

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2024-04-22

Deposited version:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Loureiro, S. M. C., Raouf, A. R., Ramkissoon, H. & Hollebeek, L. (2023). Customer engagement in tourism and hospitality research. In Raouf Ahmad Rather, Haywantee Ramkissoon (Ed.), *Handbook of customer engagement in tourism marketing*. (pp. 1-24).: Edward Elgar .

Further information on publisher's website:

10.4337/9781802203943.00010

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Loureiro, S. M. C., Raouf, A. R., Ramkissoon, H. & Hollebeek, L. (2023). Customer engagement in tourism and hospitality research. In Raouf Ahmad Rather, Haywantee Ramkissoon (Ed.), *Handbook of customer engagement in tourism marketing*. (pp. 1-24).: Edward Elgar ., which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781802203943.00010>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Customer Engagement in Tourism and Hospitality Research 1

Raouf Ahmad Rather, Haywantee Ramkissoon, Linda D. Hollebeek,
and Sandra Maria Correia Loureiro

INTRODUCTION

Customer engagement (CE) – which has garnered significant interest among tourism and hospitality scholars and practitioners in recent years (Kumar et al., 2019) – has been identified as a *sine qua non* for the attainment of organizational competitive advantage (Pansari & Kumar, 2017; Rather & Hollebeek, 2021). For example, recent empirical research suggests that CE raises tourists' brand evaluations (Harrigan et al., 2018; So et al., 2021), trust (Li et al., 2020; Rather et al., 2019), identification (Rather & Hollebeek, 2020), co-creation (e.g., Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014), commitment (Khan et al., 2020), memory (Angelino et al., 2021) relationship quality (Itani et al., 2019), brand advocacy (Bilro et al., 2019; Bilro et al., 2018), and loyalty (Dewnarain et al., 2021; So et al., 2014). Likewise, consulting firms as the Gallup Group note that engaged (vs. disengaged) customers are likely to generate 44% more visits annually (Kumar & Pansari, 2016). Pansari and Kumar (2017) also report that engaged customers spend \$84 extra per visit, while incurring a 23% profit premium (Pansari & Kumar 2017). Likewise, the Marketing Science Institute has included CE in its *Research Priorities* since 2010 (e.g., MSI, 2020), while tourism and hospitality firms (e.g., attraction sites, hotels, or airlines) have also deployed CE to build improved customer relationships throughout their consumption journeys (Lemon & Verhoef, 2016; Jaziri & Rather, 2022).

However, despite existing insight, little remains known regarding CE's dynamics during the pandemic (Ramkissoon, 2022; Hollebeek et al., 2021), which has sparked considerable change in the global tourism and hospitality business environment (e.g., by triggering economic decline, imposing social distancing requirements and mobility restrictions), exposing an important gap and warranting further research (Hollebeek et al., 2020a; Rather, 2021a; Ramkissoon, 2020a, b; UNWTO, 2021).

Corresponding to concept's theoretical importance and practical relevance, tourism and hospitality literature has obtained ever-increasing attention to CE. Key insights exist regarding CE's conceptualization, operationalization, and measurement (Hollebeek et al., 2014; So et al., 2014), its antecedents and consequences (Rather et al., 2019; Islam et al., 2019), barriers to its adoption (Chathoth et al., 2014), different theoretical lenses adopted for CE (Harmeling et al., 2017; Harrigan et al., 2018), and analysis of CE in different publics and contexts (e.g., in technological or social media-based settings; Cabiddu et al., 2014; Huerta-Álvarez et al., 2020; Li et al., 2020; Shoukat & Ramkissoon, 2022). However, despite these advancements, insight into CE and its broader nomological network remain meager, requiring further research. However, to advance with such research it is important to know what has already been done in terms of nomological network and this is what we intend to do in this chapter.

This introductory chapter, therefore, provides an overview of CE by highlighting its relevance and role in tourism and hospitality research. The chapter discusses how CE has been conceptualized, its operationalization(s) or measurement, and its nomological networks (i.e., antecedents; and consequences, mediators, moderators). Further, the chapter expands on CE's theoretical foundations, followed by its public and contexts in tourism and hospitality. Finally, we discuss CE through information and communication technologies (in tourism/hospitality?).

CE DEFINITIONS IN TOURISM AND HOSPITALITY LITERATURE/RESEARCH

CE in tourism literature has evolved in the recent decade. The following section outlines the development of CE definitions in tourism and hospitality literature.

Definitional challenges

The lack of consensus regarding CE's (or tourist, visitor, or destination engagement's) conceptualization in tourism and hospitality yields the following observations. First, tourism and hospitality researchers articulate differing CE-based insights, leading to various definitions and operationalizations of the construct. Within the general marketing literature, most of the dedicated debate about CE's definition entails whether the

concept includes both psychological and behavioral or only behavioral dimensions (Brodie et al., 2011; Harmeling et al., 2017; Rather et al., 2018).

The behavioral-psychological conceptualization includes cognitive, emotional and/or behavioral dimensions (e.g., Brodie et al., 2011; Hollebeek et al., 2014; Rather et al., 2021; So et al., 2014, 2021), while the behavioral-lens outlines CE as consumers' behavioral responses or manifestations towards a brand/firm (e.g., Van Doorn et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2020). These disagreements may derive the conceptual challenges in advancing CE-research as a more unified area of study. Despite the approach to which researchers follow, authors can usually agree that CE extends beyond the point-of-purchase. For example, Pansari and Kumar (2017) defined CE more broadly by explicitly including a purchase and beyond, and operationalized CE as “the mechanics of a customer’s value addition to the firm, either through direct and/or indirect contribution” (p. 295). Further, marketing-based CE research has extended beyond customers to consider firm-based and/or organizational strategies (Dewnarain et al., 2019; Harmeling et al., 2017). To sum up, the key definitions of CE are presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 CE Definitions in Tourism, Hospitality and **Service** Literature/Research

Author (s)	Definitions
Kumar et al. (2010) Bergel and Brock (2019)	CE is the customers' value-adding behavior that directly or indirectly contributes to firms' performance.
Van Doorn et al. (2010) Zhang et al. (2020) Choi and Kandampully, (2019)	Non-transactional behaviors relevant to firms and their stakeholders, including WOM, referrals, content generation, and suggestions
Brodie et al. (2011) Chathoth et al. (2014)	Occurs by virtue of interactive, co-creative consumer experiences with a focal agent/object (i.e., a brand) in focal service relationships.
Brodie et al. (2011) Wei et al. (2013) Rather et al. (2018) Islam et al. (2019) Aluri et al. (2019)	CE is perceived as a multidimensional concept that captures a customer's cognitive, emotional, and behavioral investment in a specific brand interaction. CE behaviors represent the behavioral dimension of CE.

