voluntary Participation in Value Co-creation Activities," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 26 (4), 388-406.

Patrício, Lia, Raymond P. Fisk, João Falcão e Cunha and Larry Constantine (2011), "Multilevel Service Design: From Customer Value Constellation to Service Experience Blueprinting", *Journal of Service Research,* 14 (2) 180-200.

Prahalad, CK and Venkat Ramaswamy (2004), "Co-Creating Unique Value with Customers," *Strategy & Leadership*, 32 (3), 4-9.

Rosenbaum, Mark S. and Carolyn A. Massiah (2007), "When Customers Receive Support From Other Customers: Exploring the Influence of Intercustomer Social Support on Customer Voluntary Performance," *Journal of Service Research*, 9 (3), 257-70.

Schau, Hope J, Albert M Muñiz Jr and Eric J Arnould (2009), "How Brand Community Practices Create Value," *Journal of Marketing*, 73 (5), 30-51.

Strauss, Anselm L and Juliet M Corbin (1998), *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Tax, Stephen S., David McCutcheon and Ian F. Wilkinson (2013), "The Service Delivery Network (SDN): A Customer-Centric Perspective of the Customer Journey," *Journal of Service Research*, 16(4), 454-470.

Van Doorn, Jenny, Katherine N. Lemon, Vikas Mittal, Stephan Nass, Doreén Pick, Peter Pirner and Peter C. Verhoef (2010), "Customer Engagement Behavior: Theoretical Foundations and Research Directions," *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3), 253-66.

Vargo, Stephen L and Robert F Lusch (2008), "Service-Dominant Logic: Continuing the Evolution," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36 (1), 1-10.

Vargo, Stephen L and Robert F Lusch (2011), "It's all B2B...and beyond: Toward a systems perspective of the market," *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40 (2), 181-7.

Vargo, Stephen L, Paul P Maglio and Melissa A Akaka (2008), "On Value and Value Co-Creation: A Service Systems and Service Logic Perspective," *European Management Journal*, 26 (3), 145-52.

Verhoef, Peter C., Werner J. Reinartz and Manfred Krafft (Eds.) (2010), "Customer Engagement as a New Perspective in Customer Management," *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3), 247-52.

Yin, Robert (2003), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage.

Zeithaml, Valerie A, Leonard L Berry, and A Parasuraman (1993), "The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21 (1), 1-12.

Table 1. Drivers of Customer Engagement Behaviors in Adopt a Station case

Focal Firm	
Access	• Allowing community use of vacant accommodation • Easy to engage for communities (low bureaucracy)
Ceding Control	• Each adoption is allowed to develop organically • Adopters are empowered within the confines of the project to make decisions about aspects of station environment
Focal Customer	
Ownership	• Sense of attachment to the station and community • Community constant within a changing corporate landscape • Freedom to make decisions regarding adoption
Need for improvements	• Rail users had needs that were not addressed within the station • Improvements desired on a collective level
Relationship and Communication	• Positive dialogue and trust with focal firm • Positive relationships with members of staff at the stations.
Stakeholders	
Support	• Local external stakeholders contribute '*in kind*' • Other stakeholders contribute financially

Table 2. Value outcomes for different stakeholders

Stakeholder	Value experienced
Focal customers	
Station Adopters	Recognition: (Media, Awards)/Reduction in Anti-social Behavior/Improved facilities/Accomplishment and Belonging/Legitimacy
Focal firm and organizations controlling rail network	
First ScotRail	Improved working environment/Better relations with the community/Benefits for passengers/Reduced fines/Differentiation
Network Rail	Better perceptions of rail network
Transport Scotland	Better perceptions of rail franchise/Enhanced community relationships
Other stakeholders	
Local Council	Improved public transport/Increase in rail use/Protection of infrastructure and historic buildings
Local Community	Enhanced station environments and service/Reduction in Anti-social Behavior/Community Awards
Passenger Focus	Enhanced, safer station environments/Reduction in Anti-social Behavior

Table 3. Types of CEB and their connection to value co-creation.

Type of CEB	Definition	Manifestation in the station case and other examples	Propositions
Augmenting behavior	Customer contributions of resources such as knowledge, skills, labor, and time, to directly augment and add to the focal firm's offering beyond that which is fundamental to the transaction.	Private citizens doing gardening and running and maintaining services in stations Other examples: Customers posting content in social media Customers inventing alternate uses for a product.	P1: The custome offering affects i and, potentially, P2: The custome offering influenc contribute resou
Co-developing behavior	Customer contributions of resources such as knowledge, skills, and time, to facilitate the focal firm's development of its offering.	Private citizens taking the initiative in solving problems at stations, for example indicating the need for seagull-proof litter bins. Other examples: Customers giving ideas for new or improved products and services. Customer participation in test use of a new product.	P3: Integration o development imp customer's value P4: Integration o development infl contribute resou P5: A firm's will into offering dev creation process
Influencing behavior	Customer contributions of resources such as knowledge, experience, and time to affect other actors' perceptions, preferences or knowledge regarding the focal firm.	Private citizens making presentations on the Adopt a Station scheme at other locations Other example: Customer provided word-of-mouth or blogging about their experiences with certain products or firms. Customers recommending certain products or firms.	P6: Influencing b propensity to cor P7: Influencing b expectations tow value interpretati
Mobilizing behavior	Customer contributions of resources such as relationships and time to mobilize other stakeholders' actions towards the focal firm.	Private citizens recruiting other citizens and businesses to plant flowers and donate money to the station scheme. Other example: Customers convincing other customers to boycott a product.	P8: Mobilizing b resource contribu P9: Mobilizing b creation processe stakeholders.