Engaging the consumer online
– A quantitative study of attaining consumer engagement through social media in the luxury fashion segment
Abstract

Good communication is an important factor for a firm to think about when wanting to engage their consumers. Recently there has been an interest over the concept of consumer engagement within the context of social media by business practitioners. Social media today is used in most aspects of life and it is important to understand how to use it in order to enhance business strategies when approaching consumers. Consumer engagement has been defined through existing research in different ways, having no clear model for practitioners to follow when attempting to engage consumers. This is one of the main problems within existing research, as well as each focusing on different social media triggers. It is important to understand which triggers are more relevant when trying to attain consumer engagement. As well as bringing up the benefits that comes from utilizing such a concept. Research regarding consumer engagement within social media is required within a different context, in order to determine the triggers relevancy to the concept of engagement.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is about attaining consumer engagement through the use of social media in the luxury fashion segment, which was done through the use of Brodie et al conceptual model of consumer engagement. The research that was conducted was of a quantitative nature, utilizing a cross-section research design. To gather primary data a questionnaire was created and distributed through social media, where 101 respondents out of a desired 90 were used for the analysis. The data gathered through the questionnaire was then analysed through the statistical program of SPSS, where descriptive statistics, a correlation analysis and a regression analysis were conducted. This was done in order to ensure the validity and reliability, as well as getting results to accept or rejected the presented hypotheses. The findings of this paper show that each of the five independent variables has a significant effect on the dependent variable of consumer engagement when tested on their own. However, when all the variables were tested together three out of the five hypotheses presented were rejected, these being the independent variables of co-developing, advocating and socializing. This does not mean that the variables for which hypotheses got rejected should be disregarded according to the results obtained from the regression analysis, according to the data gathered these triggers are still individually relevant to the attainment of consumer engagement within the luxury fashion segment via social media.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

An important factor of communication is a firm’s ability to engage customers with their brand. Customers today are an active contributor to a variety of marketing functions (e.g., product innovation and marketing communication). The customers become pseudo-marketers that often have greater influence, more effective reach, and lower costs than the firm-based marketer. This has given customers more control, which can be seen as a threat or potential opportunity for firms. For these reasons, consumer engagement has seen an explosion of interest in the business world (Harmeling et al., 2016).

The term consumer engagement was hardly used prior to 2007, but in the last decade firms have started to devote substantial resources in effort to create consumer engagement strategies (Harmeling et al., 2016). To have a consumer base that is engaged has become one of the key objectives for many professional marketers, as it has shown positive implications on consumer behaviour and brand performance (Dessart, Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2015). A firm that puts effort into their consumer engagement initiatives by motivating, empowering and measuring customer contributions to marketing functions, can alter the experience of a core offering. This is done by strengthening existing cognitive bonds and also by creating new cognitive bonds that would not be associated with the product experience otherwise (Harmeling et al., 2016).

The continuation of the increasing interest in consumer engagement can be linked to the constant evolution of the internet and the new digital technologies and tools that have emerged from it, especially social media (Harmeling et al., 2016). There is no denying that the use of social media is constantly increasing and stays up-to-date. Facebook has over 1.3 billion users that are of high use for social media marketers, and that number is still increasing (Muchardie, Yudiana, & Gunawan, 2016; Statista, 2018). Social media such as online communities, wikis, blogs, social networking sites like Facebook, and micro-blogs like Twitter, are in high interest to firms (Harmeling et al., 2016).

The interactive nature of social media with its ability to establish conversations among individuals and firms in communities of sellers and customers and involve customers in content generation and value creation has excited practitioners with its potential to better serve customers and satisfy their needs (2016, p. 254).
One of the main reasons why social media became an important tool to improve consumer engagement is the high level of use by the public. There is a potential to gather a very large sample of customers through social media (Muchardie, Yudiana, & Gunawan, 2016). In 2017, 71 percent of internet users were on social media, which accounts for 2.46 billion users around the world. The use of social media is expected to grow and is estimated to reach over 3 billion users by 2021 (Statista, 2018). Many marketers today use social media as a tool to increase consumer engagement and brand loyalty, as it allows them to create two-way direct communication flow, with fast and direct communication between the customers and firm (Muchardie, Yudiana, & Gunawan, 2016). Despite the explosion of interest, the aborning literature on consumer engagement has shown some shortcomings, such as the lack of consensus on what consumer engagement is exactly (Dessart, Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2015).

1.2 Problem Discussion

According to existing research, consumer engagement has a broad definition that can be understood in different ways within online communities and outside of them (Brodie et. al, 2013; Dwivedi, 2015; Dessart, L., Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2016; Martínez-López et. al., 2017; Hollebeek, 2011). Researchers have taken into consideration the psychological and organizational behavior that are part of consumer engagement; as well as the expanded domain of relationship marketing, and the service-dominant logic behind it (Dwivedi, 2015; Dessart, L., Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2016; Martínez-López et. al., 2017; Hollebeek, 2011). However, from these different researches there are different social media triggers that are used in various models to define how consumer engagement is created (Brodie et. al, 2013; Dwivedi, 2015; Dessart, L., Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2016; Martínez-López et. al., 2017; Hollebeek, 2011). This makes it difficult for practitioners to follow a specific model that can be applied in any sort of context, given the high level of interest within this field in recent years (Dessart, L., Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2016; Martínez-López et. al., 2017; Hollebeek, 2011).

Marketing practitioners are looking to understand how to attain and maintain online communities’ engagement in order to increase customer value (Martínez-López et. al., 2017). The benefits of using consumer engagement come from it being used as a vehicle for creating, building and enhancing customer relationships (Brodie et. al, 2013). The use of it is seen both as strategically essential in order to establish and hold a competitive advantage, as well as it being a valuable predictor for a business’s future performance (Brodie et. al, 2013). The managerial value of this
concept is based on its ability to explain desired marketing outcomes such as, consumer loyalty intentions towards a brand (Dwivedi, 2015). As stated by Dwivedi (2015), consumer loyalty intentions are caused mainly by consumer’s judgment of perceived value, perceived quality, and overall satisfaction. In order to use this concept accurately by managers, a re-defined definition that is generalizable in different contexts for such a concept, needs to be created.

Brodie et. al (2013) takes into consideration the different existing definitions for consumer engagement in order to create, from his own understanding, the different social media triggers that lead to engagement towards brands within online communities. Bringing a broad concept to a more redefined definition of what causes engagement within these communities, to then build the triggers of consumer engagement within social media (Brodie et. al, 2013).

The engagement process was found to begin with the interest of a product or brand by consumers in general, which leads to the involvement of them in online communities and begin discussion, to then fully be engaged with a brand (Brodie et. al, 2013). The discussion and involvement within an online brand community leads to the different triggers (Brodie et. al, 2013). In other words, if there's a problem which the consumer needs to fix or solve, they go to the community and fix it from there. Whether it's by learning, sharing, co-developing, advocating, and socializing, these are the social media triggers created by Brodie et. al (2013).

Brodie et. al (2013) has a created a working definition for consumer engagement but it is a working definition, which mean it needs to be backed up for it to be further validated. It would be beneficial to contribute to this research by testing whether these social media triggers have an impact on a different context within online communities rather than the ones that have been tested.

The issue with Brodie et. al (2013) research is that the study made for online communities is not specific to any brand as well as being limited to a small online community. To be specific as to the number of the said “small community” the exploratory study made by Brodie et. al (2013) consists of six members which form the core “highly engaged” respondent base. It does however give an initial insight towards the nature of consumer engagement. Nevertheless, Brodie et. al (2013) model cannot be generalizable, for this reason, and therefore requires further quantitative research to back it up. Consumer engagement is within a broader intra- and extra-organizational network, thereby, generating a need for future work on consumer engagement in network settings (Brodie et. al, 2013). The dynamic nature of central engagement processes and triggers, or the cyclical nature of these processes requires further attention (van Doorn et. al, 2010)
1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to study how to attain consumer engagement with the use of proposed social media triggers.
2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Consumer engagement

In organizational behavior literature, the concept of engagement has been explored as a way to explain organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. This led to it being used as one means by which to predict financial performance (Bowden, 2009). Engagement is not a new notion when it comes to business relationships, but practitioners have had an increased interest in the concept as it has developed in the last decades (Brodie et al., 2011).

The concept of consumer engagement (CE) has been defined by multiple authors through time, although many of them have been similar, the concept has been difficult define in one way. For example, Bowden (2009) views consumer engagement as a psychological process that consists of cognitive and emotional aspects; a process that is iterative, starting with customer satisfaction, and eventually culminating in customer loyalty. However, Vivek, Beatty, and Morgan (2012) define consumer engagement as “the intensity of an individual’s participation and connection with the organization’s offerings and activities initiated by either the customer or the organization” (p. 4).

One of the driving forces behind the interest in the concept lately is due to it being linked to a number of positive consequences at individual and organizational levels. It is argued that employee engagement is positively related to the individual’s behaviors, attitudes and intentions. It has also been linked to positive business results such as low absenteeism, job satisfaction, and high organizational commitment and performance (Bowden, 2009). Highly engaged employees are expected to perform well with customers, which leads to favorable customer evaluations (Bowden, 2009). Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) further support the previous claims as they found that “employee satisfaction and engagement are related to meaningful business outcomes at a magnitude that is important to many organizations” (p. 276). Consumer engagement involves having a relationship with the firm that is deeper than just making purchases. Such a relationship is built by understanding the customer’s business and needs. It is important to engage customers to make sure you keep them longer, to encourage them to talk about your brand, and so the customers spend more across the range of goods and services offered by you (Vivek, Beatty & Morgan, 2012).

While multiple authors have defined consumer engagement, not as many have provided a platform for the development of the definition of consumer engagement in a virtual brand community (Brodie et al., 2013). Brodie et al. (2013) provides a guide to try help with the development of a working definition, and identifies triggers that prompt an onset of specific
consumer engagement states. This occurs when a customer recognizes the need to satisfy a want or solve a problem, who then performs a search, identifying a specific online community, and eventually begins an interactive relationship with that community by posting a comment (Brodie et al., 2013).

### 2.2 Learning

Learning is defined by Brodie et al. (2013) as, “The vicarious acquisition of cognitive competencies that consumers apply to purchase and consumption decision-making” (p. 111). Brodie et al. (2013) based these triggers from five themes, the first theme is represented as the learning trigger and recognizes the importance of specific interactive experiences between consumers or other actors in the market or brand network. Brands will usually provide a platform or method online through which consumers can discuss amongst one another and thereby facilitate consumer-to-consumer engagement (van Doorn et al., 2010). An example of these methods would be to offer online chat forums, and or blogs related to the brand, through which customers are able to share their ideas with each other (van Doorn et al., 2010).

Within social media platforms there is more openness in terms of people freely exposing their stories and experiences with a product or a brand (Black & Kelley, 2009). In a social media platform, users sharing of their personal experiences and knowledge allows them to pass along their information about services or products purchased (Black & Kelley, 2009).

