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Abstract

Purpose: A customer’s visit to a retail website is a critical ‘moment of truth’ during which contemporary retailers attempt to simultaneously, during a single web navigation, capture customers’ attention, build rapport and prompt them to act. By showing how to capture customer commitment over the course of a single website visit, the concept of customer website engagement, defined as ‘the process of developing cognitive, affective and behavioural commitment to an active relationship with the website’, addresses strategic concerns. Drawing from literature on engagement, this study considers how retail websites can engage customers during the course of a website navigation. A conceptual model of website customer engagement underpinned by relationship marketing and communication knowledge, shows how perceptions of the website’s exploration and sense-making potential can activate consumer engagement, and is then empirically tested.

Design/methodology/approach: Using survey data, measures of the four dimensions of engagement (interaction engagement, activity engagement, behavioural engagement, and communication engagement) and of three drivers are developed and validated. The model is tested empirically (n=301) using structural equation modelling.

Findings: The results support the process conceptualisation of engagement, which identifies organismic as well as conative stages, and show the distinct roles played by perceptions of informational exploration, experiential exploration and sense-making in activating engagement.

Practical implications: The study provides online retailing practice with an organising framework enabling online retailing managers to consider how, depending on their product
category and their size, they might (re)design their website to optimally produce customer

engagement.

**Originality/value:** The study contributes to online marketing and retailing knowledge by

showing the relevance of the concept of engagement as it pertains to customers’ single

navigations on retail websites, and by empirically showing, through a parsimonious model,

how engagement can be activated and unfold.
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Introduction

A retail website constitutes an important touchpoint and a first online navigation can determine the future of a customer’s relationship with retailers and their offerings. Retail websites host complex interactions, with online customers where communication and relational elements are inseparably interwoven, and the website’s stimuli can simultaneously activate communication and relational responses. Such an interweaving of marketing communication and relational phenomena call for a considering of both domains, although marketing communication and relationship marketing have traditionally been separate managerial and scholarly concerns.

The concept of engagement, which describes a customer’s experience of active connection or participation with a marketing entity (such as a brand, a firm, a website, an online community), could address the need to explain initial and on-going customer–website interactions comprehensively, by encompassing communication as well as relational properties. It has acquired much prominence in the practitioner literature (e.g. French et al., 2012; Gallup, 2014), reflecting marketers’ compulsion to understand how, in today’s overcrowded and fragmented marketing landscape, they might simultaneously capture customers’ attention (Huddleston et al., 2015), build rapport with them and generate commitment to act. Scholarly attention has intensified recently (e.g. Brodie et al., 2013; Baldus et al., 2015; Bowden, 2009; Mollen and Wilson, 2010; Vivek, 2009; Brodie et al., 2011; Hollebeek et al., 2014).

Customer engagement can apply to a broad range of focal objects such as brands (Bowden, 2009; Sprott et al., 2009), organisations’ innovation initiatives (Sawhney et al.,
2005), virtual communities (Brodie et al., 2013; Baldus et al., 2015). However, the question
of why and how retail websites can engage customers on their first-time or subsequent visits
remains open. Although a few studies have considered engagement in an online context
(Mollen and Wilson, 2010; Hollebeek et al., 2014; Calder et al., 2009; Brodie et al., 2013;
Pagani and Mirabello, 2011), none so far has considered the website itself as a focal object of
engagement. A possible reason for this surprising situation is that the engagement process has
mostly (although not always - see for instance Mollen and Wilson, 2010; Fredricks et al.,
2004) been used to characterise a succession of interactions over time, rather than being
considered in the context of a single interaction.

Yet, by showing how to capture customer commitment over the course of a single
website visit, customer engagement addresses strategic concerns, since websites are often the
first and only touchpoint through which retailers interact with their customers. Further, when
the website is the locus of the first interaction with prospects or new customers, their
engagement with the website may be a sine qua non condition for converting them into
returning visitors or customers. Additionally, customer engagement can have consequences
beneficial to the marketer beyond the customer’s lifetime value, through referrals, influence
and the contribution of feedback to the firm (Kumar et al., 2010). As the first step on the
loyalty ladder, customer engagement may be key to profitability (Brodie et al., 2011).

Consequently, this study addresses the research question of how retail websites can
engage customers during the course of a website navigation. Drawing from literature on
engagement and environmental psychology, the paper develops a conceptualisation and
model of website customer engagement underpinned by relational and communication
knowledge, which it then tests. The study contributes to online marketing and retailing
knowledge by showing the relevance of the concept of engagement as it pertains to
customers’ single individual navigations on retail websites, and by providing insights into
how website perceptual attributes can activate website customer engagement. It provides online retailing practice with a framework enabling them to consider how, depending on their product category and their size, they might (re)design their website to optimally produce customer engagement.

**Theoretical background: Behaviour on the web and customer engagement**

The interactive and vivid qualities of the internet medium have been an early focus of the online marketing literature (e.g. Manganari et al., 2009). Several authors use different terminology to study the combination of cognitive and emotional phenomena that compel customers to attend to and interact with the stimuli of a website. One stream (e.g. Loiacono et al., 2007; Chang et al., 2014; Park et al., 2012) have drawn from offline atmospherics literature, to consider the ‘silent language’ (Kotler, 1973; , p. 48) of online communication, with a view to designing website stimuli which produce desirable customer responses. Another stream was initiated by Hoffman and Novak (1996), who extended the concept of flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990) to online contexts, suggesting that flow promotes ‘stickiness’ with the website and enhances customer experiences (Bilgihan et al., 2015; Rose et al., 2012; Shim et al., 2015).

Yet, the interactive nature of the internet also entails the development, during any online navigation session, of a relationship between the customer and the website (Dennis et al., 2009). Hence, the specific characteristics of internet behaviour such as interactivity (Steuer, 1992), customer participation (Meuter et al., 2003) and involving experiences (Hoffman and Novak, 1996) suggest the relevance of both relational and communications aspects. The concept of engagement, which describes a customer’s active connection or commitment to a relationship with a marketing entity based on an experience or set of
experiences, aptly captures the two aspects (relational and communicational) inherent in the interaction which customers develop with websites.

