

ZOOMING OUT: ACTOR ENGAGEMENT BEYOND THE DYADIC

Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this paper is to broaden extant understanding of actor engagement behavior beyond its currently dominant dyadic (micro-level) focus, by examining it from multiple levels of aggregation within a service ecosystem framework.

Design/methodology/approach: This conceptual paper draws on service-dominant logic and structuration theory as theoretical lenses to inform engagement research.

Findings: By means of a stepwise exercise of ‘zooming out,’ the paper introduces a multi-perspective (micro-, meso-, macro- and meta-level) view of actor engagement that develops understanding of multiple engagement contexts, and suggests that balancing multiple roles may result in actor disengagement behavior. The role of reference groups and role conflict associated with balancing multiple roles is critical to understanding why engaged actor proclivities may wax and wane between contexts.

Research limitations/implications: The paper offers a set of five propositions that can be utilized by engagement scholars undertaking further research in this area.

Practical implications: Firms need to understand the values and norms embedded in diverse engagement contexts which can affect actor groups’ needs and motivations. Firms should develop appropriate organizational mechanisms to facilitate (rather than impede or obstruct) the desired behaviors of engaged actors.

Originality/value: The broader context within which engaged actors operate, and its effects on engagement, has been largely overlooked to date. By broadening the analytical perspective on engagement beyond the dyadic this paper reveals previously unaddressed aspects of this phenomenon, such as the role of disengagement behavior, and the effects of multiple engagement contexts on actors’ future behaviors.

Keywords: Actor engagement, customer engagement, roles, service ecosystems, service-dominant logic, structuration

Article type: Conceptual paper

ZOOMING OUT: ACTOR ENGAGEMENT BEYOND THE DYADIC

1. Introduction

Research on engagement has grown in significance and impact in recent years highlighting both its theoretical and practical importance (Harmeling *et al.*, 2017; Venkatesan, 2017). Despite the concept's previous utilization in a range of academic domains (see Brodie *et al.*, 2011a), its adoption in marketing remains relatively recent (Brodie *et al.*, 2011a; Verhoef *et al.*, 2010; Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014). Within the marketing domain, an individual's engagement has been characterized as emotional bonding that extends beyond loyalty and satisfaction (Kumar & Pansari, 2016), functioning as an important precursor for customer contributions to a wide range of firm-shaping functions (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014; Harmeling *et al.*, 2017); or actors' value cocreation activities (Storbacka *et al.*, 2016).

Thus far, the analytical focus of engagement research has predominantly been on the micro level, concerned with individual customers and their relationships with specific focal objects, such as products, firms, or brands. This focus has allowed researchers to capture the nomological nature of engagement, i.e. antecedents for and consequences of engagement for the customer or the firm (see Brodie *et al.*, 2011). However, the broader context within which the individual operates and the effects thereof on engagement has been largely overlooked to date. Indeed, broadening the scope of engagement research from customers to the broader notion of actors; from dyads to networks; and from micro to meso, or macro, level of aggregation is increasingly called for (e.g. Brodie *et al.*, 2016; Storbacka *et al.*, 2016; Breidbach & Brodie, 2017; Li *et al.*, 2017). In addition, engagement is increasingly recognized as an important mid-range concept bridging the empirical domain of knowledge with the meta-theoretical lens of Service-Dominant Logic (S-D Logic; Vargo & Lusch, 2017; Brodie *et al.*, 2011b). S-D Logic thus offers a natural theoretical basis for broadening the scope of engagement research.

Broadening the analytical perspective on engagement 'beyond the dyadic' reveals aspects of this phenomenon that have remained unaddressed in previous research. An ecosystem view highlights that each actor is involved in a multitude of co-existing value creation processes with other actors (Vargo & Lusch, 2016), suggesting that they face *multiple, potentially conflicting*, contexts in which they are engaged (hereafter 'engagement contexts'). While extant research offers valuable insight into a range of individual actors' engagement, to date, it has not considered how different engagement contexts are connected to one another and,

1
2
3 importantly, how an individual (actor) is able to coordinate their engagement with multiple
4 objects simultaneously (Dessart *et al.*, 2016). What is missing, therefore, is a broader
5 perspective on engagement that takes account of the various context(s) within which
6 individual engagement behaviors are embedded. Based on Vargo and Lusch's (2017, p. 13)
7 observation that "one cannot fully understand the activity at one level without viewing it from
8 another," the aim of this paper is to broaden extant understanding on actor engagement,
9 beyond its currently predominantly dyadic (micro-level) focus, by examining it from multiple
10 levels of aggregation (Vargo & Lusch, 2017).
11
12
13
14
15

16 Thus, the paper zooms out from the micro-level, by using what Chandler and Vargo (2011)
17 term *oscillating foci* to explore engagement from different levels of aggregation. To achieve
18 this aim, literature on S-D Logic and structuration theory provide the necessary levels of
19 aggregation (micro – meso – macro) with the service eco-system as the main unit of analysis.
20 Further, literature on role conflict, institutional work, social influence and reference groups
21 are deployed to offer additional insight. In line with the broader evolution of engagement
22 research (Storbacka *et al.*, 2016; Brodie *et al.*, 2016), the analyses are not limited to
23 customers, but encompass *any* actor type in the service ecosystem; hence the term 'actor
24 engagement' is used.
25
26
27
28
29

30 This paper offers a number of contributions to engagement research. First, the analytical
31 exercise of 'zooming out' enables consideration of the institutional context within which
32 actor engagement is embedded (Vargo & Lusch, 2017), an issue that is yet to receive
33 attention. Second, this paper expands beyond dyadic engagement interactions, by examining
34 actors' parallel engagement with multiple objects, highlighting how engagement is triggered,
35 shaped, and ceased due to the relative congruence of relevant institutional settings, the social
36 influence within specific reference groups, and the degree of perceived conflict for actors
37 balancing the (perceived) requirements inherent in multiple engagement contexts. In the
38 analyses, the concept of "actor disengagement behavior" is developed, and its triggers are
39 considered, marking this paper's third key contribution. Firms will consequently need to
40 understand the values and norms embedded in different engagement contexts that affect each
41 of the relevant actor groups' needs and motivations, and subsequently develop organizational
42 mechanisms that facilitate (rather than impede or obstruct) the desired behaviors of each actor
43 group.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The paper proceeds by exploring customer engagement at various levels of aggregation,
53 through oscillating foci. This zooming out process begins by exploring *a priori* understanding
54 of customer/actor engagement at the micro level, focusing on a single engagement object.
55 Subsequently engagement located at the meso- and macro-levels of aggregation as
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 considered. Here, engagement activities are shaped and influenced by their wider service
4 ecosystems; that is, institutions and institutional arrangements (Vargo and Lusch, 2016).
5 Finally, the paper zooms out further to encompass the multiple service ecosystems hosting a
6 multitude of engagement contexts that any individual actor might experience. Finally,
7 important theoretical and managerial implications are discussed, and a research agenda for
8 future work in the area is developed.
9
10
11

12 **2. Micro-level view of actor engagement**

13
14
15 In the marketing domain, the idea of customer engagement (CE) as a *discrete* concept
16 emerged from a growing understanding of an interconnected marketplace with increasing
17 collaboration and interaction (Brodie *et al.*, 2011a), leading to a blurring of traditional roles
18 whereby customers are proactively engaged in organizational activities (Jaakkola &
19 Alexander, 2014; Harmeling *et al.*, 2017). Brodie *et al.* (2011a) offer conceptual foundations
20 of engagement that are condensed in a set of five Fundamental Propositions encapsulating:
21 engagement as a psychological state that occurs within a dynamic, iterative engagement
22 process; cognitive, emotional and behavioral dimensions of engagement; the central role of
23 engagement within a nomological network of service-based conceptual relationships; and,
24 engagement occurring within specific contextual conditions.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 As indicated, existing engagement research has, thus far, predominantly adopted micro level
32 analyses, examining individual actors' (mainly customers') engagement toward a firm or a
33 brand - typically by exploring the cognitive, emotional and behavioral dimensions - or
34 specific, identifiable behavioral manifestations that act as outcomes from this psychological
35 state. These are next discussed.
36
37
38
39