Socializing as a social media trigger brings a positive value for the attainment of knowledge and thereby engament towards a brand (Jahn & Kunz, 2012). Through discussion a better understanding can be attained, aspects about a product can be learned, however it depends on the social value that a community provides (De Vries & Carlson, 2014). The positive aspects that can come out from discussions within online communities for the attainment of engagement, the researchers have come up with the following hypothesis.

- H1: Learning motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.

### 2.3 Sharing

Brodie et al. (2013) defines the trigger of sharing as, “An act of sharing personal relevant information, knowledge, and experiences through the process of active contributions to the co-creation of knowledge within an online community, reflects the behavioral and/or cognitive dimensions of consumer engagement” (p. 111). The second theme Brodie et al. (2013), uses to
create this trigger is where the consumer engagement represents a highly context-dependent, motivational state characterized by a specific intensity level at a given point in time. Nolan, Brizland, and Macaulay (2007), gives a better understanding of this theme by stating that people’s motivation to engage within an online community is present, when perceived utility value and interest outweigh the level of perceived risk from shared experiences of other users. Information is the main focus of all interactions, it has to be passed on, received and understood before the receiver can assess its utility value (Nolan, Brizland, & Macaulay 2007).

Social media platforms enable and boost the collaboration and learning from customers in various ways, such as providing and receiving feedback regarding new products and services (Jussila, Kärkkäinen, & Leino, 2012). This process can benefit both the supplier (the company) and receiver of information (the users/customers), seeing as both parties learn by receiving and adopting new knowledge (Jussila, Kärkkäinen, & Leino, 2012).

When a consumer shares their experiences within a social media community for others, it facilitates their view about a brands product, and increases or decreases the value of a product, based on the knowledge provided, either way it is a benefiting trigger for consumers purchase decision making (Nolan, Brizland, & Macaulay, 2007). Due to the positive impact which this social media trigger has for consumers, the researchers have come up with the following hypothesis.

- H2: Sharing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.

2.4 Co-developing

Co-developing is defined by Brodie et al. (2013) as, “A process where consumers contribute to organizations and/or organizational performance by assisting in the development of new products, services, brands or brand meanings” (p. 111)

The third theme used to create this trigger by Brodie et al. (2013) is that a temporary engagement state occurs within broader, dynamic, repetitive engagement processes (Bowden, 2009). Central to the concept of relationship marketing is the notion that customer-brand relationships are dynamic in nature and develop with each service encounter over an extended period of time (Bowden, 2009). Users engaged in co-developing behaviors assist in the collaborative development of new products and services, enabling a firm’s ability to draw upon customer knowledge, experience and capabilities (Greer & Lei, 2011). There is positive impact on a new products performance, when customers are involved in the design and innovation processes (Menguc, Auh, & Yannopoulus, 2014). Within the social media context, collaborative innovation happens when users
contribute their knowledge, skills, and resources to facilitate a firm’s development of an offer, through sharing ideas for improved products or services (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014).

Co-developing as a social media trigger allows the consumer to have an involvement within the production of a product and thereby a closer relationship with a brand since the brand is enabling the consumers to make a product of their own choosing (Menguc, Auh, & Yannopoulus, 2014). Due to the seemingly open and positive aspects which this social media trigger brings, the researchers have come up with the following hypothesis.

- *H3: Co-Developing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.*

### 2.5 Advocating

The trigger of advocating a brand is defined by Brodie et al. (2013) as, “An expression of consumer engagement, which occurs when consumers actively recommend specific brands, products/services, organizations, and/or ways of using products or brands” (p.111)

The fourth theme used to create this trigger, addresses engagement as a multidimensional concept consisting of cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions (Schau, Muñiz, & Arnould, 2009). Brodie et. al (2011) states as an example, defines consumer engagement in terms of knowing a brand, having an emotional dedication, effort, as well as interactive dimensions. Advocacy is not a way for a company to speak towards customers, instead it is more about having a mutual dialogue or a sense of having a two-way communication, if the company advocates for its customers, those customers will return this through trust, purchases, and enduring loyalty (Brodie et. al, 2011). In other words, advocacy is a partnership between a firm and its customers for the mutual benefit of both. A company advocates for customers’ interests, and customers advocate for the company by buying its products and helping it design better products (Sashi, 2012). Advocacy can be seen as a two-way mediator between a brand and the consumers, it is a mutual relationship (Sashi, 2012).

In social media terms, advocating may occur through positive electronic word-of-mouth (van Doorn et al., 2010). Advocating is an expression of engagement, which occurs when users recommend their preference for specific brands, products/services and organizations (Sashi, 2012). Through advocating, consumers become aware of brands which they might not have been aware of or might have a different perspective about a brand (Schau, Muñiz, & Arnould, 2009). Due to the seemingly positive outcome which advocating can bring towards the attainment of consumer engagement, the researchers have come up with the following hypothesis.

- *H4: Advocating motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.*
2.6 Socializing

The trigger socializing is defined by Brodie et al. (2013) as, “A way to indicate two-way, non-functional interactions through which consumers acquire and/or develop attitudes, norms and/or community language” (p. 111)

The fifth theme for which this trigger was created recognizes that consumer engagement plays a central role in the process of relational exchange, where other relational concepts (e.g. participation, involvement) act as engagement consequences in dynamic engagement processes occurring within the brand community. The nature of the consumer engagement process implies that specific consequences risen from interactive actions of engagement may act as a construct of processes and/or cycles (Brodie et al., 2011).

Social media platforms, which incorporate brand pages, provide greater opportunities for interactions to happen, where consumers can obtain social value from computer-mediated interactions with one another (De Vries & Carlson, 2014). There are suggestions within existing research that a higher perception of social interaction value within an online community of social media brand pages may lead to the customer using the page more frequently and therefore becoming more engaged with the brand (De Vries & Carlson, 2014). Within social media platforms members see one another as equally similar to themselves and have the opportunity to interact, meet, and communicate with them (Jahn & Kunz, 2012).

Socializing as a social media trigger brings a positive value for the attainment of knowledge and thereby engagement towards a brand (Jahn & Kunz, 2012). Through discussion a better understanding can be attained, aspects about a product can be learned, however it depends on the social value that a community provides (De Vries & Carlson, 2014). The positive aspects that can come out from discussions within online communities for the attainment of engagement, the researchers have come up with the following hypothesis.

- **H5: Socializing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.**
3. Conceptual model

Existing literature emphasizes five different themes for which triggers were created from, for consumer engagement within online communities; Learning, Sharing, Co-developing, Advocating, and Socializing (e.g.; Brodie et al. 2013; van Doorn et al., 2010; Nolan, Brizland, & Macaulay, 2007; Bowden, 2009). The hypotheses were applied in a social media context for the luxury fashion segment in order to test each independent variable with the dependent being consumer engagement within a luxury fashion segment and determine whether the researcher’s hypothesis will be confirmed or falsified.

**H1**: Learning motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.

**H2**: Sharing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.

**H3**: Co-Developing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.

**H4**: Advocating motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.

**H5**: Socializing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media.
4. Methodology

In this chapter, the choices of what research approach, method and how the study will be conducted will be explained. Also, it will cover how data was collected, the sample selection as well as the respondents. This will then be followed by an operationalization of the study, which will be presented in an operationalization table, which will help further present the method of data analysis. Overall this chapter will discuss a number of aspects that characterize the research.

4.1 Research approach

This research will follow the study which was presented by Brodie et al. in 2013, who created a conceptual model of consumer engagement within virtual communities. The researchers of this study aim to test the model and the concepts within a new context of the fashion industry through social media. Loureiro, Maximiano, and Panchapakesan, (2018) research shows that the consumption pattern for luxury brands tend to be more psychological even when it comes to the engaging phase towards consumers. Social media channels within this segment are more limited in terms of content than other standard brands (Loureiro, Maximiano, & Panchapakesan, 2018). This makes the luxury fashion segment stand out in comparison to other brands, and therefore raises the question of, how engaged are consumers within this field via social media, hence what the research aims to determine within this study through the use of Brodie et al (2013) conceptual model.

4.1.1 Deductive research

According to authors Bryman and Bell (2015), there are two different ways in which research are approached. The main difference between these two different methods, inductive and deductive research is about how the hypothesis and research is put together. In this study the deductive approach was selected as the method for research. The deductive approach begins with the use of an already existing theory, where through that theory, hypothesis are created. Based on the hypothesis created it will be tested and based on the results that are gathered from the testing, the hypothesis is able to be rejected or accepted (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

According to another author, Creswell, 2012, through the use of a deductive approach, possibilities for explaining causal relationships between concepts and variables arise, also the possibility to be able to measure concepts quantitatively, as well as finally having the possibility to generalize research findings to a certain extent. It can overall be seen as ‘reasoning from general to
particular’ (Creswell, 2012). This research, instead of attempting to create new theory through the use of an inductive approach, is about using the already existing theory and basing the information on that, in other words, more of a deductive approach. In this study the researchers use Brodie et al (2013) conceptual model of consumer engagement and apply it to the luxury fashion industry to get new relevant information in this research field. The new relevant information in this study is to see whether the model used is also relevant in the context of the luxury fashion industry, and can further give the required data for further research in this field.

4.1.2 Quantitative research

When it comes to the research method, Creswell (2012) shows how there are three main research methods that can be used to carry out a study, these being quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods research. As mentioned above, the approach for this paper is deductive and the method used is a quantitative method.

Quantitative research is descriptive and causal, as well as an explanatory research method used for testing objective theories by examining the different relationships between variables. These variables should all be measurable and typically on technical instruments, this is so that numbered data can be collected and analysed using different statistical methods/procedures (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Creswell, 2012). Through using the quantitative method it gives the researchers the opportunity to measure, statistical and numerical data, which will have been collected from respondents through survey or questionnaire, and finally the ability to analyse the data (Creswell, 2012). Through the analysis of the data gathered, the authors should use the numbers to help find connections and relationships within the measurements, which overall will help accept or reject the proposed hypotheses (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009).

Through using a quantitative research method there are several different advantages, such as it the fast speed that the data can be collected a long with the large sample size that can come with it; as well as it being relatively fast to analyze if one knows what to do. A factor that is negative when it comes to quantitative research would be the limited ability to probe for answers, as respondents to surveys/questionnaires do so in their own words and with their own way of thinking (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Creswell, 2012).

As this research has a quantitative approach several hypothesis were drawn out and further tested through the use of a questionnaire. Through using quantitative research, helped the researchers determine the relationship between variables with the help of statistical tools and numbers. Through using the quantitative study, the researchers were able to find a correlation
between the theoretical concept and triggers chosen. As well as allowing the researchers to gather data that is generalizable, this is done through a large sample.

This quantitative research is concerned with testing the triggers of learning, sharing, co-developing, advocating and socialising which were found through a previous study on consumer engagement in virtual communities by Brodie et al (2013). As the researchers believe luxury fashion is a segment where consumer engagement can be very beneficial and important for a brand to take care of, contributed to this context being selected. As well as there not being extensive research when concerning consumer engagement on luxury fashion, and therefore by conducting this quantitative study in the new context is to see if the triggers lead to consumer engagement here as well, this will help test the conceptual model that was put forward by Brodie et al (2013) through his research in the new context. Overall this quantitative study will show whether this model and the triggers used is applicable in this new context of luxury fashion.