A review of extant typical conceptualisations of engagement (Table 1) reveals that while the concept has received much attention in the past decade from diverse disciplines, there remains much disparity about its domain and that some foci have received more attention than others.
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Several general observations seem pertinent. First, with the exception of Webster and Ahuja (2006), these conceptualisations distinguish engagement from flow, involvement and interactivity because of the action orientation of engagement. Second, there is much divergence regarding the actual domain of engagement, some authors considering it as a behavioural construct, others seeing it as a strictly organismic construct, others as a process or a state within an ongoing process. Third, the process of engagement may be ongoing, i.e. applying to a succession of interactive experiences with the focal object, or it may apply to a particular experience or interaction. Fourth, there is also much diversity in terms of the focal object of engagement: a brand, a virtual community, offerings, websites, the organisation for which employees work, learning activities, or the product development and innovation activities of an organisation. Fifth, although the definitions in the marketing studies recognise the different, simultaneous roles that customers play as receivers and producers of communication, and as actors in a developing relationship with the focal object of engagement, the studies often only draw from either the marketing communication or the
relationship marketing literature, rarely from both. Sixth, empirical studies and in particular measures of the concept remain scarce.

Several further matters arise with regard to studies that have considered the online context. So far, the literature has not examined engagement with a website other than from the perspective of the website representing the brand (Mollen and Wilson, 2010), the website being an advertising medium (Calder et al., 2009), or social television websites where the two-way interaction is with other viewers rather than the actual website (Pagani and Mirabello, 2011). Yet, in a retail context, websites are far more than advertising media or brand proxies: as environments, as service touchpoints, as the providers of multi-faceted information about offerings, they can make or break the ‘moment of truth’ which customers and prospects experience during the course of an online navigation. This moment of truth can have heavy consequences not only on purchases, but also in terms of the customer’s disposition towards the retailer and their degree of ‘active-ness’ (positive or negative) towards the retailer and the website. Therefore, this paper argues that website customer engagement is a central construct to enable retailers to understand how, over the course a single navigation, they might grab customers’ attention, develop a relationship with them and incite them to act within the context an increasingly interactive, fragmented and complex business environment.

Alongside Bowden (2009), this paper argues for a conceptualisation which acknowledges that engagement, rather than being only a psychological or a behavioural construct, is a process construct with both organismic and conative facets, to reflect the pro-active notion underpinning the construct and distinguishing it from related constructs such as involvement. This approach is conducive to ‘opening the black box’ of customer engagement and understanding how it can be activated. Furthermore, alongside Calder, Malthouse, and Schaedel (2009), Mollen and Wilson (2010), and Webster and Ahuja (2006), this paper
conceptualises the process of website customer engagement within the context of individual online navigation experiences.

Adapting Mollen and Wilson’s (2010) definition to the focus of a marketing website, and reflecting the conceptualisation of engagement as a process taking place during individual navigations, website customer engagement is defined as the process of developing a cognitive, affective and behavioural commitment to an active relationship with the website.

This conceptualisation augments retailing and customer engagement literature since the particular focal object of engagement considered here (retail websites) has so far been neglected in the engagement literature. Due to the breadth of possible focal objects of engagement and the critical contextual influences on the processes underpinning customer engagement (Brodie et al., 2011), this conceptualisation is not simply an extension of extant theory to another context. Without conceptualisation work that takes account of the specific object of engagement, further conceptual development and empirical attempts at measuring and understanding the underlying elements of the engagement process would be hampered.

Conceptual model

Retail websites are virtual environments, and an online navigation exposes customers to their stimuli. As per Mehrabian and Russell’s (1974) Stimulus – Organism – Response (SOR) model, stimuli generate a sequence of reactions: organismic reactions are internal states resulting from an immediate reaction to stimuli. In turn, they produce a behavioural response. We develop a conceptual framework using the SOR model and drawing from knowledge from relationship marketing and marketing communication literature to consider both relationship building and communication aspects underpinning the customer-website interaction on a retail website.
In a first instance, we operationalise customer engagement as a set of organismic and conative responses to interactions with the attributes of a retail website and develop hypotheses linking the different components of customer engagement through a relational and a communication route. Second, we use environmental psychology literature to identify three relevant drivers of customer engagement and develop hypotheses regarding the manner they each activate a particular route of customer engagement.

**Operationalising website customer engagement**

The conceptualisation of website customer engagement has argued that customer engagement interweaves relationship marketing and marketing communication phenomena. We now deal with these in turn.

The Web facilitates relationship-building (Yoon et al., 2008). A relationship marketing perspective views customer navigations on a retail website as emergent relationships between the customer and the marketer, as the customer interacts with the website. Li, Browne and Wetherbe (2006) argue that there exists a relationship between websites and users that evolves over time, whose qualities in terms of trust and commitment, influences stickiness intention, or the “embedding [of] a website within a user’s routine” (p. 106). This paper further posits that a single online navigation, in and of itself, also constitutes a marketing relationship: during the several minutes of the navigation, a relationship gradually develops, in which the customer discovers the manner in which the website works and responds to requests for further content, and establishes whether it is a suitable, useful and trustworthy website. Commitment at the end of a single navigation experience represents the customer's *behavioural engagement* with the site in future. Prior literature confirms links between intention and behaviour (e.g. Ajzen, 1991; Yun and Good, 2007), such that
behavioural engagement would represent the conative element of the relational interaction between the website and the customer.