40 *2.1. Engagement as a psychological state*

41
42 In their influential article, Brodie *et al.* (2011a) define customer engagement as an
43 individual's psychological state. Similarly, actor engagement may be viewed as an
44 individual's state of mind, or disposition (Storbacka *et al.*, 2016) reflecting the extent of their
45 engagement with a particular focal object (e.g. a brand, firm, salient others, etc.; Appleton *et*
46 *al.*, 2006; Koch, 1997). In the marketing literature, actors' (predominantly customers')
47 psychological engagement has been thought to contribute to important organizational
48 outcomes, including enhanced customer brand commitment, satisfaction, loyalty and
49 emotional bonding with brands (Brodie *et al.*, 2011a; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014). Extending this
50 notion to the conceptually broader 'actor engagement' concept, one might expect actors'
51 particular psychological state to impact upon their ensuing commitment, loyalty and bonding
52 with focal objects, leading to engagement (Brodie *et al.*, 2016). For example, a new mother
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 feels an intensive connection and heightened interest (e.g. Vivek *et al.*, 2012) towards a brand
4 of organic baby food, and holds a high level of cognitive and affective (i.e. psychological)
5 engagement with, and active commitment towards, maintaining an active relationship with
6 this brand beyond the basic purchase (Van Doorn *et al.* 2010; Hollebeek, 2011b). Over time,
7 a series of aggregated engagement states form a broader engagement process (Hollebeek *et*
8 *al.*, 2016; Brodie *et al.*, 2011a).

13 2.2. Behavioral manifestations of engagement

15 Extant research posits that although engagement is a multidimensional phenomenon
16 comprising emotional and cognitive components (Brodie *et al.*, 2011a), among others, it is
17 through customer engagement *behaviors* (CEBs) that engagement affects other actors (Van
18 Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014). Consistent with Brodie *et al.* (2011a) the
19 term ‘object’ is used to denote that which is engaged *with* (e.g. a product, brand, person) by
20 an engagement subject (e.g. customer, citizen). Engagement behavior reflects actors’ specific
21 resource investments (e.g. time, energy and effort) into interactions with a focal engagement
22 object (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2016; Sweeney *et al.*, 2015; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014). It is important
23 to note that extant literature views engagement behavior as a voluntary resource contribution
24 that go beyond transactions (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014; Harmeling *et al.*, 2017). In
25 essence, CEB conceptualize customers ‘exogenously, driven by their own unique purposes
26 and intentions’ (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014, p.248), rather than acting on the firm’s behest
27 (e.g. in-role behavior, co-production). Therefore, while actor engagement reflects actors’
28 cognitive (e.g. a supplier’s firm-related thoughts), and emotional (e.g. a customer’s positive
29 brand-related affect) resource investments integrated with a view to achieving particular
30 value-creating objectives (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2016), actor engagement behaviors (AEBs)
31 reflect actors’ voluntary, behavioral investments in focal object interactions to create value
32 (Verleye *et al.*, 2014).

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43 Engagement research delineates the behavioral manifestations of engagement as customer
44 actions that can either, in some way, affect the engagement object (e.g. the firm, brand), go
45 beyond behaviors elementary to purchases (Van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Verleye *et al.*, 2014), or
46 even occur outside traditional exchange relationships (Groeger *et al.*, 2016). In addition,
47 Jaakkola and Alexander (2014) reveal how CEBs contribute to broader value co-creation by
48 accruing value for engagement subjects, objects and/or other ecosystem actors via diverse
49 resource contributions gained through exchange and interaction. This systemic view of
50 engagement aligns with a move toward a more generic Actor-to-Actor configuration (A2A,
51 as opposed to B2C etc., see Vargo & Lusch, 2016). Storbacka *et al.* (2016) use the broader
52 term ‘actor engagement’ to encompass any activity of engaging in the interactive resource
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 integration processes. A view reconciling both perspectives sees actor engagement as
4 involving focal actors' resource contributions – potentially beyond what is elementary to
5 fundamental interactions – leading to an interactive resource integration process.
6 Synthesizing previous works on CEB (Van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014;
7 Storbacka *et al.*, 2016; Groeger *et al.*, 2016), this paper offers a broad definition of AEBs as
8 '*an actor's voluntary resource contributions that focus on the engagement object, go beyond*
9 *what is elementary to the exchange, and occur in interactions with a focal object and/or other*
10 *actors.*' Essentially, an engaged actor is disposed to invest a broad range of resources – such
11 as time, money, information, labor – with a focus on the focal engagement object (e.g. a
12 product, brand), and these resource contributions occur through specific, interactive
13 engagement behaviors.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Empirical investigation into engagement behaviors remains scarce. Engagement literature
21 typically discusses various customer activities that affect firm functions, including customer
22 acquisition or new product development (e.g. Van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Harmeling *et al.*,
23 2017). Jaakkola and Alexander (2014, p. 9) classify CEBs into four broad categories: (i)
24 Augmenting behavior, where customers contribute such resources as knowledge, skills, labor,
25 and time that directly augment and add to the focal firm's offering; (ii) Codeveloping
26 behavior, where customers contribute knowledge, skills, and time, to facilitate the focal
27 firm's development of its offering; (iii) Influencing behavior that refers to contribution of
28 resources to affect other actors' perceptions, preferences, or knowledge regarding the focal
29 firm; and (iv) Mobilizing behavior, where customers contribute such resources as
30 relationships and time to mobilize other stakeholders' actions toward the focal firm.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 These broad categories are also likely to have applicability to the broader actor engagement
39 context; by indicating that an actor may contribute *directly to a focal object* (i.e. i and ii
40 above), or *influence other actors' attitudes or behaviors* towards the object (i.e. iii and iv
41 above). This influence may be positively valenced (e.g. through the focal actor making
42 favorable object-related investments), or negatively valenced (e.g. with the focal actor
43 making undesirable brand-related investment, e.g. by expressing negative word of mouth;
44 Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Hollebeek & Chen, 2014), potentially diminishing other actors'
45 engagement (Naumann *et al.*, 2017). Noteworthy is that through AEBs, actors not only
46 contribute resources towards the focal engagement object, but also - directly or indirectly -
47 towards other service ecosystem actors (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014). In terms of the organic
48 baby food example, the engaged actor may recommend the brand to other parents in an online
49 parenting related discussion forum (e.g. the UK's popular '*mumsnet*'¹ a website for parents
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹ <https://www.mumsnet.com/>

1
2
3 that includes multiple discussion forums on a range of topics). Alternatively, parents can
4 engage with firms directly to give suggestions regarding new taste varieties or packaging.
5 This way, customers may also affect other parents' perception of the product, and contribute
6 valuable information to the firm that can be used to improve its product range or presentation.
7 In sum, the micro view focuses on the dyadic relationship between the individual actor and
8 the engagement object. Thus far, extant research has generated both conceptual and empirical
9 insight into customer engagement as an actor's psychological state, as well as its behavioral
10 manifestations, focusing almost exclusively on consumers (see Table 1).
11
12
13
14
15

16 **3. Zooming out beyond the dyadic: Meso- and macro-level views of engagement**

17
18 Next, the paper zooms out to a wider level of aggregation, arguing that AEBs do not occur in
19 isolation, but within service ecosystems that incorporate networked actors and multiple,
20 recurring dyadic, triadic, etc. interactions (Vargo & Lusch, 2017). Here, the ecosystem lens is
21 drawn from S-D Logic, principally the notion of *institutions* and *institutional arrangements*
22 (Axiom 5), as well as closely aligned structuration theory (Vargo & Lusch, 2016).
23 Additionally, literature on reference groups and institutional work is drawn on to elaborate on
24 the nature of institutions in the context of engagement.
25
26
27
28
29