Willems et al. (2019) Rather (2020)	
Vivek et al. (2012) Rather et al. (2019)	Tourism CE refers to the intensity of an individual's participation in, and connection with, an organization, including attention, enthused participation, and social connection.
Hollebeek et al. (2014) Rather et al. (2021)	CE is characterized by repeated interactions between a customer and an organization that strengthen the emotional, psychological, or physical investment a customer has in both the brand itself and the business organization.
So et al. (2014, 2021) Harrigan et al. (2018) Rather (2018b) Rather and Sharma (2018, 2019) Li et al. (2020) Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021a)	CE is defined as customers' personal connection to a brand as manifested in cognitive, affective, and behavioral actions outside of the purchase situation in five dimensions: enthusiasm, attention, identification, absorption, and interaction.
Taheri et al. (2014)	Visitor engagement is conceptualized as a state of being involved with and committed to a specific market offering.
Cabiddu et al. (2014)	Interaction between customers and organizations in three forms of engagement: persistent, triggered, and customized
Bryce et al. (2015)	The concept of engagement includes aspects of attachment, emotional connection, commitment, and devotion.
Kumar and Pansari (2016) Fang et al. (2020) Loureiro and Sarmiento (2019)	Tourist engagement is the attitude, behavior, and level of connectedness between the tourists and the attraction itself.
Pansari and Kumar (2017) Bravo et al. (2019)	The mechanics of a customer's value addition to the firm, either through direct and/or indirect contribution. CE behavior is also of managerial interest, as it covers the different customer activities that affect firms' performance.
Pansari and Kumar (2017) Harmeling et al. (2017)	Consumer brand engagement (CBE), including cognitive, emotional and behavioral. In short, CBE is the customer's voluntary contribution of resources to a brand's marketing function, going beyond financial patronage.
Fang et al. (2017)	User engagement with mobile travel apps in two dimensions. Psychological engagement as the level of an app user's positive, fulfilling, and app-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Behavioral engagement in this study is defined as users' continued interaction with a mobile travel app.
Bilro et al. (2018)	Online engagement refers to a consumer's positive brand-

	related cognitive, emotional, and behavioral activity during or related to focal consumer/brand interactions.
Li et al. (2018)	Hotel CE refers to the psychological state of non-transactional behaviors, such as interaction with hotel and community members, as well as co- creation of experience, which is generated by customers for a certain motivation
Flavián et al. (2019)	User engagement is defined as the quality of the experience characterized by the depth of users' cognitive, temporal, affective, and behavioral investment when interacting in the digital environment.
Hollebeek et al. (2019a,b) Rather and Hollebeek (2021)	S-D logic CE refers to a customer's motivationally driven, volitional investment of focal operant resources (including cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and social knowledge and skills) and operand resources (e.g., equipment) into brand interactions in service systems.

<a> CONCEPTUALIZATIONS MEASUREMENTS AND OPERATIONALIZATIONS OF CE

The concept of CE has been operationalized ~~and/or conceptualized~~ as a uni-dimensional construct (mostly behavioral) and/or through multi-dimensional lens/approaches.

** Uni-dimensional CE**

From a uni-dimensional view, the behavioral dimension has gained significant attention (Van Doorn et al., 2010). Precisely, behavioral conceptualizations ~~have~~ focused on several consumer behaviors consisting of positive and negative word-of-mouth (WOM; Choi & Kandampully, 2019; Wei et al., 2017), e-word-of-mouth (Liu et al., 2019; Sprott et al., 2009), destination engagement intention (Zhang et al., 2018), willingness-to-suggest and WOM (Choi & Kandampully, 2019), purchasing, helping other customers, referrals, writing reviews (Kumar & Pansari, 2016; Verleye et al., 2014; Van Doorn et al., 2010), or customer/tourist citizenship behaviors (e.g., Liu et al., 2014; Ramkissoon et al., 2013; 2018). Further, CE has been evaluated employing revenue-related indicators as discounts offered at concessions and loyalty-card-swipes (Aluri et al., 2019).

<c> Multi-dimensional CE

From a multi-dimensional perspective, CE has been conceptualized by including cognitive, affective, and behavioral engagement (Fang et al., 2020; Harrigan et al., 2018; Hollebeek et al., 2019a; So et al., 2021; Rather & Hollebeek, 2021). So et al. (2014, 2021) conceptualize CE, by incorporating absorption, enthusiasm, attention, identification, and interaction (see also Harrigan et al., 2018; Rather and Sharma, 2019; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2021a). Rather et al (2021) adopt a related approach by exploring CE on the basis of affective, cognitive, and behavioral engagement. Vivek et al (2014) encompassed conscious attention, enthused participation, and social connection that correspond to the CE's tripartite (cognitive, emotional, behavioral) dimensionality (see also Rather et al., 2019). Similarly, Hollebeek et al. (2014) propose CE to encompass cognitive processing, affection, and activation. Itani, Kassar, and Loureiro (2019) measured customers' purchases, referrals, knowledge sharing and social interaction as CE dimensions. Overall, Table 1. 2 highlights the CE dimensions in tourism and hospitality literature.