4.2 Research design

After choosing a topic, the researchers must plan how the research should be conducted in the most efficient and successful manner. By having good planning it gives the researchers direction for the completion of the study successfully. This part of the study is the research design, and without a proper design, any research conducted has the risk of being costly, as well as time consuming (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009).

As Bryman and Bell (2015), make very clear, it is vital to identify the research design that is going to be used within the study. It is also stated that there are five different kinds of research designs to choose between before conducting a study. These being, Experimental, Longitudinal, Cross-Sectional, Case study and Comparative research designs. By choosing one of these research designs it will help the researchers conduct their study in the most effective and efficient way. It can be said that the main focus in helping the researchers achieve their objectives with the paper as well as help answer hypotheses that have been created (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

For this research the authors of the paper have decided that an explanatory and cross-sectional design is going to be used.

4.2.1 Descriptive, explanatory, and exploratory

When concerned with generating a purpose, there are three different designs that can be chosen, these being, descriptive, explanatory and exploratory (Bryman & Bell, 2015).
The first one being descriptive, is concerned with describing and discussing new phenomena. It is utilized a lot of the time to describe relationships between two or more variables, as well as being considered ‘between’ the explanatory and exploratory approach. When utilizing a descriptive research design, the research must have an aim to gather data with intent to use it for a specific purpose, making it more specific and formal than exploratory research (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Neuman (2014) explains that this type of research is able to provide the readers with a more detailed picture when compared to exploratory, as well as locating new findings and helping back-up past data in that field. By using a descriptive design, questions such as how and who are to be answered, concerning, how does this happen and who is performing it (Neuman, 2014; Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009).

When concerned with Explanatory research, also known as causal research, Neuman (2014) explains that the focus lies with answering and finding solutions to issues that already exist. Therefore, explanatory research is based on already existing theories. Through using this design the focus for the researchers is to answer the question of ‘Why?’. Why does something happen? Overall it can be seen as looking at the cause and effect and attempting to identify them. The explanatory research design is commonly used in studies that are taking a quantitative approach as it is required a well-researched field (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2015).

The final of the three research designs is known as the exploratory design. If researchers are to select this design, it is concerned with exploring a specific field in order to make new findings. If this design is chosen it suggests that there is not enough data or conducted research within this specific field (Bryman & Bell, 2015). The overall aim with using an exploratory design is for the researchers to contribute new theories, questions, perspectives and techniques that can be further looked at in future research. By utilizing this design, a qualitative approach to research is preferred as it is concerned with the generations of new theories and ideas, as qualitative research has more of a focus on exploring what has not been explored (Neuman, 2014; Bryman & Bell, 2015).

In this study the researchers are concerned with testing if Brodie et al (2013) conceptual model of consumer engagement is relevant for the study, as well as it being used for the researchers to find the problem that has not been studied before in depth. In this study the authors have decided to use the explanatory approach in order to give the researchers conclusive evidence in understanding the potential problem more efficiently as well as to further test Brodie et al model on luxury fashion through social media, to see whether his model can apply in this context as well (Bryman & Bell, 2015).
4.2.2 Cross-sectional design

Bryman and Bell (2015), state that a cross-sectional design beings with the collection of data from one or more cases, usually more, at the same period of time. It can be said that this type of research design gives an overhead view of the study field at that specific period of time. Bryman and Bell (2015) also explain that cross-sectional research is not about establishing relationships, but mainly about identifying specific characteristics that exist within different sample groups. He also argues for the fact that the main focus of this research design is to be able to identify differences and similarities between the different variables measured. Overall it can be said that a cross-sectional design begins with the deciding of a research goal and the identification of the variable that the researchers want to measure (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Nueman, 2014; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009).

By using a cross-sectional design it is said that it is a valuable tool for measuring preferences, attitudes or knowledge. It is used in order to help the researchers form assumptions and from there create hypothesis that can be further tested using different research methods, the process can be seen as simple as it focuses on how a single variable differs (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). Bryman and Bell (2015), also state that internal validity is weak within this research design and external validity is strong since the samples are randomly selected. It is also stated that the ecological validity can be damaged if the researchers use self-completion questionnaires and structured observation schedules, as they disrupt what is known as the ‘natural habitat’. The cross-sectional research design has been chosen within the paper to measure whether there is a correlation between variables causing a change or not. As a cross sectional design means that researchers collect data from the population only once. This will be done in order to investigate how the respondents view consumer engagement in the context of the fashion industry on social media, and if the concepts of Brodie et al (2013) model apply to this new context. As the study aims to test hypotheses on the concept of consumer engagement, to be able to find and explain relationships between the independent and dependent variables from the data collected once from the sample, reinforcing the choice of a cross-sectional design.

4.3 Data sources

There are two different types of data that researchers gather and use within a study, being, primary and secondary data. Primary data is seen as original data that has been generated and collected for
the specific purpose of that research. Secondary data can be seen as data collected and gathered from already existing studies (Bryman & Bell, 2015; O'Gorman & MacIntosh, 2014).

Through conducting research activities such as conducting focus groups or interviews, where the information is gathered directly from the source, the data is considered primary (Bryman & Bell, 2015). All in all, secondary data is gathering information that already exists, such as, government statistics, industry association, trade publications and company websites. Whilst primary data is new information gathered to be used in a study or contribute to existing information (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). By using a method of gathering primary data, there are different benefits that may arise, one being, that the researchers is able to aim questions that are directly related to the research objective. All the information gathered is the latest, as well as being able to analyse and asses the psychology of the respondents. Although there are these benefits with primary there are also negatives, such as it having a significant cost, as well as being time consuming. Also since primary data can be collected from a questionnaire, there is always a risk of questionnaire and interviewers bias (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

If the method of using secondary data was utilized there are different benefits that are evident, such as the fact that most of the time the data gathered is without a cost, and the method is also very time-efficient (Smith, 2008). Secondary data also aids in the collection of primary data, making it more specific with the help of the collected secondary data. Although there are benefits there are also negative factors, such as the data not being updated regularly, meaning that the data can outdated and no longer relevant to the study. As well as the data not being relevant any more, the data gathered may not be made to the needs of the researchers study (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009; Smith, 2008).

In this study the researchers use primary data as the main resource. One of the main reasons for using primary is that information in the filed the authors want to do research on is not available through secondary research. Primary data is needed in this study to broaden the field of research within this specific context of testing Brodie et al (2013) conceptual model of consumer engagement, when in regard to the fashion industry through social media. The primary data that was gathered was done through a questionnaire as it is concerned with quantitative data, and the gathering of new information to be able to confirm or deny the hypothesis that the researchers have made when testing this model in the new context of luxury fashion on social media.
4.4 Data collection method

When the process of data collection starts, researchers can take many different approaches, the most popular ones being, surveys/questionnaires, content analysis, observations, focus groups and interviews (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

For a qualitative study, the three most suitable and popular methods for gathering data are focus groups, qualitative interviews, which are semi-structured interviews and unstructured interviews, as well as observations. This is because these methods are seen as beneficial for gathering deep and rich data for the study from the participants (Bryman & Bell, 2015). If a quantitative study was to be selected by the researchers, the most suitable methods to be used would be a quantitative interview, which is a structured interview, as well as surveys/questionnaires, and experiments (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

Due to this paper being of a quantitative nature, the researchers decided to use questionnaires as a standardized method for collecting primary data. All of the participants of the questionnaires will answer the same questions that have been pre-made by the researchers. In this study the method of gathering data is limited to questionnaires due to time constraints and resources. The questionnaire will be sent out through social media so that it can reach the large number of interested respondents possible. The included a variety of easy, simplified and close ended questions that will be measurable through a scale. This data that is then gathered will be analysed using a statistical program of SPSS.

4.4.1 Questionnaires

When looking at quantitative studies, it is evident that one of the most used data collection methods is the survey/questionnaire. By using this method it can be seen as seeking to describe trends in a large population of individuals. The survey or questionnaire is administered to a group of people, which are known as the sample, this is done in order to identify different attitudes, opinions, trends, behaviours or characteristics of a large group of people, which can also be known as the population (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). By conducting a questionnaire compared to one of the qualitative methods, a questionnaire should allow the collection of a big sample in a short period of time whereas the other methods such as structured interviews are more time consuming if concerned with generalizability and a large sample (Bryman & Bell 2015; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

The creation of a questionnaire should provide clear questions with no difficulty of interpreting any of the different words or sentences that are included. The questionnaire should not
be too difficult or too simple to answer, as well as it should not be too long or too short. Also as this method is useful for gathering large amount of data the researchers must take into consideration that too much data may harm the research with a broad result (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

In this case the questionnaire comprised of easier, simplified and close ended answers that will be measureable on a scale, which simplifies the process as it is easier to analyze such numbers through the statistical program (SPSS). As respondents answer the questionnaire digitally it makes the process overall easier and less time consuming (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Also when concerned with how to distribute the questionnaire in order to get a reasonable amount of respondents, it was done through the distribution channel of social media such as Facebook as it is one of the most common methods of this era.

The questionnaire for this research was created through the use of Google and their service of ‘Google forms’ as the researchers had previous experience and knowledge with this tool. As well as the Likert scale system being used, where measures will range from 1 to 5, where one is ‘Strongly Disagree’, three is equivalent to ‘Neutral’ and five is equivalent to ‘Strongly Agree’.

4.5 Data collection instrument

This section presents the operationalization and questionnaire design. It includes explanations of the questions that are in the questionnaire and the variables they are measuring.

4.5.1 Operationalization

Bryman and Bell (2015), explain an operationalization as a tool that is used in order to define and further connect the theory that has been identified by the researchers. This is carried out to define the relevant measurements that are of interest. Researchers argue about the importance of having an operationalization within the research and state that the operationalization can help collect data that is suitable and relevant for the study (Neuman, 2014).

The operationalization in this study is created by structuring questions for the questionnaire and connecting them directly to the theoretical concepts. The theories are also defined shortly so that the reader has the possibility to see a connection between the concepts and the questions.

As can be seen in table 4.5.2, the table is divided into four different columns, each having a different meaning. The first one being ‘Variable’, which shows the variable that will be operationalized in the table, where Consumer Engagement is the dependent and the other variables are independent. The second column of the four will give a theoretical definition of the variable
being operationalized. The third column is there as codes for the question that were asked in the questionnaire which can be found in Appendix 1, which will also help the readers comprehend the analysis better. The final column shows all the questions that are used in the questionnaire.

### 4.5.2 Operationalization Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Theoretical Definition</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer Engagement</strong></td>
<td>Vivek, Beatty, and Morgan (2012) define consumer engagement as “the intensity of an individual’s participation and connection with the organization’s offerings and activities initiated by either the customer or the organization” (p. 4).</td>
<td>CE_1</td>
<td>• Have you ever engaged with a fashion luxury brand on social media?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE_2</td>
<td>• How frequently do you engage with online communities related to fashion luxury brands on social media?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE_3</td>
<td>• I’m interested in taking part of an online fashion brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>Brodie et al. (2013) defines learning as, “the vicarious acquisition of cognitive competencies that consumers apply to purchase and consumption decision-making” (p. 111).</td>
<td>L_1</td>
<td>• I believe that learning about luxury fashion products before purchase is more likely to engage me with a brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L_2</td>
<td>• Learning about a luxury fashion brand from other consumers makes me more willing to engage with that brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L_3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L_4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A community that teaches others about the brand’s products makes me more willing to engage with that brand.
- I believe that learning about a luxury fashion brand engages me with that brand.