30 *3.1 Service Eco-Systems, Institutions and Engagement*

31
32 The service ecosystem concept originates from Alderson's (1965) pioneering research
33 advocating the adoption of a framework of cultural ecology for the study of marketing
34 systems, thus creating a broad, networked view of marketing. This conceptual zooming-out
35 has generated a theoretical shift toward the adoption of a systems orientation based on the
36 premise of interconnected actors and objects within specific systems (Vargo & Lusch, 2016;
37 Munro, 2009). The 'ecosystem' concept reflects a community of living organisms that share
38 the environment with specific non-living components (e.g. air, soil, man-made artefacts, such
39 as computers), and as a whole, interact as a system (Hatcher, 1990). Ecosystems host a
40 network of interactions among organisms, and between organisms and their environment,
41 which can be of any size or scope (Schulze & Mooney, 2012). Ecosystems thus encompass
42 other (smaller) ecosystems, giving a 'nested' view (Klijin, 1994). For S-D Logic, the service
43 eco-system is the principal unit of analysis (Vargo & Lusch, 2017) and offers a suitable lens
44 for developing a broader understanding on actor engagement as it allows its embedded and
45 interconnected nature as well as underlying structures to emerge.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Service ecosystems are defined in S-D Logic as a "relatively self-contained, self-adjusting
55 system of resource-integrating actors connected by shared institutional arrangements and
56 mutual value creation through service exchange," (Lusch & Vargo, 2014, p. 161). Critical to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a study of engagement beyond the dyad is the principle that service ecosystems are *multi-*
4 *level* in nature. Micro-level interactions give rise to a meso-system which, in turn creates a
5 broader macro-level structure (Lusch and Vargo, 2014). Crucially, the creation of a macro-
6 level system is precipitates a downward influence on lower (meso and macro) levels over
7 time and varies with each particular context (Lusch & Vargo, 2014). The service ecosystem
8 definition above highlights the important role of institutions and institutional arrangements.
9 Institutions are defined as ‘humanly devised rules, norms, and beliefs that enable and
10 constrain action and make social life at least somewhat predictable and meaningful’ (Vargo
11 and Lusch, 2016b, p. 11). Institutional arrangements are “interrelated sets of institutions that
12 together constitute a relatively coherent assemblage that facilitates coordination of activity in
13 value-cocreating service ecosystems.” (Vargo and Lusch, 2016a, p. 18). In essence,
14 institutions and their higher-order assemblages (i.e. institutional arrangements) provide
15 context that guides actors’ actions and interactions, and these both enable and constrain
16 service exchange (Edvardsson *et al.*, 2011).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 While engagement research has to a large extent perceived engagement as an actor’s innate,
26 personal disposition, *an ecosystem lens highlights the role of context, with its institutions and*
27 *institutional arrangements that provide rules, norms and practices for actor engagement.* The
28 context for each actor introduces norms and values that influence actor engagement behaviors
29 and perceptions of value; that is, the way they contribute and integrate resources is
30 determined by service ecosystem boundaries, as well as their positions and roles associated
31 with particular service ecosystem-based institutions and institutional arrangements
32 (Edvardsson *et al.*, 2011; Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016).
33
34
35
36
37

38 The nature of institutions depends on the level of zooming out; institutions potentially more
39 relevant for AEB are specific to the meso-level (e.g. brand community), while broader
40 macro-level institutions include rules and norms, such as legislation and cultural practices (cf.
41 Vargo & Lusch, 2016). Engagement towards a focal object (e.g. a brand) is characterized by
42 interactions between actors, who tend to undertake similar activities (e.g. through a shared
43 passion or interest; Brodie *et al.*, 2013; Schau *et al.*, 2009). For example, the mother
44 demonstrating high engagement towards organic baby food is prone to discuss and debate
45 infant nutrition issues with other like-minded parents and friends, in both online and offline
46 contexts and might, as a result, adjust her AEB toward an engagement object.
47
48
49
50
51

52 In social science, group membership is recognized as a key determinant of behavior with
53 individuals acting “in accordance with a frame of reference produced by the groups to which
54 they belong” (Bearden & Etzel, 1982). Reference groups do not necessarily require specific
55 social ties, all that is needed is a favorable attitude towards members of a particular group
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Bearden & Etzel, 1982). Lapinski and Rimal (2005) note that an assessment of the extent to
4 which others engage in a specific behavior plays an important role in an individual actor's
5 decision-making process. Conforming to a specific social norm is often deemed the most
6 appropriate course of action and serves as a form of decision-making heuristic (Lapinski &
7 Rimal, 2005). For the mother in the earlier example, the opinions and 'truths' formed and
8 shared in an online discussion forum on parenting may constitute key heuristics for particular
9 types of infant nutrition to favor and/or advocate.
10
11

12
13
14 Lapinski and Rimal (2005) refer to different levels of social norms (i.e. institutions) that
15 affect an individual. *Collective norms* operate at the systemic level and imply codes of
16 conduct for collective entities which could be specific social networks or entire societies.
17 *Injunctive norms* relate to specific beliefs held about the correct course of action in a specific
18 situation, and *descriptive norms* relate to what is done in a specific actor's social group.
19 Lapinski and Rimal (2005) further suggest that this influence is stronger when the actor
20 identifies with the specific reference group, and when there is *ego-involvement*, a
21 motivational state induced by an association between an activated attitude and some aspect of
22 the self. In other words, the norms originating from reference groups may impart a stronger
23 effect on AEB when the focal actor – such as the mother in the example above – closely
24 identifies themselves with the reference group (e.g. other parents), and the issue of parenting
25 is a key part of their self-identity.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 3.2 Actor Engagement institutions and interdependency 34

35
36 As discussed earlier, previous engagement research has predominantly studied engagement as
37 independent from its broader context, at a dyadic, micro level. However, in S-D Logic, Vargo
38 and Lusch (2016) use structuration theory to provide an underlying foundation to examines
39 the creation and reproduction of social systems (Giddens, 1984); that is, routinized, repeated
40 actions that have meaning to those in the in-group (Schau *et al.*, 2009; Akaka *et al.*, 2015).
41 Applying structuration theory to engagement research acknowledges that interdependency
42 (duality) exists between structure and agency: While structure, to some extent, governs actor
43 behavior, individuals' actions not only are enforcing, but also changing the structure
44 (Battilana *et al.* 2009; Vargo & Lusch 2016). Kjellberg and Helgesson (2006) describe
45 markets as being continually formed and re-formed through the activities of economic actors
46 who perform specific sets of interconnected practices. Similarly, through their activities,
47 actors build, interpret, modify, and accommodate institutional arrangements; thus reflecting
48 the dynamic and evolving nature of institutional arrangements (DiMaggio, 1988; Lawrence &
49 Suddaby, 2006; Battilana *et al.*, 2009). Institutional arrangements, consequently, not only
50 shape, but are also shaped by, actors' activities.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In this sense, AEBs are akin to a form of institutional work, a concept also relevant for a S-D
4 Logic lens (Koskela-Huotari *et al.*, 2016; Vargo *et al.*, 2015). Institutional work is defined as
5 ‘the purposive action of individual and collective actors aimed at creating, maintaining and
6 disrupting organizations’ (Lawrence *et al.*, 2011, p.11). The concept resonates with a
7 structurationist framework and engagement as it supports the notion of actors both
8 maintaining institutions but also transforming them through disruptive ‘work.’ Importantly,
9 literature on institutional work not only encompasses entrepreneurial or innovative actions on
10 a grand scale (Lawrence *et al.*, 2011), but also actors’ actions and their transformative
11 potential. Thus, change wrought through institutional work can be highly visible and dramatic
12 but most often is perhaps incremental and less visible. Put in an engagement context, an
13 individual actor’s engagement behavior, as a form of institutional work, either reinforces or
14 maintains the institution or enforces institutional change through disruption (cf. Battilana *et*
15 *al.*, 2009; Koskela-Huotari *et al.*, 2016)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 For the organic baby food example, at a meso level, these would include, for example, the
24 beliefs, values and norms regarding healthy infant nutrition or dangers of genetically
25 modified or processed foods shared among members in a parenting discussion forum; and the
26 wider practices of eating in particular cultural setting. In other words, through engagement
27 with a brand community like *mumsnet*, parental perception of what is acceptable and ‘good’
28 are calibrated through its beliefs and values, but at the same time, through engagement
29 behaviors these actors reinforce or change norms. For example, past successful *mumsnet*
30 campaigns have included lobbying major retailers to keep magazines with overtly sexualized
31 cover images out of children’s eye lines in shops; and asking retailers not to sell clothes that
32 play upon, emphasize or exploit a young girls’ sexuality. Both these campaigns resulted in
33 major UK retailers ‘signing up’ to the demands.²
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 At a macro level, this view would highlight not only the organic baby food setting, but also
42 that of other baby products, including children’s clothing or equipment such as prams or cots.
43 Here, each context and its associated set of institutions (e.g. norms posed by the reference
44 group of the actor) are embedded in a broader ecosystem sharing a set of broader institutional
45 arrangements (e.g. industry standards or social norms). This zooming out makes it possible to
46 see how AEB occurring in the micro-level can influence actors in both the close context
47 (other customers using the same products), but also eventually at wider levels, through
48 reproducing or altering the prevailing institutions. For example, parental pressure group
49 ‘mumsnet’ has become so influential that UK politicians are regularly contributing to the site
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ² <https://www.mumsnet.com/campaigns/mumsnet-campaigns-the-story-so-far>