Table 1. 2 CE Dimensionality in Tourism and Hospitality Literature

Author (s)	Dimensions
Van Doorn et al. (2010)	Behavior
Brodie et al. (2011)	Cognitive, Emotional, and Behavioral
Vivek et al. (2012, 2014)	Conscious Attention, Enthused Participation, and Social Connection
Hollebeek et al. (2014)	Cognitive Processing, Affection, and Activation
Cabiddu et al. (2014)	Behavior
Verleye et al., 2014	Customer Engagement Behaviors: Compliance, Cooperation, Feedback, Helping other Customers, And Positive-WOM
So et al. (2014)	Absorption, Enthusiasm, Attention, Identification, and Interaction
Bryce et al. (2015); Ramkissoon (2022a; 2022b)	Attachment, Emotional Connection, Commitment, and Devotion.
Kumar and Pansari (2016)	Customer Purchases, Customer Referrals, Customer Influence, and Customer Knowledge
Wei et al. (2017)	Behavior
Pansari and Kumar (2017)	Direct (Buying) and Indirect (Customer Referrals, Customer Influence, Customer Knowledge, Customer Feedback)

Harmeling et al. (2017)	Behaviors (voluntary resource contribution)
Fang et al. (2017)	Psychological (Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption) And Behavioral
Bilro et al. (2018)	Cognitive, Emotional, and Behavioral
Li et al. (2018)	Behaviors
Harrigan et al., 2018	Absorption, Enthusiasm, Attention, Identification, and Interaction
Rather (2018b)	Absorption, Enthusiasm, Attention, Identification, and Interaction
Aluri et al. (2019)	Cognitive, Emotional, and Behavioral
Choi and Kandampully (2019)	Behaviors (willingness-to-suggest and WOM)
Bravo et al. (2019)	Direct (Buying) and Indirect (Customer Referrals, Customer Influence, Customer Knowledge, Customer Feedback)
Loureiro and Sarmento (2019)	Customer Purchases, Customer Referrals, Customer Influence, and Customer Knowledge
Rather and Sharma (2018, 2019)	Absorption, Enthusiasm, Attention, Identification, and Interaction
Rather et al. (2019)	Conscious Attention, Enthused Participation, and Social Connection
Willems et al. (2019)	Cognitive, Emotional, and Behavioral
Islam et al. (2019)	Cognitive Processing, Affection, and Activation
Flavián et al. (2019)	Cognitive, Temporal, Affective, and Behavioral
Hollebeek et al. (2019a)	Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral
Rather (2020)	Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral
Fang et al. (2020)	Cognitive, Emotional, and Behavioral
Zhang et al. (2018)	Behavior
Zhang et al. (2020)	Online Customer Engagement Behaviors like Online Rating, Online Reviewing, Online Blogging, and Online Customer-To-Customer Interactions
Li et al. (2020)	Absorption, Enthusiasm, Attention, Identification, and Interaction
So et al. (2021)	Absorption, Enthusiasm, Attention, Identification, and Interaction
Rather (2021a)	Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral
Rather (2021b)	Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral
Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021a)	Absorption, Enthusiasm, Attention, Identification, and Interaction
Rather et al. (2021, 2022)	Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral
Rather and Hollebeek	Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral

<a> KEY ANTECEDENTS OF CE

Ambiguity persists not only about what CE constitutes, but also what its antecedents and consequences are. Thus, we discuss CE antecedents from the literature and classified these antecedents into seven categories including motivational drivers, relational drivers, firm-based/organizational, psychological, emotional, or affective drivers, situational and contextual drivers, and other drivers

** Motivational Drivers**

Prior knowledge, Individuals' desire, subjective assessments/perceptions, or experiences can drive engagement (e.g., Bilro et al., 2019; Angelino et al., 2021). Bilro, Loureiro, and Ali (2018) pointed out the relevance of website stimuli experience to engage users.

Collectively, these drivers can be regarded as motivational drivers, which represent one of the most usually studied antecedents of CE (Taheri et al., 2014). Research has indicated that cultural motivation might develop visitor's engagement, consumption of culture at heritage sites/attractions (e.g., Bryce et al., 2015; Ramkissoon et al., 2012; 2022b; Loureiro & Sarmiento, 2018). Another motivational factor developing engagement is recreational motivation and intrinsic motivations that impacts CE via service offerings (Taheri et al., 2014; Loureiro & Sarmiento, 2019).

Subjective assessments or perceptions of a destination brand might also motivate visitors to engage in a focal destination/brand outside purchases (Bryce et al., 2015). Scholars have argued that customers' perceived value is evaluated based on their perceptions (e.g., Itani et al., 2019). Ye et al. (2019) advocated that perceived ease-of-use effects utilitarian engagement in peer-to peer accommodations.

** Relational Drivers**

Many studies have investigated relational antecedents, factors, or drivers informing consumers' relationships towards a brand (destination); one pertinent aspect is

relationship-quality, which includes satisfaction, commitment, and trust (Itani et al., 2019; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2016; Ramkissoon & Mavondo, 2015). Each of these factors would influence CE. For instance, consumer trust (Nekmamud et al., 2022) has long been a primary driver of CE (Wei et al., 2017). Research recommends that when customers have a commitment-led association to a brand, they become engaged with that brand (e.g., Itani et al., 2019). Besides, customers who are more satisfied towards service-recovery-experiences are more likely to reveal CE-behaviors, like spreading e-WOM and providing feedback (Liu et al., 2019). Other relational-based drivers explored entail level of involvement (Harrigan et al., 2018; Bilro et al., 2019), atmosphere (Bilro et al., 2018; Choi and Kandampully, 2019), service quality (Islam et al., 2019; Rather & Camilleri, 2019), perceived quality of destination (Huerta-Álvarez et al., 2020; Majeed & Ramkissoon, 2020), perceived intimacy and perceived cohesion (Liu et al., 2019), value congruity (Rather et al., 2018), self-brand connection (Bryce et al., 2015). Both social presence and social interaction stimulate enjoyable feelings, thus increasing hedonic engagement, while enhanced social presence can develop utilitarian engagement (Ye et al., 2019). Fang et al. (2020) investigated how physical attractiveness of service employees' impacts tourists' CE.