A determinant of commitment is the level of closeness and understanding experienced by the customer during the navigation. *Interaction engagement* refers to the degree of closeness that customers feel toward the website, depending on how well the site seems to understand them, adapt to them and meet expectations during the navigation session. Customers may experience interaction engagement when, during the navigation, the site behaves in a manner they understand and expect, both technically and by providing the content they anticipated from a hyperlink or a search. Feelings of identification and being understood are important because they imply that the marketer has something useful to offer the customer, or that the customer can psychologically identify with the marketer (Bhattacharya and Sen, 2003; Carlson et al., 2008). Service personnel who display interpersonal sensitivity and concern build rapport with consumers (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993), which is likely to result in intentions to maintain that rapport. Further, two-way communication has been shown to facilitate the development of relationships with online retail brands (Yoon et al., 2008) and argued to increase engagement (Brodie et al., 2011). Hence, when consumers perceive that a retail website is able to adapt to their questions, queries and requirements, according to engagement theory and relationship marketing principles, they will be more likely to return to that website.

The ‘relational route’ links interaction engagement and behavioural engagement. Behavioural engagement should derive from the immediate, organismic response of interaction engagement, such that customers who feel a stronger sense of identification and adaptation with a retail website should be more willing to return to the website.

*H1: Interaction engagement with a website positively influences behavioural engagement.*
Alongside the relationship building view discussed above, a marketing communication perspective views customer navigations on a retail website as conversations between a marketer and a customer, the two parties conceivably communicating while gradually building a relationship. Such a perspective would view each action by the customer (click on a hyperlink, type in a search and press enter) as a question, which is answered in the form of a new page. Thus, the interaction between the customer and the website takes the form of a dialogue, consisting of actions and page returns. The internet enables customers to control and choose the communication they receive from marketers (Hoffman and Novak, 1996; Ariely, 2000; Fortin and Dholakia, 2005). By virtue of this control and choice, customers become ‘authors’ of the content they receive (Shih, 1998). This authoring can be involving. Activity engagement refers to the level of involvement with the task of ‘producing’ communication by calling up different elements of content (clicking on hyperlinks, search for key terms, calling up product photographs etc.). Involved states have motivations properties (Mitchell, 1979; Rothschild, 1984); specifically, involved customers search for more information (Beatty and Smith, 1987), process information better (Chaiken, 1980) and are more involved with purchase decisions (Richard and Habibi, 2016). During a navigation, customers may become more active with the website, such as when they request more pages, explore the website more thoroughly, and pay more attention to information on the screen; or they may remain more passive and only look distractedly at a few pages, without focusing on anything or following through on any information.

Beyond the communication they expose themselves to during the course of the navigation, customers can also opt to remain in communication with the website in the future, by registering to receive alerts, future newsletters or by bookmarking the site they visit. Hence, communication engagement refers to the customer’s commitment towards future dialogue with the website. Communication engagement is a form of commitment – which
Moorman, Zaltman, and Deshpande (1992: p. 316) define as “an enduring desire to maintain a valued relationship.” With the internet technology though, communication engagement goes beyond desire, because customers can create a pull for future information in the here and now.

The ‘communication route’ links activity engagement and communication engagement. Hence, communication engagement is viewed as a conative response to the communication exchange between the customer and the website, which results from the immediate, organismic response of activity engagement. Specifically, more involved customers develop positive attitudes toward a site (Richard and Habibi, 2016), which prompts them to gather more information later (Richard and Chandra, 2005). To guarantee the flow of future information, customers request further communication in the present.

H₂: Activity engagement with the website positively impacts communication engagement on the site.

Further, customers can form attachments to the object of involvement (Mittal, 1989; Broderick et al., 2007). Involvement has affective consequences (Mittal, 1989; Park and Moon, 2003), therefore customers experiencing a higher activity engagement are likely to develop stronger relational bonds with the website, as empirical studies show, which find relationships between website involvement and purchase intentions or approach attitudes (Kim et al., 2007; Richard and Habibi, 2016). Hence:

H₃: Activity engagement with a website positively influences behavioural engagement with the site.

Additionally, the decision to request future communication from the website can be seen as evidence of the stickiness of the website, which can apply to both the duration and the frequency of a website’s visit (Roy et al., 2014; Li et al., 2006), suggesting that customers wish to remain associated with the website and will use the further communication as an
opportunity to revisit the site, for instance clicking on a hyperlink provided in an email or online newsletter. Further, as discussed earlier, communication engagement constitute a form of commitment to future interactions, and commitment has been identified in several studies as an antecedent to customer loyalty to commercial websites (see Toufaily et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2006). Hence:

\[ H_4: \text{Communication engagement positively affects behavioural engagement with the website.} \]

**Drivers of website customer engagement**

According to the SOR model (Mehrabian and Russell, 1974), the organismic responses of customer engagement result from customers’ perceptions of stimuli or attributes of the retail website during their navigation (Mollen and Wilson, 2010). Following the logic of Parasuraman et al.’s (2005) means-end framework, we chose to consider, as drivers of customer engagement, a website’s perceptual attributes (i.e. the website characteristics comprising features, cues and functions, which are perceived by consumers as they use a retail website) rather than concrete cues (the individual elements which constitute a website), for two main reasons. First, cues may evolve with technology, whereas the perceptions of these cues in people’s minds are more stable; second, people may not have the technical awareness or vocabulary to assess cues, whereas they are used to considering the more abstract level of perceptions.

To conceptualise how customers perceive retail websites, this study adopts the principles of Kaplan and Kaplan’s (1982) Preference Framework, which stipulates that people’s two main needs in an environment are to make sense and to explore. People use information from the environment to address these two needs. The two concepts of sense-making and exploration are particularly apt in the context of online environments, as
empirically verified by Rosen and Purinton (2004), Singh, Dalal, and Spears (2005), Demangeot and Broderick (2010), and Brunner-Sperdin *et al.* (2014). Retail websites are less intuitive than offline shopping environments. They appear to the customer one page at a time, which complicates the task of making sense of the overall architecture and contents. For the same reasons, the hidden portions of the website (i.e., the parts that are not on the page on screen and are alluded to in the form of hyperlinks or clickable photographs, etc.) provide the potential for further exploration.