(Philips, 2012), additionally, lobbying from the site in 2013 caused the UK government to abandon proposals to increase childcare ratios in UK schools.³

In sum, the lenses of S-D Logic, institutional work and structuration allow observation of the effect of AEB from a wider perspective (see Table 1). A service ecosystem approach informed by structuration suggests that the formation of ecosystems is both a bottom up (micro configurations coalesce into meso-level, and so on) but also, top down (macro-level 'terms of engagement' affect the meso- and micro-levels). This enables consideration of the effect of AEB beyond the dyadic, micro-level. For while AEB are dictated by their institutional context, the behaviors themselves can *work upwards* and influence both meso- and macro-levels of the ecosystem.

4. Meta-level view: Multiple, parallel engagement contexts

Finally, zooming out to reach what can be called 'meta-level' view; reveals multiple, co-existing engagement contexts that involve different service ecosystems (e.g. sectors, industries), but may share the same macro-level institutions and institutional arrangements, such as legislation and cultural norms (see table 1). As each actor is simultaneously occupying multiple engagement contexts, they are in the intersections of multiple institutional arrangements. For example, in addition to engagement towards organic baby food, the mother may exhibit high engagement towards cars or a sports team, and also hold other professional and private roles associated with a related reference group and set of institutions.

Chandler and Vargo (2011) propose that contexts frame interactions or exchanges that can be seen and understood, whereby each actor's unique qualities 'affects other actors in the context, as well as the context as a whole.' As resources are drawn upon for service across varying contexts, each context provides conditions 'under which different resources will and will not be valuable' (Barney *et al.*, 2001: 43 *cited in* Chandler & Vargo, 2011). Thus, for a broader understanding of AEB and their role beyond dyadic settings it is important to consider the multiple, parallel contexts where actors will, in many cases, be engaged or be directing engagement behaviors to more than one particular foci. This 'parallel' engagement will leave an actor exposed to specific pressures and influences that may cause them to redirect their engagement efforts or disengage from one context to another. The pressure of multiple institutional arrangements puts the actor in a position analogous to role conflict as discussed in service literature (e.g. Solomon *et al.*, 1985), which is why role literature is used to further understand conflict experienced by an actor in the intersections of multiple engagement contexts. Next, the paper consider how actors might meet the demands of

³ <https://www.mumsnet.com/campaigns/mumsnet-campaigns-the-story-so-far-info>

multiple engagement contexts and circumstance, and argue that parallel engagement contexts trigger also actor *disengagement*.

4.1 Role conflict in multiple engagement contexts

When actors engage with *multiple* institutions simultaneously, they face demands, requirements and responsibilities deriving from the institutions and institutional arrangements particular to each context. In this section, circumstances when actors may experience contextual *pressures* or *conflict* are considered that may affect their propensity to engage.

An actor's *role* refers to those socially defined expectations of individuals' behaviors in a particular position (Solomon *et al.*, 1985). In service research, role theory is typically used to provide insight into interactions between a customer and an organization (and those working within it). Solomon *et al.* (1985) relate role theory as a set of practices resulting from well-established social positions between actors, typically in a service encounter situation (e.g. waiter/customer). Adopted roles govern interactions within an exchange (Broderick, 1998). Within the service domain, role theory has been applied to study service encounters with the perspective of single roles allocated to actors (e.g. customer/receptionist) that are governed by well-established social norms, and are usually bound by time within a specific encounter. However, in the wider social sciences, theorizing about *multiple roles* is more common and concerned with an individual's finite levels of energy, and the difficulty of managing multiple roles (Marks, 1977). The difficulties individuals experience in managing multiple roles creates pressure to direct their flow of performance toward more highly valued activities and thereby over-perform in some roles, while under-performing in others (Marks, 1977).

These multiple role difficulties are explained by the term 'role conflict,' which is caused by "simultaneous occupancy of conflicting structural positions" (Stryker & Macke, 1978). Role conflict disrupts the predictability which actors need before understanding individual actions in specific contexts due to disagreement on role expectation and a need to ascertain others viewpoints before engaging. Engagement behaviors therefore, which are largely voluntary, will be subject to the ebb and flow of an actor's proclivities and personal pressures arising from multiple engagement contexts governed by at least partially different institutions. Role conflicts are often associated within negative outcomes, which can be understood through affective or behavioral reactions (studied predominantly in employee (role) contexts, see Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Thus, when actors attempt to balance the needs of multiple, parallel engagement contexts (and roles therein), they may experience forms of conflict or strain associated with their engagement.

4.2 Actor disengagement behavior and multiple parallel actor engagement contexts

The highest levels of aggregation, achieved though ‘zooming out,’ are engagement contexts embedded in multiple, co-existing service eco-systems. Each engagement context and its associated reference group is associated with a unique set of institutions, which are interrelated and may, in particular circumstances, coincide, overlap and/or even conflict. This paper proposes that, as a result of inhabiting multiple parallel engagement contexts simultaneously, actors will experience a some degree of conflict as the norms, rules or activities considered desirable for one role may go against those prescribed by an actor’s other role(s). Thus, engagement behaviors that are valuable in one context may be less so in another (Akaka & Chandler, 2011). As Chandler and Lusch (2015: p. 6) state, it is “often not possible, feasible, or necessary for an actor to accept *all* value propositions” encountered, particularly when these relate to, or reflect, actors’ differing, or potentially conflicting, activities. The outcome of this, it can be assumed, would be *disengagement* from one or more engagement contexts. Arguably, actor engagement and disengagement behaviors are equally important to understand as they mark the activities contributing to interactive processes between actors; or the ceasing of such. For example, a parent may start by engaging with multiple firms or engagement platforms but discovers that one parental forum does not recommend a particular baby product or firm (*mumsnet*, for instance, does not allow advertising from global food giant Nestlé due to its aggressive marketing of milk formula in breach of international standards), this would result in the withdrawal of resources from one engagement object. On a wider scale, an actor who is engaged with multiple engagement contexts simultaneously may require to withdraw resources from one context due to an inability to inhabit multiple contexts at the same time. This disengagement could be either temporary or permanent.

Here, actor disengagement behavior (ADB) is defined as ‘*an actor’s temporary or permanent removal of resource contributions from a focal engagement object, which affects value processes and outcomes for the focal actor, as well as other actors within the service ecosystem.*’ It is important to note that ADB differ, conceptually, from negative engagement behaviors (Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Hollebeek & Chen, 2014), which are actors’ intentional efforts to inflict negativity, harm, or damage to another actor, or actor collective, in some regard (e.g. a member of the general public, using a pseudonym, who posts harmful messages about a company’s practices on social media; Paulin *et al*, 2014; Juric *et al.*, 2016). ADB, by contrast, relates to a temporary or permanent withdrawal of interactivity from a focal object, which may include engagement dormancy (i.e. temporary lags in engagement; Brodie *et al.*, 2013), or perpetual engagement termination (i.e. a permanent cessation of engagement, which could be due to changed needs, e.g. a child growing up no longer requiring infant nutrition).