** Firm-based/organizational Drivers**

Considering that customers can interact easily with brands/firms and other consumers through social media networks, firms tend to develop non-transactional customer behaviors (Van Doorn et al., 2010; Loureiro, 2022). Scholars have documented the impacts of an error-management culture on CE (Chathoth et al., 2014; Wei et al., 2017). Similarly, related service-recovery efforts also affect customers' e-word-of-mouth (WOM) engagement (Liu et al., 2019). Further, brand characteristics, brand/firm reputation brand/firm size/diversification can affect CE towards brands (Van Doorn et al., 2010). Recently, Rather et al., (2018) investigated brand identification's impact on CE with hospitality brands (also see Rather & Camilleri, 2019). Chen et al. (2021) suggest various firm-related factors, namely marketing communication skills, corporate strategies and policies and brand image, which affect tourism and hospitality-based CE.

** Psychological, Emotional, or Affective Drivers**

Marketing researchers have suggested that CE reveals customers' psychological states, which evolves from co-creative and interactive experiences towards a brand (Brodie et al., 2011; Hollebeek et al., 2014). Various tourism and hospitality works have explored experience-based drivers leading to CE, as prior knowledge. and consumers' brand experiences (Ahn & Back, 2018). Similarly, visitor's experiences towards objective-based authenticity might impact their engagement at heritage sites/attractions (Bryce et al., 2015). Further, Zhang et al. (2018) examined the role of emotional destination experiences in deriving CE, while Rather et al., (2019), Ramkissoon et al. (2018), Loureiro and Sarmiento (2019), and Ramkissoon (2022a; 2022b; 2022c) argue that place authenticity and place attachment are key drivers to develop CE. Fang et al. (2020) argue that desire for social interaction influence tourists' CE.

** Situational and Contextual Drivers**

Villamediana-Pedrosa et al. (2019) identified that situational-features including time frame (e.g., posting day and posting time) and tourism-demand seasonality, impacted on positive and/or negative-based engagement on DMOs' social media sites like Facebook pages. Relatedly, Gelderman et al. (2011) investigated the effect of situational factors and technology-related tourist's attitudes.

Van Doorn et al. (2010) suggested various context-based drivers affecting CE can mostly arise from PEST (i.e., political/legal, economic/environmental, social, and technological) aspects of the society within which brands/firms and consumers exist. Competitors and their actions also generate a strong contextual force influencing CE. Further, competitive marketing activities (actions) can persuade CE (Pansari & Kumar, 2017).

** Pursuit of Special Interests drivers**

The pursuit of individual special interests (e.g., environment concerns, serious leisure) is vital in developing CE. For instance, Chuah et al. (2020) discovered that customer engagement behavior can be sustained through corporate social responsibility, environmental concern, and green trust. Research has also shown that personally

relevant tourism experiences positively affect CE, as serious leisure pursuits (e.g., pursuits in which visitors spend effort, time, and money) and heritage-linked behaviors, which likely to be highly personal and intangible (Bryce et al., 2015).

** Other Drivers**

Consumer welfare, social surplus, economic surplus, regulation, cross-brand, and cross-customer are other key drivers effecting CE (Van Doorn et al., 2010).

<a> CE'S KEY CONSEQUENCES

We next summarize research addressing CE's key outcomes as discussed in the literature, which we divide into five categories, including affective evaluative outcomes, cognitive evaluative outcomes, behavioral/intentional outcomes, economic/financial outcomes, firm-based outcomes and others.

** Affective Evaluative Outcomes**

Psychological mechanism of CE has hardly gained full assessment, particularly in the tourism field. Li et al. (2020) and Bahri-Ammari et al. (2021) examined the role of CE in promoting brand attachment in tourism industry. Further, customer/tourist engagement significantly influences tourists' satisfaction with tourism-experiences (Lin et al., 2019), affective commitment with hospitality brands (Rather, 2018b; Rather & Shakir, 2018; Vivek et al., 2012) and customers' brand experiences (Islam et al., 2019; Rather, 2020; Rather & Hollebeek, 2020; 2021).

** Cognitive Evaluative Outcomes**

Various cognitive evaluative-based outcome factors have been investigated as CE outcomes (consequences). For instance, CE increases visitors' service-brand-evaluations (So et al., 2014, 2021). Hedonic engagement (e.g., enjoyment) and utilitarian engagement (e.g., perceived-usefulness and ease-of-use) have been identified to induce consumers' trust in peer-to-peer platforms (e.g., Ye et al., 2019). CE also enhances brand trust (Li et al., 2020), cognitive-satisfaction towards hotel brands and festivals (Vivek et al., 2012).

** Behavioral/Intentional Outcomes**

Behavioral-based outcomes developed from CE comprise of customer/brand loyalty (Li et al., 2020, Rather & Jaziri, 2022; Shams et al., 2021; So et al., 2014, 2021), advocacy (Bilro et al., 2019), tourist citizenship behaviors (e.g., Liu et al., 2014; Ramkissoon et al., 2018), repatronage intent (Islam et al., 2019), behavioral intention (Ahn & Back, 2018; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2021b), revisit intention (Majeed & Ramkissoon, 2020; Wei et al., 2017), actual future behavior (Bergel & Brock, 2019; Harrigan et al., 2018), willingness-to-pay (Kandampully et al., 2015), W-O-M (Bahri-Ammari et al., 2021; Choi & Kandampully, 2019; Wei et al., 2017), environmental behavior (Chuah et al., 2020), value co-creation outcomes (Rather et al., 2019, 2021) and sustainable development (Chen et al., 2021; Rather & Sharma, 2017; Ramkissoon, 2022d; Vo-Thanh et al., 2021).