A website’s potential for exploration can relate to both the experience of shopping, as in browsing or following links to more areas on the site, and the information that the site provides (Demangeot and Broderick, 2010). Thus, *experiential exploration potential*, or the website’s ability to replicate the experience of abundance of a real retail environment, differs from *informational exploration potential*, or the provision and storage of vast amounts of searchable information (Burke, 2002) from both marketer and non-marketer sources. This distinction between two forms of exploration potential is important, because information, while not a predominant element of most landscapes and environments, is central to online marketing environments (Huang, 2000) and can add value to customers’ online shopping experience (Koufaris, 2002). Regardless of whether they are browsing or engaging in goal-directed shopping, online customers are information seekers.

Customers who perceive a site as higher in experiential exploration potential likely visit more pages and become more interested and motivated (Kim et al., 2007), therefore a more active with the context (Ha and Lennon, 2010). Similarly, perceptions of high informational exploration potential should activate the same responses (Fortin and Dholakia, 2005). Hence:

**H3:** Perceptions of (a) *experiential exploration potential* and (b) *informational exploration potential* positively influence activity engagement with the website.
Sense-making potential relates to the website’s ability to facilitate the customer’s orientation, navigation and task accomplishment. Customers who make sense of the website should feel more comfortable and understand the site, which in turn increases their sense of familiarity (Kaplan and Kaplan, 1982). Familiarity enables them to obtain more answers from the website, which can heighten their sense of closeness and identification. Moreover, during the navigation experience, customers who perceive the site as high in experiential exploration potential likely visit and explore more pages. Experiences produce strong emotional responses (Richins, 1997), so customers who engage in shopping experiences that are high in experiential exploration potential should develop stronger relational ties with the site.

H6c: Perceptions of (a) sense-making potential and (b) experiential exploration potential positively impact interaction engagement.

Websites that offer informational exploration increase website familiarity (Richard and Habibi, 2016) and decrease levels of uncertainty towards decision-making (Mazaheri et al., 2011). Informativeness has also been found to be one of the contributors to website persuasiveness on travel websites (Kim and Fesenmaier, 2008). Hence, perceptions of informational exploration potential, by increasing familiarity with the site and decreasing uncertainty, should activate a stronger sense of feeling understood and adaptation of the website. Hence:

H6c: Perceptions of informational exploration potential positively influence interaction engagement.

Consistent with the conceptualisation of separate routes (communication and relational) to engagement, it is hypothesised that specific drivers are more effective in activating one of the two routes. Interaction engagement with the site likely relies more on the provision of relevant information, which is known to enable customers to develop trust towards the marketer behind the site (Bauer et al., 2002). Concomitantly, activity engagement is likely
more reliant on the experiential impact of the visual and immersive stimuli of the site (Fortin and Dholakia, 2005; Kim et al., 2007). Hence:

\[ H_2: \text{Informational exploration potential activates interaction engagement with the site more than it does activity engagement.} \]

\[ H_3: \text{Experiential exploration potential activates activity engagement with the site navigation more than it does interaction engagement.} \]

A visual representation of the conceptual model and the hypothesised relationships can be found (alongside hypothesis testing results discussed later) in Figure 1. Compared to other models of online shopping adoption (e.g. Dennis et al., 2009; Brunner-Sperdin et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2013; Richard and Habibi, 2016; Rose et al., 2012), the parsimonious model of customer engagement conceptualised here captures the dual challenge of relationship building and communication. It conceptualises the existence of two distinct routes (the relational route via interaction engagement and behavioural engagement, and the communication route via activity engagement and communication engagement) through which online retailers can use potent website attributes as levers to turn initial reactions into behavioural intentions.

**Method and procedure**

Because the purpose of the research is to consider how retail websites can engage customers during a single visit by developing and testing a model of website customer engagement, a survey research method was deemed to be the most appropriate. In particular, it was preferred to an experimental design, since the design of an experimental website the and manipulation of the drivers of website customer engagement (experiential exploration potential, informational exploration potential and sense-making potential) would have
affected the realism of the participants’ navigation, and therefore the study’s external validity (Hair et al., 2006).

The target population for the study was defined as consumers who shop and purchase online regularly. A convenience sample of 301 volunteer U.K.-based students and university staff was recruited to test the nomological network. The sample was recruited via advertisements on campus, email, and via the network of student ‘research assistants’. Participation was voluntary, but respondents were given the option of entering a raffle to win one of give items, the biggest prize being an iPod. In a university computer lab or at their workstations, the respondents navigated an online bookstore for eight minutes before they answered a questionnaire about their particular experience. The requirement that they navigate the website before answering the questionnaire added to the difficulty of collecting the data, but this procedure enabled a focus on respondents’ perceptions of a specific, recent navigation rather than their memories or past perceptions of a random website. This step enhances the study’s validity by avoiding halo or memory effects (Chen, Wigand, and Nilan, 1999).

The product category (books) of the stimulus is a common purchase among the respondents and increases the realism of the task. Within that product category, the study uses a relatively unknown site (only 7.3% of the sample reported that they had visited it before; none reported using it regularly) and therefore can capture fresh perceptions, untainted by the memory of previous visits or any loyalty to the site itself. The instructions asked the respondents to shop online as they would normally if they were at home, in an internet café, or at their desk. The instructions also contained examples of what respondents might want to do during the navigation session, such as “searching for a book [they] had in mind to purchase” or “browsing.”
The sample characteristics are described in Table 2. The recruitment of a convenience sample rather than the use of random sampling, due to the prohibitive costs of the latter, may affect the reliability of measures and the generalisability of the hypothesis testing results (Hair et al., 2006). Several elements mitigate these risks. First, in terms of the sample’s relevance as reflective of the target population, 96.7% of the respondents had shopped online, and 94.7% had made purchases online; therefore the sample, while a convenience sample, undertook a realistic task. Additionally, while the sample, which consists of 214 university students and 87 university staff, remains a convenience sample, the nationality breakdown of the sample is reasonably reflective of the proportions of nationalities present on a UK university campus. The statistical checks carried out revealed that there were no significant differences between students and staff concerning the variables and relationships of interest, therefore both groups were combined. Half of the total sample (obtained by random split) provided input for the scale development, and the second half served scale validation purposes (Churchill, 1979). The testing of the nomological network employed the whole sample.