1
2
3 Critically, the voluntary nature of AEB mean that actors may find it easier to withdraw from
4 specific engagement roles as a result of heightened role conflict, or as a result of a desire to
5 follow a particular reference group, resulting in ADB. This disengagement from the focal
6 object or, perhaps, redirection of efforts represents a form of push and pull at a meta level
7 where an actors desire to engage or disengage from a particular context will have a ripple
8 effect across the various ecosystems, and will reproduce or gradually disrupt institutions. For
9 example, Alderson (1965, p. 301) views the association between structure and behavior to be
10 determined by “rules, which are generated by interaction among the members of a system,”
11 and “rules of conduct, which grow out of interaction among separate systems.” Thus, actor
12 engagement behaviors in one service ecosystem may affect also others, leading to institutions
13 developing and evolving over time (Vargo *et al.*, 2015).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 **5. Conclusions**

23 *5.1 Theoretical implications*

24
25
26
27 The aim of this paper was to broaden academic understanding of the concept of actor
28 engagement beyond its currently predominantly dyadic, micro-level focus (Storbacka *et al.*,
29 2016), this was achieved by examining the concept from multiple levels of aggregation
30 (Vargo & Lusch, 2017). By means of deploying the stepwise exercise of ‘zooming out,’ the
31 paper introduces a multi-perspective (micro-, meso-, macro- and meta-level) view of actor
32 engagement that develops understanding of multiple engagement contexts and their effects on
33 individual actors’ engagement- and disengagement behaviors. This paper demonstrates that,
34 depending on the level of aggregation, researchers adopt particular research foci and are able
35 to illuminate different aspects of engagement, as summarized in Table 1. This analysis
36 suggests that given the predominant micro level focus of extant engagement research,
37 institutional contexts - as well as the existence of multiple, parallel engagement contexts - has
38 not yet been adequately addressed. Next, a set of research propositions are developed to
39 summarize the arguments of this study laying a foundation for engagement research adopting
40 an analytical focus beyond the dyadic. The following sections also explicate three key
41 contributions to the domain of engagement research and managerial implications.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 ---Insert Table 1 here---

52
53 First, this paper contributes to the literature by highlighting the role of the institutional
54 context within which engagement is embedded, an issue that has received little exploration in
55 previous customer/actor engagement research. This paper proposes that (P1): *Institutions and*
56 *institutional arrangements define expected actor engagement behaviors in a particular*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *engagement context*. Previous engagement research has limited its analyses to the role of
4 institutions only implicitly, such as in terms of brand community practices (e.g. Schau *et al.*,
5 2009; Brodie *et al.*, 2013). The paper provides a holistic view by proposing that AEB and
6 ADB emerge, and continuously evolve, in the interplay of multiple - and potentially
7 conflicting - engagement contexts governed by focal institutions, institutional arrangements,
8 and broader service ecosystems, reinforcing the conceptual relationship between S-D Logic
9 and engagement. These notions contribute to thus far limited research into more collective,
10 networked or institutional engagement dynamics (Chandler & Lusch, 2015), which remain
11 poorly understood to date.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Second, this paper expands beyond dyadic engagement relationships that dominate published
research to date, by examining actors' *parallel* engagement with multiple engagement objects
simultaneously. It is proposed that (P2): *Actors balance multiple, parallel engagement
contexts whereby they manage potential tensions between focal institutions and institutional
arrangements relevant to each of these contexts*. Thus, each actor is likely to deploy multiple,
oscillating engagement foci (objects) that exist in parallel. Further, in each context, actors can
exhibit *multiple* AEBs, which may vary in intensity and/or valence; a view that has been
missing from engagement research thus far. Service ecosystem actors' multi-context view
reflects the complex, interwoven nature of multiple actor roles and behaviors, which
resonates well with existing marketing thought (e.g. many-to-one, one-to-many, many-to-
many, etc. interactions; Storbacka *et al.*, 2016; Marks, 1977; Jahn & Kunz, 2012).

Third, this paper develops the concept of "actor disengagement behavior," building on
pioneering work on AE (Storbacka *et al.*, 2016; Chandler & Lusch, 2015), and engagement
behaviors (Van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014). From the zoomed out,
meta-level view, it is possible to view multiple service ecosystems and reveal how
engagement can fluidly transition into disengagement (Naumann *et al.*, 2017), and/or convert
or evolve from, or into, the other (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014). The
potential for role conflict to emerge from actors' attempts to inhabit and balance the demands
of multiple engagement contexts and respective institutional arrangement may result in a
shifting of engagement from one context to another or, alternatively, temporary or permanent
disengagement from their focal engagement object (Brodie *et al.*, 2013).

The third proposition (P3) is as follows: *Actor disengagement behavior is an actor's
temporary or permanent removal of resource contributions from the engagement object*.
Further, the analysis of engagement from multiple levels of aggregation enables elaboration
on the nature and influence of actor engagement behavior. AEBs are voluntary actor activities
that are based on underlying motivational drivers (Van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Jaakkola &

1
2
3 Alexander, 2014; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2016), governed by institutions and institutional
4 arrangements relevant to the engagement context. Influenced by these institutions, actors
5 choose to integrate (or withhold) particular operant and/or operand resources, thereby
6 producing focal AEBs through focal object interactions (Brodie *et al.*, 2011). Here,
7 proposition 4 states (P4): *Actor engagement behaviors are triggered, shaped, and also ceased*
8 *as a result of the degree of conflict experienced when balancing multiple engagement*
9 *contexts.* These findings add to previous engagement research that lacks insight into actors'
10 intentional ceasing of engagement, despite the obvious managerial and theoretical relevance
11 of this question.
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 ADB also plays a role in the forming and reforming of institutions. The observable
19 regularities of social systems – that is, institutions and institutional arrangements – exist only
20 as long as they are re-created through social activity over time (cf. Giddens, 1984;
21 Edvardsson *et al.*, 2011). When institutions are not reinforced by actors' behaviors, they may
22 be 'de-institutionalized' (Oliver, 1992), indicating that AEBs and ADB may be/are equally
23 important in the development (or dissolution) of institutions as a form of institutional work
24 (Lawrence *et al.*, 2011). Clearly, an actor's disengagement from one context may also result
25 in the individual engaging, re-engaging, enhancing or reducing the level and/or valence of
26 their engagement in other contexts, thus rendering the study of disengagement an important
27 future research area.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 The notion that individual customer interests can wax and wane from one brand or firm to
35 another is not new (e.g. as tastes change, so do related buying and usage habits). However,
36 when an individual stops buying a particular product or service there is only a single dyadic
37 effect, directed towards the focal brand or firm. However, it is the networked, interactive
38 nature of AEBs that enhance the impact of any oscillations. Engagement behaviors have the
39 capacity to affect other actors' feelings or direct actions toward a focal object (Alexander &
40 Jaakkola, 2016); if these behaviors wane, then it is not just the individual customer's
41 relationship with the focal object that is affected but, there may be much wider, systemic
42 effects. This leads to proposition P5: *Through (dis)engagement behaviors, actors contribute or*
43 *withdraw resources related to the focal engagement object that gradually reinforce and/or*
44 *change institutions and institutional arrangements particular to focal engagement contexts,*
45 *thereby eventually affecting other actors' engagement.*
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Together, these notions broaden extant understanding on actor engagement that has been
54 examined primarily from a micro-level perspective; that is, by focusing on individual
55 engagement contexts. This study is among the first attempts to consider how different
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engagement contexts are connected to one another and, importantly, how individual actors
4 are able to coordinate multiple engagement contexts simultaneously.
5
6