** Economic/Financial Outcomes**

Limited research has investigated the firm/economic-outcomes of CE, with the exclusion of Kandampully et al. (2015) who advocated that consumer loyalty can build superior firm profitability (see also Hollebeek & Rather, 2019; Rather, 2017, 2018a; Rather & Hollebeek, 2019). Particularly, developing consumers' share-of-wallet can generate 10 times more value for a brand than merely focusing on customer retention.

** Firm-based Outcomes**

Firm-based outcomes including financial, reputational, regulatory, competitive, and employee, product/brand are important consequences influencing CE (Chen et al., 2021; Van Doorn et al., 2010; Loureiro et al., 2020a).

<a> ORGANIZATIONAL BARRIERS OF CE

Existing antecedents focused mostly on factors, which trigger, motivate, or promote CE, rather than underlining drivers/barriers. Chathoth et al. (2014) however did identify four barriers for CE including *consumers* (e.g., risk perception of consumers, lack of

information sharing, consumer complaints/dissatisfaction, lack of consumer interaction), *technology* (e.g., role of information technology, technology, integration with services), *strategy* (e.g., lack of information sharing, lack of innovation, excessive control of brand), and *management structure and culture* (e.g., geographical context, lack of flexibility, traditional marketing methods, predominant profit motive, traditional approach to organizational structure, failure to recognize and acknowledge roles), which affect CE tourism and hospitality service.

<a> KEY CE-BASED MEDIATORS

Any factor playing a substantive role in associations between dependent and independent factors could be either mediating and/or moderating variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Numerous intervening factors can exist in a framework/model, revealing the relational structures that are more complex, although these factors can assist to explain associations between independent and dependent factors (e.g., Hayes, 2017). As an important indicator to assess the association between consumers and firms/brands, how to generate CE and leverage the positive impact of CE is one of the crucial goals for businesses (Chen et al., 2021). Thus, mediators can either mediate the relations between CE-based antecedent/s and CE, and/or between CE and CE-based consequence/s.

For example, customer brand identification mediates the association between value congruity and CE with hospitality brands (Rather et al., 2018; Rather & Camilleri, 2019). Researchers have tested the mediating role of perceived intimacy and perceived cohesion between self-disclosure and tourist's engagement (e.g., Lin et al., 2019). Destination emotional experience mediates the association between tourist's online platform experiences and destination engagement intentions (Zhang et al., 2018). While Itani et al., (2019) explored the mediating effect of relationship-quality in the association between customer's perceived value and CE, Fang et al. (2020) argued that desire for social interaction mediates the relationship between physical-attractiveness of service employees and CE in tourism industry. The relationship between CE and brand-loyalty is mediated by customer trust and brand attachment in the tourism social media context (Li et al., 2020). Rather (2020) argued that brand identification and customer experience

mediate the link between CE-cognitive, affective, behavioral factors and behavioural intentions in tourism destination context. Recently, Rather et al. (2021) explored the mediating effects of customer experience and co-creation on the association between CE and revisit intent. Further, social media and brand co-creation/revisit intention-relationship has been mediated by CE during COVID-19 pandemic (Rather, 2021a, b).

<a> KEY CE-BASED MODERATORS

Moderators systematically modify the strength or form of the relationship between a predictor- and a criterion factor (e.g., Hair et al., 2010). Tourism and hospitality studies investigated CE moderators less frequently as compared to mediators (Rather & Hollebeek, 2021). Moderation-research is thus extremely desirable from a conceptual and practical perspective (Khan et al., 2020; Ramkissoon & Mavondo, 2015). Studies investigating moderation effects have mostly focused on customer-/individual-level variables. For instance, Itani et al. (2019) explored the moderating role of consumers' value consciousness on the association between customers' perceived value and CE. Wei et al. (2017) tested how customers' perceived error controllability and perceived controllability moderated the effect of error management culture on CE behaviors. Few other studies have tested the effects of data breach locality on error management and consumer's attitudes and CE-behaviors (Zhang et al., 2018) or the effect of signaling on management response and CE (Li et al., 2018). Fang et al. (2020) argued that tourism service characteristics (i.e., tourism service expertise) moderates the association between physical attractiveness of service employees and the desire for social interaction/CE. Rather et al. (2021) study showed that customer involvement moderates the link between customer experience, co-creation, and revisit intent in destination context. Bahri-Ammari et al. (2021) concluded that brand community subscription seniority moderates the engagement/word-of-mouth relationship at a tourism music festival context.

Further, scant studies have explored the moderation effects of demographic-based factors or factors linked with the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, Rather and Hollebeek (2021) investigated how customer age moderates the effect of cognitive, affective and behavioral-CE on customer experience, and how age moderates the

impact of customer experience on tourists' behavioral intention in tourism destination. Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021a) investigated the moderating role of gender between tourist engagement (i.e., attention, enthusiasm, absorption, interaction, and identification) and loyalty in tourism. Recently, Rather (2021b) in his study showed that fear-of-COVID-19/perceived risk negatively moderates the relation between social media and CE. The author has also tested the moderating role of fear-of-COVID-19/perceived risk and co-creation/revisit intention during COVID-19 pandemic times.

<a> CE THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Another key observation is that differing theoretical underpinnings/perspectives are employed to frame CE. For example, while Vivek et al. (2014) adopts relationship marketing theory-informed CE and Hollebeek et al. (2019a) proposes SDL-informed CE, others draw on alternate perspectives, including affordance theory (Cabiddu et al., 2014), theory of customer engagement (Pansari and Kumar, 2017; Harmeling et al., 2017), social exchange theory (Harrigan et al., 2018; Loureiro et al., 2020a), congruity theory (Rather et al., 2018), stimulus-organism-response (Fang et al., 2017), uses and gratification theory (Bilro et al., 2018), generational cohort theory (Bravo et al., 2019) protection motivation theory (Rather, 2021a,b) to name a few, which likely to generate unique CE-based nomological networks.