**Sharing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brodie et al. (2013) defines sharing as, “an act of sharing personal relevant information, knowledge, and experiences through the process of active contributions to the co-creation of knowledge within an online community, reflects the behavioral and/or cognitive dimensions of consumer engagement” (p. 111).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I share my experiences regarding luxury fashion brands on social media.
- I would be willing to share my experiences regarding luxury fashion brands on social media.
- Reading about others personal knowledge and experience with luxury fashion brands online engages me with those brands.
- I believe that sharing my experiences regarding luxury fashion brand products creates engagement with that brand.
| Co-developing | Co-developing is defined by Brodie et al. (2013) as, “a process where consumers contribute to organizations and/or organizational performance by assisting in the development of new products, services, brands or brand meanings” (p. 111) | CD_1  
CD_2  
CD_3  
CD_4  
CD_5 |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
|                | • If I have the option to customize a product, I am more likely to be engaged with a brand.  
• I am more likely to engage with a luxury fashion brand that is open to ideas/designs from consumers.  
• Being involved in the creation process of a luxury fashion’s product makes me more willing to engage with that brand.  
• Being involved in the creation process of a luxury fashion’s brand meaning, makes me more willing to engage with that brand.  
• I believe that co-developing for luxury fashion brands creates engagement. |
| **Advocating** | Advocating is defined by Brodie et al. (2013) as, “an expression of consumer engagement, which occurs when consumers actively recommend specific brands, products/services, organizations, and/or ways of using products or brands” (p.111) | A_1  
A_2  
A_3 | • If someone recommends a luxury fashion brand’s product to me I will consider purchasing it.  
• If I am satisfied with a luxury fashion brand’s product, I further recommend it.  
• I believe that advocating for luxury fashion brands creates engagement. |
| **Socializing** | Brodie et al. (2013) as, “A way to indicate two-way, non-functional interactions through which consumers acquire and/or develop attitudes, norms and/or community language” (p. 111) | SO_1  
SO_2  
SO_3  
SO_4 | • I feel engaged with a luxury fashion brand when discussing it with others.  
• Discussions about a luxury fashion brand can lead to a positive attitude towards that brand.  
• After forming a positive attitude towards a luxury fashion brand, I am more likely to engage with that brand.  
• I believe that socializing about luxury fashion brands creates engagement. |
4.5.3 Questionnaire design

Concerned with this paper, the researchers decided to use the approach of collecting data through online, electronic questionnaires. As Malhotra (2009) explains, there are a number of different aspects that researchers must consider in order to create a good/successful questionnaire. First of all, the researchers must be specific with the information and why they are conducting the study. As this is vital the researchers of this study made sure that they know what kind of data they want from the respondents through the questions constructed. Bryman and Bell (2015) explain how it is vital to follow some steps in order to make the questionnaire more pleasant for the respondents. The first step would be that the questionnaire needs to have clear information about the research as well as describing different concepts and ways to think while filling in the questionnaire.

As a questionnaire is concerned with constructing questions, they are of an essential part, as not everyone might have the same cultural background, knowledge or language skills, this must be taken into consideration so that all the questions are simplified and easy to understand for anyone (Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010). As there are different types of questions, such as open-ended, structured or unstructured, where open-ended questions do not give respondents alternatives to choose between, it is usually about filling in the answer manually in a text box. Looking at close ended questions it gives the respondents an alternative to choose from, such as a check box. With close-ended questions there are different alternatives to measure the answers, such as a simple, ‘yes’ or ‘no’, or researchers could use a Likert scale, which commonly has five alternatives to choose between, these alternatives are usually between strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (5) (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

Many different researchers discuss the importance of the length of a questionnaire, where the overall perspective is that a questionnaire being shorter has a higher chance of getting a larger amount of responses (Bryman & Bell 2015; Ghauri & Grønhaug, 2010; Malhotra, 2009). Although this point is made by these different researchers, Ghauri and Grønhaug (2010) state that there is no research that confirms the appropriate length of a questionnaire.

According to Bryman and Bell (2015) as well as, Ghauri and Grønhaug (2010), it is more common today that respondents are invited to answer a questionnaire through a link to a website. By using this online questionnaire method, the researchers are able to hide questions from the respondents; this is done by making a couple of questions appear at a time. As this is such a common method now a days, there are many different tools that can be utilized, Bryman and Bell (2015) mention the version of surveymonkey.com, although the authors of this paper decided to use the version of ‘Google forms’ as this is the area where most knowledge was held.
4.5.4 Pre-testing

When conducting a questionnaire, Bryman and Bell (2015) explain the relevance and importance of conducting a pre-test before the questionnaire is distributed to the sample of choice. By pre-testing the questions and overall questionnaire it helps eliminate potential issues that can arise, such as misunderstandings and bad wording by the researchers (Malhotra, 2009). This is done by sending out the completed questionnaire to a small sample of respondents, where these respondents then look over the questionnaire and relay back any issues that can be found to the researchers, in order for them to adjust the questions. Malhotra (2009) explains that a pre-test does not only test the procedure of the method, but can also evaluate the research instrument from an overall perspective, such as the sentences, words, questions and instructions.

As the questionnaire in this research concerned with information from anonymous respondents and the questionnaire is processed by the respondent alone, it is vital that the clearness of the questionnaire is made with no confusion for the respondent (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

In order for the authors of this research to validate the questionnaire, a pre-test was required and tested with the help of knowledgeable individuals from the Linnaeus University master’s program, as well as a lecturer for the marketing department. Through the pre-test and the results from it, the researchers adjusted some of the questions, as well as adding a couple of new ones. Once these changes were made the questionnaire was once again sent out again to find whether there are any more adjustments that need to be made. Once the second pre-test was completed and small final adjustments were made, the questionnaire was ready to be sent out to respondents.

*Questionnaire can be found in Appendix 1.*

4.6 Sampling

When it comes to sampling, there are two different approaches that can be utilized, the first being probability sampling, and the second one being non-probability sampling (Neuman, 2014; Bryman & Bell, 2015). If the study was to be of a qualitative nature then non-probability sampling is commonly utilized, meaning that some individuals have a higher chance of being chosen for a study than others. Whilst if a quantitative approach was taken, the most common way of sampling would be probability sampling, which is when every member of the population has a known chance of being chosen for a study (Neuman, 2014).
According to Bryman and Bell (2015), a population consists of all the units/individuals a researcher can select a sample from; this sample can for example be selected out of cities, nations or a specific company. The sample can be said to be a small part of a population and through this sample try and generalize or show what the whole is like (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009). Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, (2009), show that there are three different types of non-probability sampling, which include, convenience, snowball and quota sampling. When referring to convenience samples, it is about how a researcher collects the sample out of individuals that are available for participation. To use convenience sampling Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, (2009), mention that this method is suitable for when, the universe is not clearly defined, sampling unit is not clear and complete source of list is unavailable. Quota sampling is second method of sampling within non-probability sampling, and refers to when a sample is chosen based on the reflection of the population.

Where there are relative factors that should match within the sample, such as age, gender occupation and other factors, as well as the number of respondents is determined by the population (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009). The last method of non-probability sampling would be snowball sample, this is concerned with the researchers contacting a small group of individuals that are appropriate and relevant to the study, and through these individuals gather more participants that will also have a relevance to the study (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009).

When referring to probability sampling, every individual of the population has an equal chance of being chosen, where there are four different methods mention by Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, (2009), these being, a simple random sample, systematic sampling, stratified sampling and finally a cluster sample. According to Bryman and Bell (2015), a simple random sample is when every single member of the population has the same chance of being included in the sample. Making the selection free from bias as the investigator does not exercise his preference in the choice of units (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009). A systematic sample can be described as a method where a sampling frame is made, and the data is then gathered from the sample frame that has been constructed (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009). A stratified sampling method refers when researchers divide an entire population into different subgroups and from that they randomly select the participants for the sample (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009).

The final one of the four methods for probability sampling is the cluster method, which Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath (2009), and Bryman and Bell (2015), explain to be a random selection of sampling units consisting of population elements. It can be said that in the initial stage, the researcher chooses a cluster and then samples units from within the cluster. A researcher named
Green (1991) provided a formula in order to help determine a sample size, this formula being; \( N > 50 + 8m \) (\( m \) refers to the number of independent variables in the study).

### 4.6.1 Sampling frame and selection

When concerned with a sampling frame, it can be said that it is a list of subsets that are within the target population from which the samples are then gathered, showing that a sampling frame serves as a framework to determine the target population (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009). The sample frame that is to be chosen is overall to reflect the population that has been targeted for the research (Bryman & Bell, 2015).

The authors of this paper have took an approach of probability sampling, where every individual had the option to participate in the questionnaire that was shared by the researchers through social media platforms such as Facebook. The only requirement that was given was that the respondents are of age, being at least 18 years old, as the researchers believe this age and over is the section where individuals consider purchasing luxury fashion products the most. The sample consisted of individuals who have a high interest in fashion as well as those who do not, as anybody has the opportunity to partake in the research. Also as the questionnaire was distributed specifically through the use of social media as well as personally distributed to individuals that the researchers knew. Where these individuals then decide on their own if they want to participate or not, respondents will therefore be individuals who use social media. The then selected sample frame will contribute to past research conducted by Brodie et al. (2013) on consumer engagement, but in the new context of luxury fashion on social media, as it is stated within Brodie et al. (2013) study that the model is needed to be further tested in new contexts, and by testing these triggers of consumer engagement within a new context makes it better for the generalizability of them as a way to define consumer engagement amongst a vast number of existing and related definitions.

After the questionnaire was completed a number of 101 replies had been accepted and considered as respondents. All of the responses came by choice to the respondents if they wanted to partake or not, through using the formula, \( N > 50+8m \) presented by Green (1991) the researchers of this paper came to a result of having at least 90 individuals respond to the questionnaire. As this research is concerned with five different independent variables, 8m becomes 40, and therefore 50+40 became the number the researchers aimed to have as least responses.
4.7 Data analysis method

This section will explain how the collected data was analyzed through the statistical program of SPSS.

4.7.1 Descriptive statistics

The use of descriptive statistics in quantitative research is for clearly summarizing and portraying the empirical data that has been gathered in an understandable way. By using this method it provide details about different statistics that have been gathered (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). There are different ways in presenting the data is descriptive statistics; it can be done through graphs, diagrams, charts or other statistical illustrative tools. Another way of using descriptive statistics would be through the measures of central tendency, which refer to statistical concepts such as the mode, mean, median, dispersion and more. Where the mode shows which value appears most frequently, the mean shows the average value and the median shows the middle value through a distribution of points. The dispersion represents how the data is spread around the central tendency and can be measured through a standard deviation test, which shows the variation around the mean expressed as an average value (Bryman & Bell, 2015). Through using these concepts within the analysis method it helps the researchers interpret the data that has been gathered (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

Also when concerned with descriptive statistics, skewness and kurtosis are two important aspects when analyzing data (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). For skewness and kurtosis of data to be perfect it would have to lie on 0 of a normal distribution curve. Due to the fact that data is never usually perfect, an acceptable kurtosis level would between -3 and 3, and the skewness would lie between -1 and 1 (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).