----------------------------------------
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----------------------------------------

The procedure for developing reliable and valid measures of the seven constructs in the nomological framework followed accepted procedures (Churchill, 1979). The study operationalised activity engagement by adopting Mishra et al.’s (1993) involvement with the choice task measure. Convergent validity requirements (Hair et al., 2010) resulted in reducing the four-item measure to three items.
Measures for the model’s remaining six constructs were developed (or adapted) and validated. Although some of the constructs may describe phenomena that relate to well-known constructs from relationship marketing, marketing communication, and environmental psychology literature, their application to the online context required sufficient changes, to warrant the rigorous development and validation process set out by Churchill (1979) and others (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). These measures’ items emanate from published scales (Agarwal and Karahanna, 2000; Aladwani and Palvia, 2002; Kim and Stoel, 2004; Liu, Arnett, Capella, and Taylor, 2001; Park and Kim, 2003; Venkatesh and Davis, 1996), an exploratory phase consisting of think-aloud protocols (Ericsson and Simon, 1993), and depth interviews with 19 informants.

Nine expert judges performed a sorting task of the 156 items gathered through these methods. According to the rules of interjudge reliability prevalent in marketing literature (e.g. Hardesty and Bearden, 2004), 106 items were appropriate for retention; a pilot test included these items in a questionnaire distributed to a convenience sample of 39 students. The final survey included 69 items selected on the basis of qualitative feedback, item-to-total correlations, and exploratory factor analysis. To guard against the possibility of response bias (Baumgartner and Steenkamp, 2001), each measure contained negatively worded items, and items from all seven measures appeared in a random sequence in the questionnaire.

To estimate the model, structural equation modelling was chosen in preference to other techniques such as ANOVA because this technique (1) simultaneously estimates several interrelated dependence relationships; (2) it enables the testing of indirect as well as direct relationships between constructs; and (3) can deal with relationships can include unobserved phenomena, for which measurement error is taken into account during the estimation (Hair et al., 1998). Furthermore, it is particularly well suited to permit the testing of several alternative models in order to assess their relative fit. In view of the small
percentage of missing data (which ranged from 0 to 1.3%) and its apparent randomness, imputation was preferred to any deletion method, in order to preserve the sample size and avoid estimation problems associated with the use of matrices of different sizes generated by pairwise deletions.

Results

Measure validation

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses helped purify and validate the measures. The Appendix provides the measures’ psychometric properties. The measurement model displays acceptable goodness-of-fit: Chi-square = 893.87, degrees of freedom [df] = 474 (p=.000); root mean squared error of approximation [RMSEA] = .054; confirmatory fit index [CFI] = .98; n=301; square root mean residual [SRMR = .056]. All seven measures have strong composite reliabilities, well above the recommended threshold of .60 (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988). Their average variances extracted are all above or within a few decimal points of the recommended .50 threshold (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988). The square of any correlation between two measures is less than the average variance extracted of each measure, in support of discriminant validity (Fornell and Larker, 1981). Additionally, for each for each pair of variables, the analysis tested nested two-factor models, where the correlation between the two factors was set free, then set to equality. All Chi-square differences are significant at the .005 level, implying all constructs have discriminant validity. Therefore, although the measures had originally been piloted on a test sample consisting only of students, they remained valid when administered to a wider group, thus adding weight to the argument that students constitute a suitable sample for this study. The latent variables’ correlations and other statistics are shown in Table 3.
Hypothesis testing

Structural equation modelling permits the test of hypothesised relationships between the constructs that constitute customer engagement and their drivers. The results suggest good model fit (Chi-square = 913.98, degrees of freedom [df] = 483; root mean squared error of approximation [RMSEA] = .055; confirmatory fit index [CFI] = .98; square root mean residual [SRMR] = .059; non-normed fit index [NNFI] = .98); Figure 1 presents these results. The first set of hypotheses (H₁–H₄) proposes a network of relationships between the four constructs of customer engagement. The results support these four hypotheses at the .001 level. The strongest relationship links activity engagement to communication engagement (.66, t = 11.31). The relationships between communication engagement and behavioural engagement (.38, t = 6.89), activity engagement and behavioural engagement (.35, t = 4.84), and between interaction engagement and behavioural engagement (.24, t = 4.16) are all significant.
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Regarding the relationships between customer engagement and its drivers, the structural equation model results support H₅–H₆ at the .05 level or higher. Informational exploration potential predicts both interaction engagement (.64, t = 7.68) and activity engagement (.39, t = 5.77); experiential exploration potential predicts both activity
engagement (.50, t = 6.41) and interaction engagement (.19, t = 2.68). Sense-making potential is a weaker though still significant predictor of interaction engagement (.15, t = 2.48).

To test the final hypotheses, H7 and H8, further analysis aimed to determine whether the drivers activate one route significantly more than the other. To investigate whether informational exploration potential activates the relational route more than the communication route, an alternative model was specified, in which the paths from informational exploration potential to interaction engagement and activity engagement were set equal, then free. The Chi-square difference between the two models, for one degree of freedom, is 4.38. Therefore, informational exploration potential activates the relational route significantly more than the communication route. In a similar investigation of whether experiential exploration potential activates the communication route more than the relational route, the Chi-square difference, for one degree of freedom, is 13.11. Hence, experiential exploration potential activates the communication route significantly more than the relational route.

The squared multiple correlations for each of the four structural equations indicate that the model explains 73% of the variability of interaction engagement, 63% of the variability of activity engagement, 44% of the variability of communication engagement, and 69% of the variability of behavioural engagement. The model therefore includes important predictors of customer engagement.