A key premise of service dominant logic (SDL), wherein 'intangibility, exchange processes, and relationships are central' (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, p. 2). SDL is particularly relevant in tourism industry, which is heavily based upon the customers' experience, suggesting that tourism consumers and suppliers interact most closely at all stages of their relationship (Shaw et al., 2011). SDL acknowledges the active involvement of customers (tourists) in the enhancement of their personal experiences, wherein value is generated through the interaction process with the tourism-destination's resources (Rather et al., 2019, 2021). Social exchange theory (SET) is defined "as a general sociological theory in understanding the exchange of resources between groups and individuals in an interaction situation" (Ap, 1992, p. 668). SET holds the interaction between two parties by focusing on costs and benefits accumulating to each party during exchange-process (Harrigan et al., 2018; Nunkoo,

Smith & Ramkissoon, 2012; Verleye et al., 2014). Harmeling et al., (2017, p. 312) defined customer engagement marketing “as a firm’s deliberate effort to motivate, empower, and measure customer contributions to marketing functions - marks a shift in marketing research and business practice”. Table 1.3 provides the various theoretical underpinnings used in tourism and hospitality research.

Table 1.3 CE Theoretical Underpinnings in Tourism and Hospitality Literature

Author (s)	Theoretical underpinnings
Van Doorn et al. (2010)	Self-Schema Theory; Attachment Theory
Brodie et al. (2011)	Service-Dominant Logic (SDL)
Vivek et al. (2012)	Relationship Marketing Theory
Vivek et al. (2014)	Relationship Marketing Theory
Verleye et al. (2014)	Social Exchange Theory
Cabiddu et al. (2014)	Affordance Theory
Hollebeek et al. (2014)	Service-Dominant Logic (SDL)
So et al. (2014)	Relationship Marketing Theory
Kumar and Pansari (2016)	Relationship Marketing Theory
Pansari and Kumar (2017)	Theory of Customer Engagement
Harmeling et al., 2017	Theory of Customer Engagement
Fang et al. (2017)	Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R)
Wei et al. (2017)	Attribution Theory
Bilro et al. (2018)	Uses And Gratification Theory
Rather et al. (2018)	Congruity Theory
Rather (2018b)	Relationship Marketing Theory
Harrigan et al., 2018	Social Exchange Theory
Flavián et al. (2019)	Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R)
Islam et al. (2019)	Social Exchange Theory
Choi and Kandampully (2019)	Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R)
Willems et al. (2019)	Social Exchange Theory
Rather et al. (2019)	Service-Dominant Logic (SDL)
Rather and Sharma (2018, 2019)	Social Exchange Theory
Loureiro and Sarmiento (2019)	Attachment Theory
Bravo et al. (2019)	The Generational Cohort Theory
Hollebeek et al. (2019a)	Service-Dominant Logic (SDL)
Rather et al. (2021b)	Service-Dominant Logic (SDL)
Rather (2020)	Social Exchange Theory

Li et al. (2020)	Social Exchange Theory
Fang et al. (2020)	Grounded Theory
Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021a)	Relationship Marketing Theory
Bahri-Ammari et al. (2021)	Social Exchange Theory
Rather (2021a)	Protection Motivation Theory (PMT); SDL
Rather (2021b)	Protection Motivation Theory (PMT); SDL
So et al. (2021)	Relationship Marketing Theory
Rather et al. (2021)	Service-Dominant Logic (SDL)

 CE PUBLIC AND CONTEXTS

CE is approached from various publics and contexts, including tourist/guest/visitor/customer; organization/industry/brand, technology, culture, destination/attraction. Organizations, brands, and destinations/attractions share the premise of the strategic role of CE for competitive performance/benefits, stressing a marketing and management approach (Rather et al., 2021; So et al., 2021). The tourist/visitor/customer publics analyses CE as it happens in the tourist sphere, regarding the psychology and behavior involved in experiences, before, during, and after the travel/consumption. The key CE-perspectives in tourism and hospitality literature are offered in Table 1. 4.

Table 1. 4 CE Perspectives in Tourism Literature

Author (s)	Perspectives
Vivek et al. (2014)	Customer, Brand
Verleye et al., 2014	Customer, Organization
Cabiddu et al. (2014)	Tourist, Organization
Hollebeek et al. (2014)	Customer, Brands
So et al. (2014)	Tourist, Tourism Brand
Taheri et al. (2014)	Tourist, Attraction
Bryce et al. (2015)	Tourist, Culture, Attraction
Kumar and Pansari (2016)	Customer, Organization
Pansari and Kumar (2017)	Customer, Organization
Fang et al. (2017)	Tourist
Wei et al. (2017)	Tourist, Culture
Bilro et al. (2018)	Tourist
Rather et al. (2018)	Tourist

Harrigan et al., 2018	Tourist, Attraction
Rather (2018b)	Customer, Hospitality Brand
Islam et al. (2019)	Customer, Hospitality Brand
Flavián et al. (2019)	Tourist, Technology, Destination
Aluri et al. (2019)	Tourist, Organization
Willems et al. (2019)	Tourist, Technology, Destination
Rather et al. (2019)	Tourist, Attraction Site
Rather and Sharma (2018, 2019)	Customer, Hospitality Brand
Choi and Kandampully (2019)	Customer, Hospitality Brand
Bilro et al. (2019)	Online customer
Loureiro and Sarmiento (2019)	Tourist, Attraction, Culture
Bravo et al. (2019)	Tourist, Attraction
Rather et al. (2021b)	Tourist, Attraction
Rather (2020)	Tourist, Technology
Li et al. (2020)	Tourist, Social media Technology
Fang et al. (2020)	Customer, Managers
Rasoolimanesh et al. (2021a)	Tourist, Destination
Bahri-Ammari et al. (2021)	Tourist, Technology
Angelino et al. (2021)	Tourism students
Rather (2021a)	Tourist, Technology, Destination
Rather (2021b)	Tourist, Technology, Destination
So et al. (2021)	Tourist, Tourism Brands
Rather and Hollebeek (2021)	Tourist, Destination
Rather et al. (2021)	Tourist, Destination
Rather et al. (2022)	Tourist, Destination