4.7.2 Correlation analysis

When researchers want to see a relationship between variables, a correlation analysis would be utilized (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009). This analysis method is done through the use of Pearson’s correlation coefficient which stands for the strength of the relationship between variables (Bryman & Bell, 2015). When measuring using Pearson’s correlation coefficient, the ranges are from 0 to 1, where 0 means that there is no relationship between the variables, and 1 stands for a perfect relationship between the variables. There is also a chance of a negative correlation between the variables, meaning that there is a negative relationship between them. If the results come in between
0.3 and 0.9 it can be said that there is a moderate relationship between the variables, whilst if it is below 0.3 there is a weak relationship and if it is above 0.9 there is a very strong relationship (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2015).

4.7.3 Regression analysis

According to Bryman and Bell (2015), a regression analysis is used in order to find a relationship between dependent and independent variables. By using this method of analysis it measures and shows the impact that the independent variable has on one or more of the dependent variables (Bryman & Bell 2015; Iacubucci & Churchill 2015). The value of the dependent variable is measured by having a single independent variable categorized; whilst the other ones are kept fixed, which is then repeated on every independent variable so that the results are visible (Iacubucci & Churchill, 2015). If there is a change in an independent variable that affects the dependent, it suggests that the overall relationship between the variables is of a linear one (Iacubucci & Churchill, 2015).

The authors Saunders, Lewis, and Thornhill (2009) explain two things that can affect the linear regression that need to be taken into consideration; these two being, extreme values on the variables and values that break the assumptions. Extreme values need to be considered as they are risky for the research as they can negatively have an effect on the linearity assumption. That is why it is vital that one step is to remove these extreme values from the analysis. If values break the assumptions then a step to remove or reconstruct the values should be taken in order to increase the reliability of the results (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009).

In this research the aim is to conduct a regression analysis in order to find a relationship between the different variables of Brodie et al (2013) conceptual model, to see whether or not there is a relationship between the variables in the new context of consumer engagement in the luxury fashion industry through social media. Through the regression analysis it will help the researchers of the study accept or rejected their proposed hypotheses in the above chapters.

4.8 Quality criteria

Bryman and Bell (2015) argue for the fact that reliability and validity are the two main quality criteria’s that are required to be put in place when conducting research. When it comes to a quantitative study both of these quality criteria’s are considered highly. Whilst these two are the main concerns when it comes to quality criteria another aspect is replicability, which is closely
linked to reliability (Appannaiah, Reddy & Ramanath, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2015). Below will be an explanation of these three quality criterions.

4.8.1 Content validity

When looking at how Bryman and Bell (2015) as well as Neuman (2014) discuss content validity, which can also be referred to as face validity, it is used to see to which extent the measures that have been used reflect the concept that is under investigation. In order for this to be done, the researchers of the paper can take precautions to ask people, preferably individuals who are experts and have the knowledge needed to evaluate the different measures.

Through using a content validity approach it provides the researchers with information about the clarity and representation of these different measures. By using this method and having other people/experts look at the measures it allows the researchers to improve the measure. This type of validity was utilized within the study as it helped ensure that all the questions represent the variables that are desired.

4.8.2 Construct validity

When referring to construct validity, Bryman and Bell (2015) state that this is described as the measure of the operationalization of the research concept, how specific it is and to which extent is measures the concepts which it is supposed to. Creswell (2012), argues for the importance of construct validity as the researchers may come to faulty conclusions due to errors when measuring the collected data.

Bryman and Bell (2015) states that correlation is the best approach when concerned with measuring construct validity. To find a correlation between variables the method of Pearsons correlation coefficient should be utilized, which is used to summarize how strong or weak a relationship is between those variables (Bryman & Bell 2015; Creswell, 2012). Overall expressing that the closer to 1 the coefficient is, the stronger the relationship, and the closer the coefficient is to 0, the weaker the relationship. This type of validity is to be used within this study when analyzing the results received from the final questionnaire through the use of a correlation analysis.

4.8.3 Criterion validity

When referring to criterion validity, it is said that it is about the ability of the questions in the questionnaire to be able to produce definite predictions, that the questionnaire performs the way that it is expected to (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2015). Some authors divide
criterion validity into two different categories, such as Bryman and Bell (2015), who splits it up into predictive and concurrent validity. From this point of view, predictive validity stands for where the researcher uses the future criterion, whilst the concurrent validity has a set criterion that researchers use in order to estimate the relevancy of the concept in question. For this specific study the researchers use the aspect concurrent validity, meaning that the questions have been carefully evaluated in the sense of credibility and to be in line with concurrent theory.

4.8.4 Reliability

When measuring the reliability of a study, a reliability test investigates if the measures for specific concepts are consistent (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2015; Nueman, 2014). When considering reliability in a study, there are two different aspects that should be considered, these being internal and external reliability. When referring to external reliability, various authors explain that it refers to the stability of the study, meaning that if institutions or academics decide to recreate the same study or use the same tests, would the results be similar or identical, which if they are, reinforces reliability of the study (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009; Bryman & Bell, 2015; Nueman, 2014). When referring to internal validity Bryman and Bell (2015) explain it as investigating if there are any measures that have ended up measuring the same concepts. One way that has been put forward to do this is the through the use of Cronbach’s alpha, which will be utilized within this research. This is used in order to measure the consistency between the responses from the questionnaire, and from there a scale is constructed in order to measure a precise concept (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2009).

When looking at Cronbach’s alpha it is measured from a scale from 0 to 1, where 0 means there is no correlation and 1 means there is high correlation and reliability (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). If the questions are supposed to measure the same concept then the relationship should be strong, which is over 0.6, but at the same time it should not be too strong, which is 0.95 and over, as that would suggest that the questions are practically the same. Although if the questions are supposed to measure different concepts the relationship should be weaker as it is concerned with different concepts. Within this study the authors minimum Cronbach’s alpha was put on 0.6.

For a study to be considered reliable it needs to be stable, which in other words means that it needs to be replicable, for example, if the sample respondents respond to a questionnaire again, the results will not differ to a greater extent (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009).
4.8.5 Replicability

The authors Bryman and Bell (2015) explain that a study should be replicable, meaning that the possibility to reproduce the study is possible, this is in order so that the results that have come from this study and the accuracy of it can be confirmed by other researchers conducting a study in the same field. Overall there should be a detailed process of the steps taken throughout the study so that it acts as guidelines for future research to be conducted in the same way without confusion. The researchers have explained the process and made sure that the replicability of the study is as accurate as it can be, as every step that has been taken throughout the study is explained.

4.9 Ethical considerations

According to Bryman and Bell (2015) there are multiple different ethical issues that might occur when conducting research. There are four main ethical principles that should always be considered and not broken, these being, harm to the participants, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy and finally, deception/fraud. When concerned with harming the participant it refers to more aspects than just physical harm, such as harm to the self-esteem, harm to possible employment, and harm in the sense that the participants might learn more about themselves than they wanted (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Love, 2012). In research there are different ways of looking at the ethical considerations, known as the different stances that the researchers have taken. There are four different stances to consider before conducting the research (Love, 2012). These four stances are, universalism, situational ethics, pervasive ethics and anything goes.

By taking the stance of Universalism the researchers will not break any of the ethical precepts that were mentioned above, the study is to be fully ethical. When it comes to situation ethics, this is the stance researchers take when they believe that it is acceptable to break ethical precepts in order to get the desired results. Pervasive ethics is about not telling the full truth, where the researchers believe that the respondents are never fully truthful, therefore the researchers are not fully truthful with the respondents. Finally there is the stance of anything goes, which can be seen as throwing all the precepts out and conducting the research in whatever way the researcher sees fit, as it is viewed as not being as bad when compared to transgression performed by other institutions such as the media or police (Bryman & Bell, 2015; Love, 2012).

The study conducted takes the ethical issues into consideration. The purpose and objective of the study is clearly stated to all the participants and they are aware of their voluntary participation. Also to make the participants feel even safer they were told that they would keep their anonymity,
and that in no circumstance would this be broken. The participants knew what they were participating in and also the aim of the study was clearly explained to reduce the risk of misunderstandings occurring. Overall of ethical stances were taken into consideration as well as the ethical principles that should not be broken and made sure that none of them were broken throughout the process of gathering the data for the research, as harming the respondents in any form is the last thing the researchers wanted.

4.10 Method summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Approach</th>
<th>Deductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Method</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Explanatory purpose. Cross – sectional design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>Primary Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Probability Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis Method</td>
<td>SPSS – descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Criteria</td>
<td>Content Validity, Construct Validity, Criterion Validity, Replicitability and Reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Considerations</td>
<td>All ethical precepts are taken into consideration for this research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.10 – Method summary*
5. Results

5.1 Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE_AVG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-.874</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L_AVG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>-.655</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_AVG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-.587</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD_AVG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>-.773</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_AVG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>-.506</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO_AVG</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>-.858</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 – Descriptive statistics

In table 5.1 the researchers present the descriptive statistics for each of the variables within the study, both dependent and independent. In this case the researchers decided to use the averages to display it in the table in order to make it is clear as possible and easily understandable for the readers. As also mentioned in previous chapter of the study, the variables were measured through the use of a Likert Scale, which in this research, was ranging from 1 to 5, where one is ‘Strongly Disagree’, three is equivalent to ‘Neutral’ and five is equivalent to ‘Strongly Agree’. Through the descriptive statistics shown in the table 5.1 it gives the average mean of the responses when in regard to the different variables within the study.

By viewing the descriptive statistics in table 5.1 in can be seen that two variables have a mean of less than but close to 3, being Consumer engagement and Sharing, which indicates that the respondents don’t have the best attitude and experiences with these two variables. The dependent variable of Consumer Engagement has a mean of 2.49, indicating that the majority of individuals that took part in the questionnaire are not actively engaged with luxury fashion on social media. When looking at the independent variable of sharing it also has an average of 2.66, indicating that a majority of the respondents do not actively share through the channel of social media.

When concerned with the other four variables it can be seen that the mean values for them are all above three, suggesting that the respondents are generally positive and agree with the different measurements created for these three variables. When concerned with learning it is seen that the majority of respondents believe that this is more of a positive aspect in order to achieve customer
engagement in luxury fashion through social media, this is as the average mean was 3.39. Co-developing is the second variable that respondents are generally positive, where the average mean was 3.58, suggesting that individuals believe that being a part of the creation process of a brand or product will lead to engagement within that brand, in this case luxury fashion. The third variable that respondents had a generally positive attitude towards was advocating, where the average mean was 3.37, indicating that individuals believe that advocating for a luxury fashion brand or hearing about it from somebody else will lead to consumer engagement within that brand. The final variable that had an overall generally positive response from respondents is the variable of socializing, where the average mean came out to be 3.47, indicating that individuals believe socializing through discussion about luxury fashion on social media will lead to consumer engagement.