7 5.2 Managerial Implications

8
9 This research highlights the benefits of zooming engagement research out from its
10 predominately micro-level focus to date, to encompass broader levels of aggregation (e.g. the
11 meta-level), which also has implications for firms that seek to encourage, or rely on, engaged
12 customers. Existing research (e.g. Schau *et al.*, 2009; Brodie *et al.*, 2013; Bowden *et al.*,
13 2017; Hollebeek *et al.* 2017) provides a preliminary understanding of consumers'
14 engagement practices in the virtual brand community context. Extending this notion to the
15 domain of AE, actors, in executing their relevant engagement behaviors and/or
16 disengagement behavior, or practices, tend to adopt particular routinized, habitual and/or self-
17 regulated practices, and in doing so, tend to work with and/or around other actors in seeking
18 to meet their needs within broader service ecosystems.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Firms, consequently, need to understand the values and norms embedded in diverse
26 engagement contexts affecting each of the relevant actor groups' needs and motivations, and
27 subsequently develop organizational mechanisms that facilitate (rather than impede or
28 obstruct) the desired behaviors of each actor group. Another contribution of this view is that
29 while engagement (behaviors) are typically desirable, in some cases actor disengagement
30 behaviors will be paramount and/or sought (e.g. reducing social media engagement in
31 teenagers). Further, the development of enhanced understanding of these (dis)engagement
32 behavior(s) for particular actor groups, and their underlying motivations, can thus help
33 managers to better understand actors' respective (dis)engagement motivations, triggers and
34 inhibiting factors, which can, in turn, contribute to enhanced actor relationships and returns.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 This research can also assist organizations by allowing them to better understand the
42 mechanisms by which engaged actors form, develop and influence service eco-systems. By
43 cultivating their own rules (institutions), engaged actors not only influence individual other
44 actors (micro-level), collective actors (e.g. in a firm; meso-level), but also at a broader,
45 macro-level, such as national governments. For example, customer collectives lobbying
46 against specific government legislation may be able to exert particular pressures that will
47 impact on a product's ecosystem and supply chains (e.g. lobbying to reduce calories in
48 packaged food). To illustrate, the *mumsnet* example shows how the brand community
49 influences individual parents' views on bringing up their children, targets specific firms and
50 product types, and enacts progress at the governmental level through legislative changes. This
51 wider, ecosystem view of engagement should encourage firms to adopt a broader
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 understanding of the role of engaged actors in their organizations, and their respective
4 returns, including bottom line, double-bottom line and triple bottom line returns.
5
6

7 Understanding the dynamic relationship between AEB and ADB will be of interest to
8 organizations across a broad range of sectors, and dealing with balancing the needs, interests
9 and outcomes related to a broad range of actors. This paper introduces the notion of
10 (dis)engagement's fluid nature into the literature. Specifically, actors may struggle (over
11 time) to satisfactorily engage in multiple engagement contexts. Specifically, each actor's own
12 unique configuration of engagement contexts (with associated reference groups and conflict)
13 suggests that engaged actors may be prejudicing one role over another (Marks, 1977; Shamir,
14 1980). Recent research (e.g. Harmeling *et al.*, 2017) highlights the importance of engagement
15 marketing, which, coupled with the notion of total engagement value (Kumar *et al.*, 2010)
16 suggests that firms, in the near future, need to adopt an engagement-based strategic mindset,
17 *not only* from customers, *but also* from other types of actors, including suppliers, the general
18 public, regulators, etc. that takes into account actors' engagement, as well as disengagement,
19 and potential transgressions between these. For example, TripAdvisor sends out emails to
20 participants who have not reviewed for a while to remind them of the ongoing impact of their
21 reviews, and request further reviews from them. Essentially, the potential for disengagement,
22 as much as engagement (and the importance of capturing engagement value) means that firms
23 need to ensure they develop and retain engaged actors on an ongoing basis (Kumar *et al.*
24 2010).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 In summary, if organizations understand the effect of multiple, parallel engagement contexts
36 within which actors are engaged, they can work to create improved engagement contexts,
37 including through engagement platform facilitation and/or other support mechanisms, thus
38 resulting in engagement-conducive (and disengagement-reductive) institutions and
39 institutional arrangements. Given this backdrop, this paper has key implications in societies
40 where customer labor, often of a voluntary nature, is increasingly endogenous to
41 governmental, commercial and charitable organizations to supplement their activities. As a
42 result, the support provided to engaged actors becomes critical, if particular modes
43 engagement are likely to be in any way transient and/or fragile. Finally, the development of a
44 sound understand of what constitutes an engaged actor - and how to nurture and retain these -
45 across particular engagement contexts also remains critical for managers.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 *5.3 Future research implications*

53
54

55 As Table 1 illustrates, engagement research to date, has been largely conceptual or focused
56 around dyadic settings (micro level). This paper reveals new insights on engagement that can
57 be gained by zooming out and using the service ecosystem lens to consider meso, macro or
58
59
60

1
2
3 meta level issues relevant for engagement researchers. By zooming out, researchers can
4 highlight the dynamic, inherently systemic nature of AEBs and ADB, and their co-evolution
5 with their surrounding service ecosystem and its associated sub-structures, including focal
6 institutions and institutional arrangements. In particular, the interdependent relationships that
7 exist between actors and their ecosystem-based environment render the relevance of future
8 investigation into this area. New insight can be gained by drawing on, for example, actor-
9 network theory, which views actors and objects as interdependent parts of interactive social
10 networks (Munro, 2009). Future researchers may seek to explore factors that give rise to
11 AEBs transitioning or shifting into ADB, or vice versa (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011), and the
12 key consequences therein (e.g. in terms of a focal actor's commitment toward an agent or
13 object; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014). Future (empirical) research can also explore the development
14 and evolution of AEBs and ADB, as well as actor roles, including their antecedents, change
15 process and key effects over time within service ecosystems.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 This research also highlights the value of considering engagement behaviors as a finite or
24 temporal resource with customers transitioning in and out of focal engagement contexts, or
25 shifting resources from one context to another. This suggests a need for further research that
26 considers the focal engagement dynamics as exposure to specific reference groups, and social
27 influences will undoubtedly affect actors' engagement motivations.
28
29
30
31

32 In their most recent paper Vargo and Lusch (2017, p. 39) ponder: "How can strategic
33 planning and implementation be cocreated with multiple stakeholders and what is the impact
34 of these cocreation processes on the firm and its stakeholders?" The confluence of S-D Logic
35 and AEB indicates how engagement behaviors are influenced but, crucially, can influence,
36 networks of actors and wider institutions. The ways in which firms should create, facilitate
37 and react to engagement behaviors within a service ecosystem are also of increasing
38 importance for future research. Finally, this paper is among the first to recognize that actors
39 are often forced to inhabit and balance the demands of multiple engagement contexts,
40 resulting in such tensions through reference groups or role conflict. It is out of this paper's
41 scope to consider under what circumstances these might occur or, indeed, at what point they
42 might engender ADB. Future research in this area is therefore also critical.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **6. References**

52
53 Akaka, M.A. and Chandler, J.D. (2011), "Roles as resources: A social roles perspective of
54 change in value networks", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 243-260.