<a> CE THROUGH INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES

In today's environment, Information and communication technologies help the flow of knowledge and information among customers/tourists, managers, suppliers, and employees and thereby increases CE and collaboration for value co-creation (Cabiddu et al., 2014; Chathoth et al., 2014; Li et al., 2020; Ramkissoon & Uysal, 2018). The growth of technology including, internet, social media, online brand communities, and/or smart phones have started an acceleration of attention in CE. These technologies assist in interactive relationships by engaging consumers through active participation (Cabiddu et al., 2014; Flavián et al., 2019; Huerta-Álvarez et al., 2020; Willems et al., 2019; Bilro

et al., 2019). In the current generation, the rise of social media technology is a global phenomenon that contributes to boost the engagement process between tourists and tourist firms/brand (Chen et al., 2021; Ramkissoon, 2020b). Booking.com, Trivago, and TripAdvisor are prevalent tourism-social media platforms and facilitate tourism and hospitality firms/brands to promote their brand to tourists (Aluri et al., 2019) and develop connections with them beyond the service encounter (So et al., 2014). Relatedly, the growth of augmented reality (AR), virtual reality (VR), mixed reality (MR) might add value for tourists by offering more interactive, entertaining and dynamic interfaces (Hassan & Ramkissoon, 2016; Hollebeek et al., 2019b; Willems et al., 2019; Loureiro et al., 2020b), which are more suitable to assist visitors in the firm of their holidays by providing them with vivid information (Aluri et al., 2019) and increasing their level of engagement (Wei et al., 2013). Technological advances (e.g., social media networks, augmented, virtual reality, service robots, artificial intelligence) help the tourism firms to widely use CE in increasing customer-brand relationships (Flavián et al., 2019; So et al., 2021). Therefore, these technological advancements have crucial marketing and tourism implications (Aluri et al., 2019; Harrigan et al., 2018; Li et al., 2020; Ramkissoon, 2022d).

For example, tourism firms/brands can increase their interactions with visitors by persuading visitors to comment and vote online or share their tourism-based experiences on social media platforms (e.g., Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram; Chen et al., 2021; Wei et al., 2013). CE also increases customers' review endeavor, brand-usage-intent, subjective well-being and sales organizations (Bilro et al., 2019). Wei et al. (2017) explored the impact of hotels' error management culture on CEBs. Flavián et al. (2019) integrated virtual reality devices to investigate the effects of technological embodiment on CE/behavioral intentions with the destination. Willems et al. (2019) examined the effect of representation media on CE in tourism marketing. Aluri et al. (2019) employed machine learning to co-create value through dynamic CE in a brand-loyalty program in tourism. Recently, Rather (2021a,b) monitoring the effect of tourism-based social media on CE, tourist's attitude, and revisiting behaviour during COVID-19. Potential research directions involve exploring how technology can inspire tourists or change their relationships with brands. Likewise, technological advancements and

transformative effects of social-media on our society have made the virtual-world a crucial focus of tourism/marketing activities toward triggering or cultivating CE.

<a> METHODOLOGICAL CE-BASED DEVELOPMENTS

Most tourism and hospitality studies reviewed in this chapter employed cross-sectional, self-reported consumer surveys together with covariance-based structural equation modeling (CO-SEM), partial least squares-structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) and associated multivariate analyses (Rather & Hollebeek, 2021; Rather et al., 2020, 2021; So et al., 2021). However, many researchers agree that CE is innately behavioral (or includes a behavioral aspect). Most of studies only included attitudinal (perceptual) constructs; organizational-based/aggregated economic outcomes are generally lacking, as are field experiments employing in-market consumer response data (e.g., Hughes et al., 2019). The other methodological gaps involve experimental studies, longitudinal research, multilevel analysis, sophisticated qualitative studies outside in-depth interviews, and different data collection methods like behavioral/neural techniques. However, the widespread interest to CE has been possibly encouraged by technological/media developments, few CE works introducing advanced data-analytics (e.g., machine learning) in tourism and hospitality literature till date (Akshiq et al, 2022; Aluri et al., 2019; Rezapouraghdam et al., 2021). The majority of research in this subject is based on micro-level relationships as (individual consumers' responses and relationships with brands/organizations). Meso-level relationships like (aggregated social-collectives and individual consumers) and macro-level like (platforms and organizations) investigations beyond the individual brand/firm dyad can instill this work with novel insights (Hollebeek et al., 2020b). This is known as *actor engagement*-perspective. The latter entails that future-CE research might incorporate a larger group of stakeholders, including stakeholder engagement (Hollebeek et al., 2022) and/or employee engagement (Pansari & Kumar, 2017). Methodologically, these works wish to include different units of analysis, diverse sampling methods, and statistical approaches addressing network data.

<a> CONCLUSIONS

Customer engagement is a key area in tourism and hospitality research and practice over the past decade. Given CE's theoretical significance and practical relevance, tourism and hospitality research has received rising attention. Thus, this chapter offers an overview of CE by stressing its relevance in tourism and hospitality, and discusses definitional challenges, conceptualization, operationalization, measurement, antecedents, and consequences of CE. Furthermore, the chapter highlights the CE's theoretical foundations, followed by the publics and contexts in tourism and hospitality. We also discuss CE through information and communication technologies followed by CE-methodological developments.

Therefore, it is important to study and explore CE to develop scientific understanding via theoretical, empirical, and methodological contributions. It is also critical to highlight the different approaches and perspectives to CE in tourism and hospitality research. Further, studies are required in different research contexts (e.g., tourism destinations, attractions, sites, events, hotels, resorts, services, tourism experiences etc). Besides, different approaches and methodologies (theoretical, empirical, quantitative, qualitative, big data etc.), repeated dimensions need to be considered. This is addressed in this *Book*. This will also be of interest to tourism and hospitality service firms, organizations, or brands, that have the sale of experiences as their business model. The *Book* will also help a better understanding of CE in tourism development by bringing together diverse perspectives and disciplines.