When concerned with skewness and kurtosis of the data collected in table 5.1, the skewness should lie between -1 and 1 and the kurtosis should lie between -3 and 3. In this case the skewness lies between -0.858 and 0.232, and the kurtosis ranges -0.874 and 1.220. These numbers all fall between the accepted ranges for skewness and kurtosis, and therefore means that the data collected is normally distributed.

5.2 Reliability

As has been mentioned in the previous chapter, Cronbach’s Alpha is used for measuring the reliability for each of the measurements of every concept within the questionnaire. Below, in the following categories the researchers present the Cronbach’s Alpha for each variable in the study, dependent and independent. The recommended levels as mentioned before, lay between 0.6 and 0.9, indicating that the measurements are reliable.

5.2.1 Consumer engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1 – Cronbach’s Alpha

The Cronbach alpha for Consumer Engagement is 0.865, which indicates that the measurements used for this variable are reliable.
5.2.2 Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 2 – Cronbach’s Alpha*

The Cronbach’s Alpha for Learning is 0.837, which indicates that the measurements used for this variable are reliable.

5.2.3 Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 3 – Cronbach’s Alpha*

The Cronbach’s Alpha for Sharing is 0.834, which indicates that the measurements used for this variable are reliable.

5.2.4 Co-Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 4 – Cronbach’s Alpha*

The Cronbach’s Alpha for Co-developing is 0.871, which indicates that the measurements used for this variable are reliable.
5.2.5 Advocating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s Alpha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 5 – Cronbach’s Alpha*

The Cronbach’s Alpha for Advocating is 0.694, which indicates that the measurements used for this variable are reliable.

5.2.6 Socializing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s Alpha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 6 – Cronbach’s Alpha*

The Cronbach’s Alpha for Socializing is 0.831, which indicates that the measurements used for this variable are reliable.

5.2.7 Summarized table of reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer engagement (dependent)</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning (independent)</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing (independent)</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-developing (independent)</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating (independent)</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing (independent)</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.2 – Table of reliability*

By viewing the Table 5.2 above, it is evident the measurements for all variables, both dependent and independent have a Cronbach’s alpha between 0.694 and 0.871. It is seen that all variables but one has a very high reliability compared to the variable of Advocating. Although there is a significant difference between this one variable and the others, it still lays between the recommended levels of 0.6 and 0.9, overall showing us that all measurements are reliable.
### 5.3 Correlation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CE_AVG</th>
<th>L_AVG</th>
<th>S_AVG</th>
<th>CD_AVG</th>
<th>A_AVG</th>
<th>SO_AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE_AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.580**</td>
<td>0.668**</td>
<td>.251*</td>
<td>0.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L_AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.580**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.654**</td>
<td>0.518**</td>
<td>0.699**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S_AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.688**</td>
<td>0.654**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.531**</td>
<td>0.555**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD_AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.251*</td>
<td>0.518**</td>
<td>0.531**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.422**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.483**</td>
<td>0.699**</td>
<td>0.555**</td>
<td>0.422**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO_AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.422**</td>
<td>0.656**</td>
<td>0.566**</td>
<td>0.582**</td>
<td>0.738**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.3 – Correlation analysis*

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

As mentioned in the last chapter, correlation coefficient ranges from 0 to 1 (can also be -0 to -1), where 0 means there is no relationship between variables and 1 means there is a perfect relationship. Correlation coefficient between 0.3 and 0.9 are considered a moderate relationship. Table 5.3 shows that almost all of the variable relationships have a correlation coefficient between the range of 0.422 to 0.738, with the exception of the relationship between co-development and consumer engagement, which has 0.251. All of the variables have a positive relationship with each other individually. Every variable relationship except for one is significant at the 0.01 level. The significant between co-development and consumer engagement is at the 0.05 level.
### 5.4 Regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp. Sign</th>
<th>Model 1 (Control)</th>
<th>Model 2 (L)</th>
<th>Model 3 (S)</th>
<th>Model 4 (CD)</th>
<th>Model 5 (A)</th>
<th>Model 6 (S0)</th>
<th>Model 7 (All)</th>
<th>Verdict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.529**** (0.449)</td>
<td>0.068 (0.354)</td>
<td>0.414* (0.247)</td>
<td>1.349*** (0.455)</td>
<td>0.074 (0.451)</td>
<td>0.265 (0.491)</td>
<td>-0.068 (0.562)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.188 (0.141)</td>
<td>0.003 (0.120)</td>
<td>-0.065 (0.107)</td>
<td>-0.153 (0.138)</td>
<td>-0.153 (0.124)</td>
<td>-0.089 (0.131)</td>
<td>-0.083 (0.109)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.343 (0.226)</td>
<td>0.267 (0.186)</td>
<td>0.369* (0.167)</td>
<td>0.358 (0.220)</td>
<td>0.364* (0.198)</td>
<td>0.377* (0.205)</td>
<td>0.361** (0.169)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.714**** (0.101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.277* (0.147)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.779**** (0.087)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.677**** (0.117)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Developing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.319*** (0.123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.264** (0.118)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.716**** (0.130)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.153 (0.178)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.640**** (0.138)</td>
<td>-0.019 (0.184)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.501*</td>
<td>50.056****</td>
<td>79.683****</td>
<td>6.673***</td>
<td>30.128****</td>
<td>21.481****</td>
<td>15.083****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 – Regression analysis

*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01; ****p<0.001, N=101

S.E (standard error) is presented within parenthesis for each of the independent variables.
5.5 Hypothesis results

Table 5.4 displays the regression analysis, which shows the relationships between all of the variables. This tests the five hypotheses and whether they were accepted or rejected. According to the regression table displayed only two hypothesis, H1 and H2 were accepted, whilst the other three were partially accepted. Meaning that the triggers have an effect on consumer engagement however not all have that significant of an influence on it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Exp. Sign</th>
<th>Model 1 (Control)</th>
<th>Model 2 (L)</th>
<th>Model 3 (S)</th>
<th>Model 4 (CD)</th>
<th>Model 5 (A)</th>
<th>Model 6 (SO)</th>
<th>Model 7 (All)</th>
<th>Verdict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.714****</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.277*</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.147)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.779****</td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.677******</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.117)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Developing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.319****</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.264**</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.118)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.716****</td>
<td>(0.130)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.646*****</td>
<td>(0.138)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.5 – The independent variables in the regression analysis*

5.5.1 Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis; H1. *Learning motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media* is accepted, given that learning has a low significance value at p<0.10 when put together with the other variables testing for the all (model 7, table 5.5). According to the B-value obtained, it shows that learning has a weak correlation (0.277) to consumer engagement however does have a relationship with it. If one were to take into consideration the statistics presented for the learning variable by itself, tested versus consumer engagement (model 2), the results show that their relationship is highly significant having a value of p<0.001 with a much stronger correlation shown in the B-value (0.714). When looking at the r-square results, it indicates a 0.336 value which reflects a 33.6% variation in consumer engagement. Thereby shows an existing relationship between consumer engagement and learning as a way to create engagement.
5.5.2 Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis; H2. Sharing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media is accepted, given that sharing has a high significance value of p<0.001 when put together with the other variables testing for the all (model 7, table 5.5). According to the B-value obtained, it shows that sharing has a strong correlation (0.677) to consumer engagement. When taking into consideration the statistics presented for the sharing variable by itself, tested versus consumer engagement (model 3), the results show that their relationship is highly significant as well with a value of p<0.001 with a much stronger correlation shown in the B-value (0.779). When looking at the r-square results, it indicates a 0.446 value which reflects a 44.6% variation in consumer engagement. Thereby proposing an existent relationship between consumer engagement and sharing as a way to create engagement.

5.5.3 Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis; H3. Co-Developing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media is partially accepted, given that co-developing has a low significance value at p<0.05 when put together with the other variable testing for the all (model 7, table 5.5). According to the B-value obtained, it shows that there is a weak negative correlation (-0.264) to consumer engagement meaning that there is no correlation. However, interestingly enough when taking the variable of co-developing by itself (model 4) it can be seen that the relationship between co-developing and consumer engagement is significant with a value of p<0.01 with a weak correlation of shown in the B-value (0.319). When looking at the r-square results, it indicates a 0.063 value which reflects a 6.3% variation in consumer engagement. Thereby proposing a nearly non-existent relationship between consumer engagement and co-development of products as a way to create engagement.

5.5.4 Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis; H4. Advocating motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media is partially accepted, given that advocating has no significant value when tested, due to the fact that the significance value was too high p>0.10 when put together with the other variables, testing for the all (model 7, table 5.5). According to the B-value obtained, it shows that there is a low correlation (0.153) towards consumer engagement. Interestingly enough, however when taking the variable of advocating by itself (model 5) versus consumer engagement it can be seen that the relationship between both is significant based on the value of p<0.001 with a strong correlation of (0.716) as shown through the B-value. When looking at the r-square results, it indicates a 0.233 value which
reflects a 23.3% variation in consumer engagement. Thereby proposing an existing relationship between consumer engagement and advocating of products as a way to create engagement.

5.5.5 Hypothesis 5

The fifth hypothesis; H5. Socializing motivates consumers to engage with a brand on social media is partially accepted, given that socializing has no significant value when tested, due to the fact that the significance value was too high p>0.10 when put together with the other variables, testing for the all (model 7, table 5.5). According to the B-value obtained, it shows that there is a weak negative correlation (-0.019) to consumer engagement meaning that there is no correlation. However, the results for when this variable is tested by itself towards consumer engagement (model 6) versus consumer engagement it can be seen that the relationship between both is significant based on the value of p<0.001 with a strong correlation of (0.640) as shown through the B-value. When looking at the r-squared results, it indicates a 0.178 value which reflects a 17.8% variation in consumer engagement. Thereby proposing an existing but low relationship between consumer engagement and socializing about a product.
6. Discussion

6.1 Hypothesis 1

Learning as one of the proposed triggers of consumer engagement, was one of the five independent variables that was focused on in this study. The effectiveness of this trigger is discussed within existing research stating that within social media platforms, there is more openness in terms of people freely exposing their stories and experiences with a product or a brand (Black & Kelly, 2009; van Doorn et al., 2010; Brodie et al., 2013).

According to the descriptive statistics for learning, the results showed a mean of 3.39, thereby showing a positive attitude towards learning as a way to engage consumers. The learning variable showed a positive correlation towards consumer engagement. When compared to consumer engagement alone, it showed a high correlation of 0.714 and had a significant value of p<0.001 which shows a positive relationship between the two. However, when this variable was tested together with all the other variables, the results showed a lower correlation value. This means the other independent variables are factors which have a negative effect on learning and consumer engagement in this case when put together. The r-squared value of learning is 0.336 which means that learning out of 100% of the impact on the dependent variable of consumer engagement, learning has 33.6%. This is the second highest out of the five triggers. According to the results found displayed above, the hypothesis pertaining to learning was accepted. Even with the inclusion of all variables the correlation and significance were enough for the hypothesis to be accepted and thereby confirmed within the context of luxury fashion brands online.