At best, a good fit between a model and the data indicates that the model provides a possible explanation of a phenomenon; therefore, an alternative model provides a means to assess relative fit. An alternative model was also tested, which features the four components of customer engagement as direct consequences of the three drivers, such that experiential exploration potential and informational exploration potential are antecedents of all four components, whereas sense-making potential is an antecedent only of interaction engagement.
and behavioural engagement. The antecedent–consequence relationships among the four
components of customer engagement do not appear in the alternative model. Its goodness-of-
fit indices reveal a far worse fit (Chi-square = 1045.34, df = 482; RMSEA = .062; CFI = .97;
SRMR = .065). The comparison and resulting Chi-square difference of 131.36 (one degree of
freedom) add further support to the two-step model of customer engagement developed here.

Discussion

Theoretical implications

Building on initial conceptualisations of customer engagement (Mollen and Wilson, 2010;
Brodie et al., 2011; Vivek, 2009; Bowden, 2009; Hollebeek, 2011; van Doorn et al., 2010),
this paper has proposed and tested a model of website customer engagement. Structural
equation modelling results empirically support the two-step model that was developed and
the hypothesised relationships between customer engagement and its three drivers. It also
confirms the existence of two distinct routes to customer engagement, which can be activated
separately by manipulating different website attributes.

This study offers four major implications. First, by distinguishing between organismic
and conative responses, the model of customer engagement specifies, in interaction
engagement and activity engagement, two distinct means of activation which prompt
customers’ desirable behaviours, namely, behavioural engagement and communication
engagement. Both organismic responses predict behavioural engagement; activity
engagement also affects communication engagement, which in turn influences behavioural
engagement. Therefore, the model confirms the existence of both organismic and conative
facets to engagement (Brodie et al., 2011) and clarifies the sequence of the responses to
website attributes and pinpoints the importance for retailers of designing websites able to
generate, concurrently, a close interaction with the site and an active experience. The
predictive importance of activity engagement on both communication and behavioural
eengagement supports the proposition that participation in the production or delivery of a
service (in this case, online retail shopping) is an antecedent of long-term customer
engagement (Brodie et al., 2011).

Second, the findings support the existence of two distinct routes to customer
engagement: experiential exploration potential activates activity engagement more than it
develops interaction engagement, which suggests a marketing communication route; and
informational exploration potential develops interaction engagement more than it creates
activity engagement, which suggests a separate relationship marketing route. Different kinds
of exploration potential therefore appear to activate different routes. While other models of
online consumer behaviour (e.g. Richard and Habibi, 2016; Rose et al., 2012) have tended to
privilege the communication and experiential side of consumer interactions with websites,
our results show the similarly significant importance of the relationship route, which can be
activated by the informativeness of the retail website. While website informativeness has
been considered in earlier studies (e.g. Richard, 2005; Richard and Habibi, 2016; Mazaheri et
al., 2011; Hausman and Siekpe, 2009), its influence on relationship building online has not
been investigated.

Third, the study finds that activity engagement is more the result of experiential
exploration potential than informational exploration potential, re-emphasising the importance
of experiences in online shopping and service situations (Malthouse and Calder, 2011; Rose
et al., 2012; Ding et al., 2010). Although customers may start a navigation with purely
utilitarian intentions, their ultimate commitment to the site is enhanced by its experiential
potential.

Fourth, a particularly interesting finding is that informational exploration potential
activates the relational route of engagement more than its communication route. This
suggests that in the absence of any human being during the navigation, the provision of abundant information can help develop a sense of closeness and understanding with the site. In the absence of service personnel, a B2C website’s depth of information may enhance the relationship between the customer and the site, possibly by building trust through the provision of quality information (Li et al., 2006; Porter and Donthu, 2008). This result also echoes Sicilia and Ruiz’s (2010) finding that even under high information load conditions, attitudes towards a website remain high, although a decline in cognitive processing happens beyond a certain level.

**Implications for practice**

When conceiving their website, retailers face the major challenge of designing an environment that can engage prospects and customers within the few minutes of a single navigation. This study provides an organising framework that enables retailers to deploy their online investments strategically towards this purpose.

The study identifies specific drivers that, by activating specific organismic responses, are able to commit customers to act. The two main activators of customer engagement, experiential exploration and informational exploration potential, work in a complementary manner. However, the study also provides more specific insights into which driver can be used to the most effect to develop relational or communication elements on online touchpoints.

To develop the relational route of customer engagement, retailers can focus on enhancing their website’s potential for informational exploration. In particular, bearing in mind that the website may be the first and only touchpoint which customers or prospects access, retailers should ensure that the information they provide is sufficient to enable customers to complete their task. That task may simply be a general search, or the purchase
of a needed item. For this purpose, adaptive websites that enable retailers to model customer
online behaviour by comparing their first few steps on the website with generic models of
behaviour, can more successfully pattern the subsequent pages they present to customers after
their particular preferences, thus enhancing the likelihood of stronger interaction engagement,
and stronger behavioural engagement. The strong relationship between informational
exploration potential and interaction engagement also suggests that service providers and
marketers of credence goods can go some way towards overcoming the challenges of human-
less online operations, by developing their customers’ interaction engagement through the
abundant provision of information online. Taking account of the results presented here,
together with those by Sicilia and Ruiz (2010) mentioned in the last section, retailers would
be well advised to provide as much information on their website as they can, since this
information serves, among other purposes, to build the relationship commitment of their
customers.

To develop the communication route of customer engagement, marketers can focus on
enhancing their website’s potential for experiential exploration. The study results reinforce
the importance of the experience of the navigation, which prompts activity engagement as
well as, to a lesser degree, interaction engagement. Retailers, therefore, need to develop the
experiential intensity of their website. Several individual elements can contribute to the
development of a richer experience (Demangeot and Broderick, 2006), such as interactive
images (Fiore et al., 2005), 3-d representations of products, or even environments in virtual
worlds such as Second Life (Hoffman and Novak, 2009).