REFERENCES

In Process

Hassan, A., & Ramkissoon, H. (2016). Augmented reality application to museum visitor experiences. *Visitor management in tourist destinations*, 3, 117.

Rezapouraghdam, H., Akhshik, A., & Ramkissoon, H. (2021). Application of machine learning to predict visitors' green behavior in marine protected areas: Evidence from Cyprus. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1-25.

Hollebeek, L., Smith, D., Kasabov, E., Hammedi, W., Warlow, A., & Clark, M. (2021), Customer Brand Engagement during Service Lockdown, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 35(2), 201-209.

Ramkissoon, H., Smith, L. D. G., & Weiler, B. (2013). Testing the dimensionality of place attachment and its relationships with place satisfaction and pro-environmental

behaviours: A structural equation modelling approach. *Tourism management*, 36, 552-566.

Ramkissoon, H. (2020a). Perceived social impacts of tourism and quality-of-life: A new conceptual model. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1-17.

Shoukat, M. H., & Ramkissoon, H. (2022). Customer delight, engagement, experience, value co-creation, place identity, and revisit intention: a new conceptual framework. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 1-19.

Ramkissoon, H. (2020b). COVID-19 Place confinement, pro-social, pro-environmental behaviors, and residents' wellbeing: A new conceptual framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 2248.

Ramkissoon, H. (2022c). Perceived visitor impacts of cultural heritage tourism: The role of place attachment in memorable visitor experiences. In *Handbook on the Tourist Experience* (pp. 166-175). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Ramkissoon, H., Mavondo, F., & Uysal, M. (2018). Social involvement and park citizenship as moderators for quality-of-life in a national park. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(3), 341-361.

Dewnarain, S., Ramkissoon, H., & Mavondo, F. (2019). Social customer relationship management: An integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 28(2), 172-188.

Ramkissoon, H., & Uysal, M. S. (2018). Authenticity as a value co-creator of tourism experiences. In *Creating experience value in tourism* (pp. 98-109). Wallingford UK: CAB International.

Ramkissoon, H., Mavondo, F., & Uysal, M. (2018). Social involvement and park citizenship as moderators for quality-of-life in a national park. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(3), 341-361.

Nunkoo, R., Smith, S. L., & Ramkissoon, H. (2013). Residents' attitudes to tourism: A longitudinal study of 140 articles from 1984 to 2010. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(1), 5-25.

Nekmahmud, M., Ramkissoon, H., & Fekete-Farkas, M. (2022). Green purchase and sustainable consumption: A comparative study between European and Non-European tourists. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 43, 100980.

Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2016). Stakeholders' views of enclave tourism: A grounded theory approach. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 40(5), 557-558.

Majeed, S., & Ramkissoon, H. (2020). Health, wellness, and place attachment during and post health pandemics. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 573220.

Ramkissoon, H. (2022a). Behaviour change in tourism, in D. Buhalis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Tourism Management & Marketing*, Edward Elgar.

Ramkissoon, H. (2022). Cultural tourism impacts and place meanings: Focusing on the value of domestic tourism. In A. Stoffelen & D. Ioannides (Eds.), *Handbook of tourism impacts: Social and environmental perspectives* (pp. 75-87). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Ramkissoon, H. (2022b). Tourist decision-making, in D. Buhalis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Tourism Management & Marketing*, Edward Elgar.

- Angelino, F., Loureiro, S.M.C., & Bilro, R.G. (2021). Exploring Tourism Students' Engagement through Telepresence, Pleasantness of the Experience and Memory: A Virtual Reality Approach. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 28(5), 669-685. doi: [10.1080/10496491.2021.2009614](https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2021.2009614)
- Itani, O. S., Kassar, A.-N., & Loureiro, S.M.C. (2019). Value get, value give: The relationships among perceived value, relationship quality, customer engagement, and value consciousness. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 80, 78-90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.01.014>
- Bilro, R.G., Loureiro, S.M.C., & Guerreiro, J. (2019). Exploring online customer engagement with hospitality products and its relationship with involvement, emotional states, experience and brand advocacy. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 28(2), 147-171. doi: 10.1080/19368623.2018.1506375
- Loureiro, S.M.C, & Sarmiento, E.M. (2018). Engaging visitors in cultural and recreational experience at museums. *ANATOLIA: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 29(4), 581-592 doi: 10.1080/13032917.2018.1484378
- Bilro, R. G., Loureiro, S. M. C.; Ali, F. (2018). The role of website stimuli of experience on engagement and brand advocacy. *Journal of hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 9(2), 204-222. doi:10.1108/JHTT-12-2017-0136
- Loureiro, S.M.C. & Sarmiento, E. M. (2019). Place Attachment and Tourist Engagement of Major Visitor Attractions in Lisbon. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19(3), 368–381. doi: 10.1177/1467358418761211
- Loureiro, S.M.C. (2022). Stakeholder engagement. In Dimitrios Buhalis (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Tourism Management and Marketing*. Massachusetts: Edward Elgar publishing. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800377486> ISBN: 978 1 80037 747 9
- Loureiro, S.M.C., Romero, J., & Bilro, R.G. (2020a). Stakeholder engagement in co-creation processes for innovation: a systematic literature review and case study. *Journal of Business Research*, 119, 388-409. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.038>
- Loureiro, S.M.C., Guerreiro, J., & Ali, F. (2020b). 20 years of research on virtual reality and augmented reality in tourism context: A text-mining approach. *Tourism Management*, 77 104028 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104028>

Sprott, D., Czellar, S., & Spangenberg, E. (2009). The importance of a general measure of brand engagement on market behavior: Development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Marketing research*, 46(1), 92-104.