55
56 Akaka, M.A. Vargo, S.L. and Schau, H.J. (2015), "The context of experience", *Journal of*
57 *Service Management*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 206-223.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Alderson, W. (1965), *Dynamic marketing behaviour*, Richard D. Irwin, Homewood.
- 5
6 Alexander, M. and Jaakkola, E. (2016), "Customer engagement behaviours and value co-
7 creation", in Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D. and Conduit, J. (Eds.), *Customer*
8 *Engagement: Contemporary Issues and Challenges*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp. 3-20.
- 9
10 Algesheimer, R. and Gurau, C. (2008), "Introducing structuration theory in communal
11 consumption behavior research", *Qualitative Market Research: An International*
12 *Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 227-245.
- 13
14 Appleton, J.J., Christenson, S.L., Kim, D. and Reschly, A.L. (2006), "Measuring cognitive
15 and psychological engagement: Validation of the student engagement instrument",
16 *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 427-445.
- 17
18 Battilana, J., Leca, B. and Boxenbaum, E. (2009), "How actors change institutions: Towards
19 a theory of institutional entrepreneurship", *Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 3
20 No. 1, pp. 65-107.
- 21
22 Bearden, W. O., and Etzel, M. J. (1982), "Reference group influence on product and brand
23 purchase decisions", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 183-194.
- 24
25 Bowden, J., Conduit, J., Hollebeek, L., Luoma-Aho, V. & Solem, B. (2017), "Engagement
26 Valence Duality and Spillover Effects in Online Brand Communities," *Journal of*
27 *Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 877-897.
- 28
29 Breidbach, C. F., & Brodie, R. J. (2017). "Engagement platforms in the sharing economy:
30 conceptual foundations and research directions". *Journal of Service Theory and*
31 *Practice*, Vol. 27, No.4, pp. 738-760.
- 32
33 Broderick, A.J. (1998), "Role theory, role management and service performance", *Journal of*
34 *Services Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 5, pp. 348-361.
- 35
36 Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Juric, B. and Ilic, A. (2011a), "Customer engagement:
37 Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research",
38 *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 252-271.
- 39
40 Brodie, R. J., Saren, M., & Pels, J. (2011b), "Theorizing about the service dominant logic:
41 The bridging role of middle range theory", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 75-
42 91.
- 43
44 Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013), "Consumer engagement in a virtual
45 brand community: An exploratory analysis", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66
46 No.1, pp.105-114.
- 47
48 Brodie R.J., Fehrer J.A., Jaakkola E., Conduit J. and Hollebeek L.D. (2016), "From Customer
49 to Actor Engagement: Exploring a Broadened Conceptual Domain." *45th European*
50 *Marketing Academy Conference (EMAC)*, Oslo, Norway.
- 51
52 Chandler, J. D., & Vargo, S. L. (2011), "Contextualization and value-in-context: How context
53 frames exchange", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 35-49.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Chandler, J.D. and Lusch, R.F. (2015), "Service systems: A broadened framework and
4 research agenda on value propositions, engagement, and service experience", *Journal*
5 *of Service Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 6-22.
6
- 7 Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C. & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2016), "Capturing Consumer Engagement:
8 Duality, Dimensionality, and Measurement," *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol.
9 32 No. 5-6, pp. 399-426.
10
- 11 DiMaggio, P.J. (1988), "Interest and agency in institutional theory", in Zucker, L. (Ed.),
12 *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment*, Ballinger,
13 Cambridge, pp. 3-21.
14
- 15 Echeverri, P. and Skålén, P. (2011), "Co-creation and co-destruction: A practice-theory based
16 study of interactive value formation", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 351-373.
17
- 18 Edvardsson, B., Tronvoll, B. and Gruber, T. (2011), "Expanding understanding of service
19 exchange and value co-creation: A social construction approach", *Journal of the*
20 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 39 No. 2, pp. 327-339.
21
- 22 Giddens, A. (1984), *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*, Polity
23 Press, Cambridge.
24
- 25 Groeger, L., Moroko, L. and Hollebeek, L.D. (2016), "Capturing value from non-paying
26 consumers' engagement behaviours: Field evidence and development of a theoretical
27 model", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 3-4, pp. 190-209.
28
- 29 Harmeling, C. M., Moffett, J. W., Arnold, M. J., and Carlson, B. D. (2017) "Toward a theory
30 of customer engagement marketing", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*,
31 Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 312-335.
32
- 33 Hatcher, B.G. (1990), "Coral reef primary productivity: A hierarchy of pattern and process",
34 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, Vol. 5 No. 5, pp. 149-155.
35
- 36 Hollebeek, L.D. (2011a), "Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty
37 nexus", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 27 No. 7-8, pp. 785-807.
38
- 39 Hollebeek, L.D. (2011b), "Exploring customer brand engagement: Definitions and themes",
40 *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 7, pp. 555-573.
41
- 42 Hollebeek, L.D. & Chen, T. (2014), "Exploring positively- versus negatively-valenced brand
43 engagement: A conceptual model", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol.
44 23 No. 1, pp. 62-74.
45
- 46 Hollebeek, L.D., Glynn, M.S. & Brodie, R.J. (2014), "Consumer brand engagement in social
47 media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation", *Journal of Interactive*
48 *Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 149-165.
49
- 50 Hollebeek, L.D., Srivastava, R.K. & Chen, T. (2016), "S-D logic-informed customer
51 engagement: integrative framework, revised fundamental propositions, and
52 application to CRM", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*,
53 doi:10.1007/s11747-016-0494-5.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Jaakkola, E. & Alexander, M. (2014), "The role of customer engagement behavior in value
4 co-creation: A service system perspective", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 17 No.
5 3, pp. 247-261.
6
- 7 Jackson, S.E. & Schuler, R.S. (1985), "A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research
8 on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings", *Organizational Behavior and*
9 *Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 16-78.
10
- 11 Jahn, B. and Kunz, W. (2012), "How to transform consumers into fans of your brand",
12 *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 344-361.
13
- 14 Juric, B., Wilks, G. and Smith, S. (2016), "Negative customer brand engagement: An
15 overview of conceptual and blog-based findings", in Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D.
16 and Conduit, J. (Eds.), *Customer engagement: Contemporary issues and challenges*,
17 Routledge, Singapore. pp. 272-286.
18
- 19 Kjellberg, H. and Helgesson, C.F. (2006), "Multiple versions of markets: Multiplicity and
20 performativity in market practice", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 5 No. 7,
21 pp. 839-855.
22
- 23 Klijn, F. (1994), "Spatially nested ecosystems: Guidelines for classification from a
24 hierarchical perspective", *Ecology & Environment*, Vol. 2, pp. 85-116.
25
- 26 Koch, J. (1997), "Candidate gender and women's psychocological engagement in politics",
27 *American Politics Research*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 118-133.
28
- 29 Koskela-Huotari, K., Edvardsson, B., Jonas, J. M., Sörhammar, D., & Witell, L. (2016).
30 "Innovation in service ecosystems—Breaking, making, and maintaining
31 institutionalized rules of resource integration", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69
32 No. 8, pp. 2964-2971.
33
- 34 Koskela-Huotari, K., and Vargo, S.L. (2016), "Institutions as resource context", *Journal of*
35 *Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 163-178.
36
- 37 Kumar, V., Aksoy, L., Donkers, B., Venkatesan, R., Wiesel, T., & Tillmanns, S. (2010),
38 "Undervalued or Overvalued Customers: Capturing Total Customer Engagement
39 Value", *Journal of service research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 297-310.
40
- 41 Kumar, V. and Pansari, A. (2015), "Competitive advantage through engagement", *Journal of*
42 *Marketing Research*, in press, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmr.15.0044>.
43
- 44 Lawrence, T.B. and Suddaby, R. (2006), *Institutions and institutional work*, Sage, London.
45
- 46 Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). "Institutional work: Refocusing institutional
47 studies of organization", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 52-58.
48
- 49 Lee, M.S.W., Motion, J. and Conroy, D. (2009), "Anti-consumption and brand avoidance",
50 *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 2, pp. 169-180.
51
- 52 Lapinski, M. K., & Rimal, R. N. (2005), "An explication of social norms", *Communication*
53 *Theory*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 127-147.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Li, L. P., Juric, B., & Brodie, R. J. (2017). Dynamic multi-actor engagement in networks: the
5 case of United Breaks Guitars. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27, No.4,
6 pp. 761-777
7
- 8 Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2014), *Service-dominant logic: Premises, perspectives,*
9 *possibilities*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
10
- 11 Marks, S.R. (1977), "Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and
12 commitment", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 42 No. 6, pp. 921-936.
13
- 14 Munro, R. (2009), "Actor-network theory", in Clegg, S.R. and Haugaard, M. (Eds.), *The Sage*
15 *Handbook of Power*, Sage, London, pp. 125-139.
16
- 17 Naumann, K., Bowden, J., and Gabbott, M. (2017), "A Multi-Valenced Perspective on
18 Consumer Engagement Within a Social Service", *Journal of Marketing Theory and*
19 *Practice*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 171-188.
20
- 21 Oliver, C. (1992), "The antecedents of deinstitutionalization", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 13
22 No. 4, pp. 563-588.
23
- 24 Paulin, M., Ferguson, R.J., Jost, N. and Fallu, J.M. (2014), "Motivating millennials to engage
25 in charitable causes through social media", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 25
26 No. 3, pp. 334-348.
27
- 28 Philips, J. (2012). "Mumsnet and the politics of parent power", Retrieved from
29 <https://www.totalpolitics.com/articles/interview/mumsnet-and-politics-parent-power>
30
- 31 Schau, H.J, Muñiz, A.M., Jr. and Arnould, E.J. (2009), "How brand communities create
32 value", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73 No. September, pp. 30-51.
33
- 34 Schulze, E.D. and Mooney, H.A. (2012) (Eds.), *Biodiversity and ecosystem function*, New
35 York: Springer.
36
- 37 Shamir, B. (1980), "Between service and servility: Role conflict in subordinate service roles",
38 *Human Relations*, Vol. 33 No. 10, pp. 741-756.
39
- 40 Solomon, M.R., Surprenant, C., Czepiel, J.A. and Gutman, E.G. (1985), "A role theory
41 perspective on dyadic interactions: The service encounter", *Journal of Marketing*,
42 Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 99-111.
43
- 44 Storbacka, K., Brodie, R.J., Böhmman, T., Maglio, P.P. and Nenonen, S. (2016), "Actor
45 engagement as a microfoundation for value co-creation: Conceptual directions for
46 further research on SDL", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 69 No. 8, pp.3008-3017
47
- 48 Stryker, S., & Macke, A. S. (1978), "Status inconsistency and role conflict", *Annual Review*
49 *of Sociology*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 57-90.
50
- 51 Sweeney, J.C., Danaher, T.S. and McColl-Kennedy, J.R. (2015), "Customer effort in value
52 cocreation activities: Improving quality of life and behavioral intentions of healthcare
53 customers", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 318-335.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K.N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pimer, P. and Verhoef, P.C.
4 (2010), "Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research
5 directions", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 253-266.
6
- 7 Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing",
8 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
9
- 10 Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008), "Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution",
11 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
12
- 13 Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2016), "Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of
14 service-dominant logic", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 44 No.
15 1, pp. 5-23.
16
- 17 Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2017), "Service-Dominant Logic 2025", *International Journal*
18 *of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 46-67.
19
- 20 Vargo, S.L., Wieland, H. & Akaka, M.A. (2015), "Innovation through institutionalization: A
21 service ecosystems perspective", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 44 No. 1,
22 pp. 63-72.
23
- 24 Venkatesan, R. (2017), "Executing on a customer engagement strategy", *Journal of the*
25 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 289-293.
26
- 27 Verhoef, P. C., Reinartz, W. J., & Krafft, M. (2010), "Customer Engagement as a New
28 Perspective in Customer Management", *Journal of service research*, Vol. 13 No. 3,
29 pp. 247-252.
30
- 31 Verleye, K. (2015), "The co-creation experience from the customer perspective: Its
32 measurement and determinants", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp.
33 321-342.
34
- 35 Verleye, K., Gemmel, P. and Rangarajan, D. (2014), "Managing engagement behaviors in a
36 network of customers and stakeholders: Evidence from the nursing home sector",
37 *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 68-84.
38
- 39 Vivek, S. D., Beatty, S. E., & Morgan, R. M. (2012). Customer engagement: Exploring
40 customer relationships beyond purchase. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*,
41 Vol.20 No.2, pp.122-146.
42
- 43 Vivek, S.D, Vivek, D. and Beatty, S.E. (2016), "Partner engagement - A perspective on B2B
44 engagement", in Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L., Conduit, J. (Eds.), *Customer*
45 *Engagement: Contemporary Issues and Challenges*, Routledge, UK, pp. 53-66.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Engagement research foci viewed from different levels of aggregation.