Finally, and importantly, rather than the judgment of expert website designers or
marketers that might be measured through ‘objective’ scales, engagement is activated by
customers’ perceptions of website attributes. Accordingly, this study has developed valid
measures that retailers can usefully administer to test-customers to evaluate the ability of
their website to induce customer engagement, and to compare it with best-in-class or competitor websites. Retailers’ main aim remains to ensure that the features and devices developed by the website designers work together, coherently, at enhancing customers’ overall perceptions of experiential and informational exploration potential. In this sense, the constructs used here constitute a valuable ‘vocabulary’ for retailers to use when considering the performance or objectives of the website.

It is important to acknowledge that the potential for experiential exploration may be more costly to enhance than the potential for informational exploration since it typically involves much larger outlays to acquire advanced technology. Such investments are not at the disposal of all retailers. Smaller-scale retailers may therefore use the framework to realise that they may not be able to develop the communication route as powerfully as their larger competitors, in which case they should further emphasise the priority of making the most of the relational route, by maximising the website’s informational exploration potential.

Finally, the results of our study can also be considered in the light of emerging business practice. In this respect, several observation appear pertinent. First, the importance of communication engagement and the communication route overall can be seen in the increasing number of alternative platforms (e.g. Facebook, Instagram, YouTube) on which retailers seek to gain their customers’ communication engagement, hence also prompting further behavioural engagement. The different platforms, through their different functionalities, operate differently in potentially activating further activity engagement on the retail website. Second, the importance of informational exploration potential as a driver a customer engagement can be related to the increasing amount of content, whether retailer- or user-generated, displayed on retail websites. Third, the importance of the experiential exploration potential of a website can be related to the increasing use of technical means such as videos, auto-scrolling images, multiple views of a product, etc. used to enable consumers
to have a vivid experience an online store and its products. Fourth, consistent with the
findings of this study showing the weak role of sense-making potential in comparison to
experiential exploration potential and informational exploration potential, practitioner
conversation, which was initially focused on designing for functionality and ease of use, has
now shifted towards the issues designing for experience and information, as attested by a
number of ‘how to’ guides published in practitioner media (e.g. Schiff, 2015; McCreary,
2015). Fifth, let us also note that the elements of the experiential exploration potential and
informational exploration potential of websites are now increasingly being used in brick and
mortar environments such as Audi City, Primark, or New Balance (Charlton, 2013).

Conclusion
This study contributes to online marketing and retailing knowledge by empirically showing
the relevance of the concept of engagement in the context of online retail environments and
explaining how perceptions of website attributes activate engagement. In essence, this study
‘opens the black box’ of customer engagement in the context of retail websites, critical
touchpoints accessed by customers and prospects alike. In a single, parsimonious model, the
study has conceptualised and tested relationships between the four facets of engagement and,
as antecedents, perceptions of informational exploration, experiential exploration, and sense-
making. In the process, it provides psychometrically valid measures of four dimensions of the
engagement process and their drivers within an online retailing context.

Nevertheless, the study suffers from several limitations. The sample is a convenience
sample; however due to their above-average internet literacy, the university students and staff
who make up the sample are probably more representative of future customers, for whom
marketers need to plan. In addition, this study focuses on a single product category, and the
main survey related to a single website, although measure development utilised two different
websites. Books tend to be involving; however, the relational route to engagement may be more prominent for product categories associated with higher levels of risk.

The study centres on the one-to-one interaction between online retailers and customers, without considering customers’ ability to influence other customers through word-of-mouth or recommendations in social media. Further research should examine the strength of each route for activating customers’ desire to produce recommendations or tell friends about the site. Does each route elicit a different kind of word-of-mouth activity? A cross-sectional design limits the study’s claim of causality. Further research could consider the relative effects of experiential and informational exploration potential by experimentally manipulating the attributes of a website.

Additional research, in particular interpretive research, should attempt to provide a deeper understanding of the process by which retails website attributes activate customer engagement. How does the potential for experiential exploration activate activity engagement, and what specific features are most successful in doing so? Similarly, how does the potential for informational exploration activate interaction engagement, and what particular features or interactions produce higher levels of such engagement?

As conceptualised and empirically validated in this article, the parsimonious nomological network of website customer engagement contributes to elucidating the dual marketing challenge of communication and relationship building. The identification of two distinct mechanisms through which website attributes activate engagement confirms the strategic importance of the phenomenon and endows it with sound theoretical foundations within a context of strategic importance to all retailers.
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Figure 1: Nomological net of website customer engagement and hypothesis testing results

\[ \chi^2 = 913.98; \text{df} = 483 (p = .000); \text{RMSEA} = .055, \text{CFI} = .98; \text{SRMR} = .059; \text{NNFI} = .98; n = 301 \]