From these results obtained, learning motivates consumers to engage with a luxury fashion brand through social media. Thereby reinforcing van Doorn et al. (2010)’s point that by providing a platform or method online through which consumers can discuss amongst one another about a brand’s product or service, the engagement between consumer-to-consumer is thereby facilitated.

6.2 Hypothesis 2

People’s engagement comes from the motivation of being involved within an online community is present, when perceived utility value and interest outweigh the level of perceived risk from shared experiences of other users (Jussila, Kärkkäinen, & Leino, 2012; Nolan, Brizland, & Macaulay, 2007; Brodie et al. 2013). Sharing as one of the proposed triggers of consumer engagement was one of the five independent variables that was focused on this study. From the descriptive statistics obtained,
the results for the variable of sharing were low, the value of the mean was 2.66 showing that people were less prone to share their experiences with luxury fashion brands online. Even though the results obtained for the questionnaire showed sharing to be less influential towards consumer engagement, respondents still believe that this trigger leads to consumer engagement. The results obtained from the regression analysis showed to be positive when analysing the relationship between sharing as a trigger and consumer engagement.

When sharing as an independent variable was compared to consumer engagement alone it showed a high correlation of 0.779 and had a significant value of p<0.001 which shows a positive relationship between the two. However, when the variable was tested together with all the other variables, the results showed a lower correlation value, however not significantly lower when compared to learning as a trigger of consumer engagement for example. Even with the inclusion of all variables the correlation and significance were enough for the hypothesis to be accepted. Sharing has the strongest relationship towards consumer engagement in comparison to the other variables that lead towards consumer engagement with a positive correlation coefficient of 0.677. Sharing has the highest r-square value of the independent variables at 0.446. This means it has the highest impact on consumer engagement at 44.6%. From the results obtained, sharing motivates consumers to engage with a luxury fashion brand through social media.

According to the results in Table 5.5, the hypothesis related to sharing is accepted. Reinforcing Jussila, Kärkkäinen, and Leino (2012)’s statement that social media platforms boost as well as enables the collaboration and learning from customers by providing and receiving feedback regarding new products and services.

### 6.3 Hypothesis 3

Users engaged in co-developing behaviours assist in the collaborative development of new products and services, enabling a firm’s ability to draw upon customer knowledge, experience and capabilities (Greer & Lei, 2011; Menguc, Auh, & Yannopoulus, 2014; Brodie et. al 2013; Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014). Co-developing as one of the proposed triggers of consumer engagement was one of the five independent variables that were focused on this study. The results obtained for the variable of co-developing were low according to the researcher’s descriptive statistics; the value of the mean was of 3.58 and was the highest out of all the independent variables. This indicates that participants were generally more positive about co-developing leading to consumer engagement on its own. When looking through the regression analysis, co-development individually paired with consumer
engagement had an acceptable coefficient correlation of 0.319 and a strong significance of 0.000 which shows that this variable alone has a low correlation with consumer engagement, however when compared to all the variables being tested at the same time, there is a surprising turn on the correlation.

The correlation coefficient between the dependent and independent turns into a weak and negative relationship at -0.264 with a significant of p<0.05. This could mean that consumer engagement is not statistically dependant on co-development, but it could also mean that the study design used to generate the data wasn’t sufficient to detect the dependence. Co-developing has the lowest relationship towards consumer engagement out of all the variables. The r-square result for the independent variable of co-developing was of 0.063, meaning that co-developing has a 6.3% impact on consumer engagement. From the results obtained the hypothesis is rejected. It can be discussed that the relevancy of co-developing by itself does create engagement from the descriptive data obtained.

Validating the statement that co-developing as a trigger has an overall positive impact on a new products performance, when customers are involved in the design and innovation processes (Menguc, Auh, & Yannopoulus, 2014). Jaakkola and Alexander (2014) however state collaborative innovation within the social media context occurs when users contribute their knowledge, skills, and resources to facilitate a firm’s development of an offer, through sharing ideas for improved products or services. This statement can also be seen from the point of view that the company benefits more than the consumer, due to the fact that users are seen as enablers of a firm’s ability to draw upon customer knowledge, experience, and capabilities (Greer & Lei, 2011). Thereby affecting co-development when paired with the other variables to attain consumer engagement.

6.4 Hypothesis 4

In social media terms, advocating may occur through positive electronic word-of-mouth (van Doorn et al., 2010; Sashi, 2012; Brodie et al., 2011; Brodie et. al, 2013). Advocating as a proposed trigger of consumer engagement was one of the five independent variables that were focused on this study. According to the results from the descriptive statistics the mean for the independent variable of advocating showed to be 3.37 showing that people had an overall positive reaction towards agreeing on advocating leading to consumer engagement within luxury fashion brands. Even though the descriptive mean shows a positive outcome in the answers received from the questionnaire;
Individually, advocating had a very strong correlation coefficient with consumer engagement at 0.716 and a very strong significant at p<0.001. However, when tested with all the variables the correlation coefficient showed a very surprising result. It had gone from being a very strong correlation to a very weak correlation at 0.153, and its significant turned out to be p>0.10. This means that advocating seems to affect motivation for consumer engagement alone, but the other variables seem to have a negative effect on the relationship between the two.

Advocating is amongst one of the lowest relationships towards consumer engagement out of all the variables. The r-square result for the independent variable of advocating was of 0.233, meaning that co-developing has 23.3% impact on consumer engagement. From the results obtained the hypothesis is rejected. The positive results obtained from the descriptive data show that people would be more engaged with a brand when it is being advocated from another person’s point of view. Reinforcing van Doorn et. al (2010)’s statement that the recommendation of consumers preference for specific brands, products/services and organizations creates engagement (Sashi, 2012). Positive electronic word of mouth can lead for consumers to be engaged with a brand (van Doorn et. al, 2010). However, since the researcher’s hypothesis was rejected, Brodie et. al (2011) point of view that advocacy is a partnership between a firm and its customers, mutually benefiting both; shows that the company’s involvement is still present through consumers advocation. The involvement of a company in a consumer’s way to advocate a brand can have a negative impact over a consumer’s perception and desire of purchase, whether a company chooses not to embraces honesty and transparency (Brodie et. al, 2011).

6.5 Hypothesis 5

Social media platforms, which incorporate brand pages, provide greater opportunities for interactions to happen, where consumers can obtain social value from computer-mediated interactions with one another (De Vries & Carlson, 2014; Jahn & Kunz, 2012; Brodie et. al, 2013). Socializing as a proposed trigger of consumer engagement was one of the five independent variables that were focused on this study.

When looking over the descriptive statistics for the independent variable of socializing, the mean for it showed to be 3.47, which means that respondents were more agreeing on average towards socializing leading to consumer engagement. Even though the descriptive mean shows a positive outcome in the answers received from the questionnaire; the relationship between socializing and consumer engagement when compared alone, has a fairly strong correlation
coefficient of 0.640 and a very strong significant at p<0.001. However, just like the results from H3 and H4, the results for socializing when tested with all variables were surprising. The correlation coefficient turned into a negative at -0.019 and the significant was higher at p>0.10, which shows an almost non-existent relationship between the two variables. This means the other variables have a very negative effect on the relationship, making it almost irrelevant. For these reasons, the hypothesis is rejected. Advocating is amongst one of the lowest relationship towards consumer engagement out of all the variables. The r-square results for the independent variable of socializing was of 0.178, meaning that socializing has 17.8% impact on consumer engagement. From the results obtained the hypothesis is rejected.

There are suggestions within existing research that a higher perception of social interaction value within an online community of social media brand pages may lead to the customer using the page more frequently and therefore becoming more engaged with the brand (De Vries & Carlson, 2014). Meaning that depending on the user’s perception of social interaction value within an online community, engagement and will of socializing by consumers is affected, if the value is optimal for consumers the engagement will be created and if the value given from a page is minimal consumers are less likely to be engaged (Jahn & Kunz, 2012).

6.6 Overall discussion

Social media can be used to create a two-way communication between consumers themselves and with brands as well, in ways that other channels cannot (Brodie et. al, 2011). Brands overall have had an increase in interest over consumer engagement within past years, this interest leads to possibilities for creating or attaining the engagement of consumers towards a brand. In order to do so, the understanding of how to attain consumer engagement is unclear as there are different existing theories about how to approach such a concept (Brodie et. al, 2013; Dwivedi, 2015; Dessart, L., Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2016; Martínez-Lopéz et. al., 2017; Hollebeek, 2011). There are different existing triggers that affect consumer engagement which brands have not yet fully understood (Brodie et. al, 2013). The benefits that come from each individual trigger are evident according to the results obtained and how they influence consumer engagement individually.

All triggers, learning, sharing, co-developing, advocating, and socializing showed a high significance value of p<0.001 when tested against the dependent variable of consumer engagement by themselves. The results in terms of correlation showed that all variables also had an acceptable value ranging from 0.60-0.70 and co-developing with a low yet acceptable value of 0.319. Showing
that most triggers have a strong correlation towards consumer engagement independently. Thereby
reinforcing previous research analysis on making these triggers relevant to consumer engagement
(Brodie et. al, 2013; Dwivedi, 2015; Dessart, L., Veloutsou, & Morgan-Thomas, 2016; Martínez-
López et. al., 2017; Hollebeek, 2011). The descriptive results showed that all participants agreed in
that these triggers have a positive outcome in terms of getting to know people within a community
for the development of knowledge in regards to a brands product according to the questions posed in
the survey sent out. However, when testing all the triggers together which Brodie et al (2013)
proposes through his model, some triggers showed to be less relevant in comparison to others in
terms of relevancy to attain consumer engagement. Only two of the five triggers from Brodie et al.
model work, when put together with all other triggers. These two were mainly learning and sharing,
which fits the description from (Black & Kelly, 2009; van Doorn et al., 2010; Brodie et al.,2013;
Jussila, Kärkkäinen, & Leino, 2012; Nolan, Brizland, & Macaulay, 2007) that within a social media
community, users sharing of their personal experiences and knowledge enables them to pass
information about services or products along, thereby increasing the knowledge of other unaware
consumers in order to create engagement towards a brand. The acquisition of knowledge gives
consumers a better judgment towards engaging with a brand or not.