Level of aggregation	Key focus	Aspects of engagement illuminated	Current state of engagement research
Micro view	Service ecosystem layer focusing on dyadic relationships between actors and the engagement object	An actor’s relationship with the engagement object, manifested in behaviors that occur in interactions with a focal object and/or other actors but go beyond what is elementary to the exchange.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical and conceptual insight into antecedents and outcomes of consumer engagement (e.g. Vivek et al., 2012; Brodie et al., 2011). • Empirical and conceptual insight into forms and outcomes of consumer engagement behavior (e.g., van Doorn et al., 2010; Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014).
Meso view	Service ecosystem layer forming the context around the engagement object, such as a brand community.	The immediate context surrounding an engagement object. Specific institutions and institutional arrangements reinforce or guide, but are also shaped by, engagement behaviors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empirical research on how participation in a brand community affects consumer engagement (Brodie et al, 2013). • Empirical research on interactive engagement practices that illustrate the impact of institutions (e.g. Li et al. 2017). • Limited research addressing institutions or other governance mechanisms for engagement (Storbacka et al., 2016).
Macro view	Service ecosystem layer focusing on the broader category or industrial context of the engagement object, such as a product group or an industry.	The broader ecosystem sharing a set of higher level institutional arrangements (e.g. industry standards or social norms) where each engagement context and its associated set of institutions are embedded in.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of research addressing the broader category or industrial context of the engagement object.
Meta view	Multiple, co-existing service ecosystems, such as sectors or industries.	The combination of multiple engagement contexts across industries that host multiple institutional arrangements but may share the same macro-level arrangements, such as legislation and cultural norms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of research exploring how engagement transitions across multiple engagement objects. • Lack of research addressing how actors maintain balance between multiple engagement objects.

JOSM-08-2016-0237.R1 Response to Reviewer

We thank both reviewers for the positive evaluation of our paper. We thank reviewer 2 for additional comments and have revised the paper as specified below:

- *The use of 'engagement context' appear several times without any definition or description. The authors should define/describe the term or use the more common 'in the context where actors are engaged'.*

Response: Thank you for noticing this. To ensure a parsimonious narrative we felt engagement context was the more efficient term but we recognize it needs a little explanation. We have altered the text at the bottom of page one as follows:

"An ecosystem view highlights that each actor is involved in a multitude of co-existing value creation processes with other actors (Vargo and Lusch, 2016), suggesting that they face multiple, potentially conflicting, contexts where they are engaged (which we term engagement contexts)."

- *The sentence 'A critical development was a paper by Brodie et al...' reads odd. Please rephrase (p. 4 row 21/22)*

Response: We agree, the sentence now starts "Brodie et al. (2011a) provide conceptual foundations..."

- *In the definition of AEB (p. 6 row 14) the authors use 'resource contribution' in the definition. Since you are drawing on S-D logic, why not use 'resource integration' as a known term instead of introducing a new term?*

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. While we agree that in S-D logic, resource integration is an established concept, we maintain that "resource contribution" is better aligned with extant engagement conceptualizations. Previous engagement research defines customer engagement as "resource contributions" as is apparent in the following definitions:

CEB is "behavior through which customers make voluntary resource contributions that have a brand or firm focus but go beyond what is fundamental to transactions (Jaakkola & Alexander 2014, p. 248)

"We therefore define customer engagement as a customer's voluntary resource contribution to a firm's marketing function, going beyond financial patronage". (Harmeling et al., 2016)

"customers choose to invest ... resources in particular brand interactions" (Hollebeek et al. 2016, p. 3)

Similarly, we define actor disengagement behavior as 'an actor's temporary or permanent removal of resource contributions' – here 'integration' would not make sense.

- *The sentence 'This analysis shows that engagement have as yet been not been addressed....' seems odd, please rephrase.*

Response: Sentence has been adapted: "This analysis suggests that given the predominant micro level focus of extant engagement research, institutional contexts - as well as the existence of multiple, parallel engagement contexts - have not yet been addressed."

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References:

Harmeling, C. M., Moffett, J. W., Arnold, M. J., & Carlson, B. D. (2017). Toward a theory of customer engagement marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(3), 312-335.

Hollebeek, L. D., Srivastava, R. K., & Chen, T. (2016). SD logic–informed customer engagement: integrative framework, revised fundamental propositions, and application to CRM. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*.

Jaakkola, E., & Alexander, M. (2014). The role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation a service system perspective. *Journal of Service Research*, 17(3), 247–261.