* : sign at p<.05
** : sign at p<.01
***: sign at p<.001
Table 1: Main Extant Conceptualisations of Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Focus of engagement</th>
<th>Definitional notions</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Literature base of conceptualisation</th>
<th>Measurement developed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldus et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Online brand community</td>
<td>‘the compelling, intrinsic motivations to continue interacting with an online brand community’</td>
<td>Motivational state</td>
<td>Consumer motivations</td>
<td>11 dimensions of motivations to engage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden (2009)</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>‘a psychological process that models the underlying mechanisms by which customer loyalty forms for new customers of a service brand as well as the mechanisms by which loyalty may be maintained for repeat purchase customers of a service brand.’</td>
<td>Ongoing process</td>
<td>Relationship marketing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodie, Hollebeek, Juric and Ilic (2011)</td>
<td>All foci</td>
<td>‘a psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive, cocreative experiences with a focal agent/object (e.g. a brand) in focal service relationships. [...] It is a multidimensional concept subject to a context-specific and/or stakeholder-specific expression of relevant cognitive, emotional and/or behavioural dimensions.’</td>
<td>State within an ongoing process</td>
<td>Relationship marketing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodie et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Virtual community</td>
<td>‘a context-dependent, psychological state characterised by fluctuating intensity levels that occur within dynamic, iterative engagement processes’</td>
<td>State within an ongoing process</td>
<td>Relationship marketing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Focus of engagement</td>
<td>Definitional notions</td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Literature base of conceptualisation</td>
<td>Measurement developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Web site as advertising medium</td>
<td>manifested in specific experiences with the Web site, and which causes one to feel connected towards the focus of engagement</td>
<td>Organismic, relates to specific experience</td>
<td>Marketing communication</td>
<td>Personal engagement, social-interactive engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollebeek et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>‘a consumer’s positively valenced cognitive, emotional and behavioural brand-related activity during, or related to, specific consumer/brand interactions’.</td>
<td>State within an ongoing process</td>
<td>Relationship marketing</td>
<td>Cognitive processing, affection, activation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahn (1990)</td>
<td>Employees’ organisation</td>
<td>‘the simultaneous employment and expression of a person's ‘preferred self” in task behaviours that promote connections to work and to others, personal presence (physical, cognitive, and emotional), and active, full role performances’.</td>
<td>State within an ongoing process</td>
<td>Job design</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearsley and Shneiderman (1998)</td>
<td>Learning activities</td>
<td>‘all student activities involve active cognitive processes such as creating, problem-solving, reasoning, decision-making, and evaluation. In addition, students are intrinsically motivated to learn due to the meaningful nature of the learning environment and activities’</td>
<td>Organismic and behavioural</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Focus of engagement</td>
<td>Definitional notions</td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Literature base of conceptualisation</td>
<td>Measurement developed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollen and Wilson (2010)</td>
<td>Web site as personalising a brand</td>
<td>‘a cognitive and affective commitment to an active relationship with the brand’</td>
<td>State (emotional and cognitive) within one interaction</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagani and Mirabello (2011)</td>
<td>Social television Web site</td>
<td>‘a collection of qualitative experiences with the medium’.</td>
<td>Organismic within an ongoing Web site relationship</td>
<td>Marketing communication</td>
<td>Personal engagement; social-interactive engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawhney, Veronba and Prandelli (2005)</td>
<td>Product development and innovation</td>
<td>(no definition given)</td>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Marketing communication</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprott, Czellar and Spangenberg (2009)</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>‘an individual difference representing consumers’ propensity to include important brands as part of how they view themselves.’</td>
<td>Individual trait</td>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>Brand engagement in self-concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Doorn et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>‘Customers’ behavioural manifestation toward a brand or firm, beyond purchase, resulting from motivational drivers such as word-of-mouth activity, recommendations, helping other customers, blogging, writing reviews.’</td>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Branding</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Conceptualisation</td>
<td>Developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivek (2009) Offerings, brands, firms, activities</td>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Customer engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the intensity of consumers’ participation and connection with [the focus of engagement]’</td>
<td>Relationship marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster and Ahuja (2006) Web site</td>
<td>Cognitive state within one interaction</td>
<td>Engagement with the information system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More passive state than flow and involvement</td>
<td>Information systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study Website</td>
<td>Ongoing process</td>
<td>Interaction engagement, activity engagement, behavioural engagement, communication engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘the process of developing a cognitive, affective and behavioural commitment to an active relationship with the website’</td>
<td>Marketing communication and relationship marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample characteristics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University students</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University staff</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample’s nationalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of sample that has shopped online</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of sample that has made purchases</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Behavioural engagement</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Communication engagement</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Activity engagement</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interaction engagement</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Experiential exploration potential</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Informational exploration potential</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sense-making potential</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: all correlations significant at p<0.05 (two-tailed) level.
### Appendix: Measures developed and validated for this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Item Wording</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Completely Standardized Loading (t-Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity engagement</strong></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The navigation was stimulating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79 (t=14.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The navigation was enjoyable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81 (t=15.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The navigation was exciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction engagement</strong></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with the website gave me answers to my questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71 (t=12.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt as if I was actually getting answers to what I was after on this website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65 (t=11.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This website didn’t understand what I’m interested in (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71 (t=12.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This website didn’t understand my needs (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication engagement</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the website had a function enabling me to register for email alerts, I would register.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87 (t=23.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would refuse to let this website contact me for special offers or promotions (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57 (t=11.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like this website to keep in touch with me through email.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 (t=26.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would register to receive newsletters from this website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural engagement</strong></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will visit this site first when I want to buy books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78 (t=18.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to use this website in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 (t=26.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to continue using this website in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.95 (t=30.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect my use of this website to continue in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92 (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential exploration potential</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This website was incapable of reproducing the excitement of shopping (R)</td>
<td>.63 (* )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This website replicated the kind of experience I have when I shop</td>
<td>.67 (t=9.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I navigated this website I felt I was shopping for real</td>
<td>.70 (t=9.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience of shopping was not there when I navigated on this site (R)</td>
<td>.73 (t=9.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational exploration potential</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could learn a lot about the products</td>
<td>.71 (t=12.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This website provided complete product description</td>
<td>.60 (t=10.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This website adequately met my information needs</td>
<td>.78 (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site had insufficient product information (R)</td>
<td>.71 (t=12.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There wasn’t enough information on this website to make a purchase decision (R)</td>
<td>.60 (t=10.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was enough information on this website to assess the products</td>
<td>.65 (t=11.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense-making potential</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content on the website was clear</td>
<td>.80 (t=11.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information on this website was disorganized (R)</td>
<td>.65 (t=9.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization of the information presented on the screen was confusing (R)</td>
<td>.66 (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content on this site was well organized</td>
<td>.67 (t=10.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My interaction with this website is clear and understandable</td>
<td>.75 (t=11.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The web pages were easy to read</td>
<td>.70 (t=10.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The links and buttons on this website made sense</td>
<td>.64 (t=9.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The categories and buttons were difficult to understand (R)</td>
<td>.63 (t=9.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 893.87, df = 474 \text{ (p=.000); } RMSEA = .054 ; \text{ CFI } = .98; n=301; \text{ SRMR } = .056 \]

*The metric for each scale was established by fixing one of the construct indicators to 1.00.

(R): Item was reverse-scored.