The remaining three triggers whose hypotheses were denied showed a low correlation value
ranging from -0.019 and 0.153, in comparison to the learning and sharing triggers which received
0.277 and 0.677 with respective significances of p<0.10 and p<0.001. Interestingly enough out of
the three hypotheses, co-developing had a significance value p<0.05 however received a negative
correlation value showing that the hypothesis regarding co-developing creating consumer
engagement to be denied. Co-developing according to the questionnaire received a statistical mean
of 3.58 being the highest out of all the triggers for which respondents agreed to have an impact on
engagement. For this reason, according to the correlation results, this could explain why co-
developing, even though having its hypothesis rejected, had a positive significance value. This
interpretation goes in hand with Jaakkola and Alexander (2014) where there is mention that through
the contribution of consumers in the development of a product makes it easier for a firm to develop
an offer. There is a positive side for both the company and the consumer through this trigger,
however it does not seem as beneficial for the consumers alone when compared to learning and
sharing which mainly occurs between consumers within an online community. Similar to co-
developing advocating shares a similar explanation for the hypothesis to be rejected. Even though
advocating received a higher correlation value than that of co-developing, there was no significance
value for it. The involvement of a company in a consumer’s way to advocate a brand can have a
negative impact over a consumer’s perception and desire of purchase, whether a company chooses not to embrace honesty and transparency (Brodie et. al, 2011). In order for a brand to have advocates it needs to understand that transparency leads to consumers trust and eventually become advocates for that brand (Brodie et. al, 2011; Sashi, 2012). This trigger however received a statistical mean of 3.37 from respondents showing that advocating can lead to engagement.

Socializing as a trigger also received a negative correlation value just as co-developing however closer to a positive correlation, there was no significant value obtained from the regression analysis done. However, received a value of 3.47 amongst the means from the descriptive data, once again showing that respondents believe this trigger to have an effect on engagement. These results relate with Jahn and Kunz (2012) point of view that the dependency of a consumer’s perception of social value within an online community affects the engagement and will of socializing by consumers, if the value is optimal for consumers the engagement will be created and if the value given from a page is minimal consumers are less likely to be engaged (Jahn & Kunz, 2012).

From the three triggers that were rejected there is a pattern that can be observed, the trigger of co-development seems to benefit the company more than the consumers when it comes to engagement. In order for advocating to have an impact over engagement a brand must be honest and transparent in their motives for consumers to reciprocate a positive word of mouth. Finally, socializing is a main part of online communities and the main purpose through which consumers can learn and share information about a brand; if the social value within a community is low, or the amount of information is not relevant to what users seek there is less engagement. These are things to consider from a managerial perspective if these triggers are to be taken into consideration. They do have a positive impact towards engagement by themselves however do not seem as relevant when compared to the other two triggers of learning and sharing, which showed to be the most relevant when engaging consumers within online communities.
7. Conclusion

To conclude, it is obvious that consumer engagement is a complicated concept with many different definitions existing. There have been several different studies conducted on what helps lead to customer engagement, where researchers have come to different conclusions and display an uncertainty with what is the best way to achieve customer engagement. In this case it was through the use of Brodie et al. (2013) conceptual model of consumer engagement, where it is discussed and analyzed whether the variables of learning, sharing, co-developing, socializing and advocating also apply to the new context of consumer engagement in luxury fashion through social media.

Overall, the purpose of this study was to test Brodie et al. (2013) already existing conceptual model of consumer engagement in the new context of luxury fashion through social media. This was done to find a relationship when concerning learning, sharing, co-developing, socializing and advocating, when in relation to consumer engagement. The research of this study ended up with some surprising results that the researchers did not foresee. As only two of the five hypotheses presented were accepted whilst the other three were rejected, however for the hypotheses’ that were rejected, they still seem relevant to the case of this study. The two independent variables whose hypotheses were accepted were the triggers of learning and sharing. The three independent variables that were rejected (co-developing, advocating and sharing) still show significance when tested on their own and tested against the dependent variable of consumer engagement, suggesting that there is a relationship between these independent variables and the dependent when on their own. However, when tested together with all the other variables the results showed that there was no significance, hence leading to three of the five hypotheses being rejected.

Due to the results it can be argued that each of the triggers within Brodie et al. (2013) conceptual model leads to consumer engagement when tested on its own, but when tested together the results take a turn where three variables have less of an impact on consumer engagement than the other two whose hypotheses were accepted. This suggests that consumer engagement in the luxury fashion industry can be achieved through the different triggers independently, but when all combined, seems to have less success.
8. Contributions, limitations, and future research

8.1 Theoretical and practical contribution

As was mentioned in the problem discussion, Brodie et al. (2013) definition for consumer engagement is a working definition, meaning that the results presented by Brodie et al. (2013) need to be backed up for it to be further validated. Research on what leads to consumer engagement can be found within existing research papers, this study differs from previous research in the framework and new context of testing these different independent variables of consumer engagement on social media in the luxury fashion segment. As the sampling method of this research was of a probability sample, it will contribute to this field in the sense that it can aid in the generalizability of the population.

When concerned with the contribution of this research, it can be said that it is about the testing of different variables that lead to consumer engagement on social media in the luxury fashion industry. This was done through the testing and combination of learning, sharing, co-developing, advocating and socializing, to uncover whether these lead to consumer engagement on social media in the luxury fashion industry. Through this research the researchers have uncovered some surprising and interesting data, finding that all the independent variables on their own do lead to consumer engagement, but once they are all put together and analyzed, it becomes evident that not all these variables together help lead to engagement. This does not mean that these variables should be disregarded, as they still have a contribution to consumer engagement within this context.

Also, as stated previously in this study, there are many different issues and definitions identified in the field of consumer engagement. Through the results gathered in this research, companies can utilize it to help with consumer engagement, where the recommended focus would be on the variables learning and sharing, as these were the variables that showed the best results and largest relevance, although as stated previously, the other variables should not be disregarded because of this as they still have relevance in this context. From this research's findings, companies can build plans and strategies that focus on these variables, as well as having the option to choose which trigger has the most relevancy to their strategy, which will lead to individuals becoming engaged within the luxury fashion industry on social media.
8.2 Research limitations

In all studies, there are limitations that arise throughout the research and analysis process, sometimes it may be a few limitations, and other times there might be a lot of limitations. In this study the authors wanted to use Brodie et al. (2013) conceptual model in a new context to see whether the triggers he believes lead to consumer engagement can be applied to the luxury fashion segment through social media, and thereby more generalizable. Although it can be argued that the majority of individuals which took part of the questionnaire have at some point in their life made a luxury fashion purchase, there is no proof or evidence that this is the case, as anybody had access to the questionnaire through the channel of social media. As the sampling within this study was almost completely random due to limitation of time and resources, the researcher’s barley know anything about the respondents, which could be a problem in the sense that the respondents are so very different that it can affect the results overall in terms of purchasing or having an interest in luxury fashion brands.

8.3 Future research

When concerned with consumer engagement it is evidently an interesting topic. As has been mentioned previously in the study, customer engagement is a field where additional research is required for further clarification and re-enforcement. As consumer engagement is a very broad concept and can be defined in many different ways, as mentioned previously, future research of using models such as Brodie et al. (2013) can conduct similar studies on either different geographical areas or on other markets for it to be generalized even further, due to the fact that this study is concerned specifically with the engagement with luxury fashion through social media.

In the case of this study the researchers decided not to focus on the control variables of age and gender in the analysis chapter, but focus mainly on the dependent and independent variables that are included to test their value when it comes to the attainment of consumer engagement. Therefore, in future research it can be a good idea to see whether the control variables have a significant effect on consumer engagement within the luxury fashion segment through social media. Another factor that can be taken into consideration for the future is the sample size, although the recommended sample size was reached in the study, future researchers should attempt to gather a larger sample in order to have the results be even more generalizable.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 – Questionnaire

Consumer engagement within Luxury Fashion on Social Media

Hello!

We are happy that you are taking time to help us complete this questionnaire for our final bachelor thesis. The questionnaire will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete.

We are three marketing students from Linnéuniversitetet in Växjö, Sweden. We are writing our thesis on consumer engagement through social media within the luxury fashion industry. Consumer engagement is about the intensity of an individual's participation and connection with a brand's offering. It also refers to activities that are initiated by either the customer or the brand. Examples of luxury fashion brands are NIKE, Rolex, Hugo Boss, Ralph Lauren, Swarovski, Michael Kors, etc. When referring to social media we refer to different online communities such as, Facebook, Twitter, blogs, community forums etc.

For ethical reasons all of the respondents are to be of at least 18 years of age. Your answers are anonymous and unable to be tracked back to you. It is voluntary for you to participate, but we appreciate your time and cooperation.

If you have any specific questions feel free to contact us:

Birkir Páll Benediktsson - bb222gd@student.lnu.se
Jonas Gustav Peter Levenius - jjl223gm@student.lnu.se
Sebastian Ramos Melo - sr222nf@student.lnu.se

Thank you in advance for your participation!

How old are

☐ 19-20
☐ 21-25
☐ 26-30
☐ Above 30

Gender

☐ Male
☐ Female
Consumer engagement within Luxury Fashion on Social Media

The Likert scale is used and is scaled from 1-5:
1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

Have you ever engaged with a luxury fashion brand on social media? *

Engagement can be understood as taking part in a conversation about a brand, posting a comment, or searching up information about a brand/product online.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

How frequently do you engage with online communities related to luxury fashion brands on social media?

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree

I’m interested in taking part of an online community of a luxury fashion brand.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree

Strongly Agree
I believe that learning about luxury fashion products before purchase is more likely to engage me with a brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning about a luxury fashion brand from other consumers makes me more willing to engage with that brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experts within a luxury fashion brand community that teach others about the brand’s products make me more willing to engage with that brand.

Experts are considered consumers that have a high level of engagement and knowledge about a brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe that learning about a luxury fashion brand engages me with that brand.
I share my experiences regarding luxury fashion brands on social media.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree

I would be willing to share my experiences regarding luxury fashion brands on social media.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree

Reading about others personal knowledge and experience with luxury fashion brands online engages me with those brands.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree

I believe that sharing my experiences regarding luxury fashion brand products creates engagement with that brand.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree
If I have the option to customize a product, I am more likely to be engaged with a brand.

Customizing a product means, changing aspects of a product for one’s personal preference. Eg. Color, Design, etc.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree

I am more likely to engage with a luxury fashion brand that is open to ideas/designs from consumers.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree

Being involved in the creation process of a luxury fashion’s product makes me more willing to engage with that brand.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree

Being involved in the creation process of a luxury fashion’s brand meaning, makes me more willing to engage with that brand.

Brand meaning refers to brands ideas, perceptions, and promises.

1  2  3  4  5

Strongly Disagree  ○  ○  ○  ○  ○  Strongly Agree
I believe that co-developing for luxury fashion brands creates engagement.*

Co-developing is when consumers assist in developing new products, services, brands, or brand meanings.

Strongly Disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇  Strongly Agree

If someone recommends a luxury fashion brand’s product to me I will consider purchasing it.*

Strongly Disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇  Strongly Agree

If I am satisfied with a luxury fashion brand’s product, I further recommend it.*

Strongly Disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇  Strongly Agree

I believe that advocating for luxury fashion brands creates engagement.*

Advocating occurs when consumers actively recommend specific brands, products/services, organizations, and/or ways of using products or brands.

Strongly Disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇  Strongly Agree
I feel engaged with a luxury fashion brand when discussing it with others. *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussions about a luxury fashion brand can lead to a positive attitude towards that brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After forming a positive attitude towards a luxury fashion brand, I am more likely to engage with that brand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe that socializing about luxury fashion brands creates engagement. *

Socializing is when consumers have interactions where they develop attitudes and norms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>