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Report Summary

Traditionally, marketers have used customer satisfaction as a guiding objective and metric. Increasingly, however, marketers are focusing on customer engagement as a complement or even an alternative to satisfaction, and many large, established companies have made engagement a major objective of their marketing efforts. At the same time, there is little agreement on what engagement is or how to employ it as a marketing metric.

Whereas satisfaction is an integrative, usually post-hoc evaluation of a product or service, engagement is a highly personal and motivational state arising out of consumer experiences with a product or service. It is not yet clear how engagement should be conceptualized and whether it is fundamentally different from satisfaction. That is, will measures of satisfaction and engagement actually reveal different facets of the customer point-of-view that most companies seek to capture?

In this report, Bobby Calder, Mathew Isaac, and Edward Malthouse clarify the concept of engagement and show that it can offer unique insights from satisfaction. Specifically, they suggest that because satisfaction is a summary concept that reflects a product’s overall value, a host of product-related factors such as price and availability are likely to impact one’s satisfaction. These factors are less likely to influence engagement, which arises from experiencing a product in pursuit of a larger personal goal. Engagement reflects the qualitative experience of what consuming the product means for the person.

The authors develop a new model for measuring engagement, consistent with their conceptualization, and demonstrate via two large-scale surveys that engagement and satisfaction are each uniquely and incrementally predictive of different kinds of consumption behaviors.

Managerial implications

In order to evaluate their marketing activities, many companies regularly query their customers following a consumption experience. This research suggests, first, that it is worthwhile to assess both satisfaction and engagement whenever possible since each construct can provide different insights into the customer’s point-of-view. Second, their study suggests that satisfaction may be the better indicator for consumption metrics that reflect the evaluation of alternatives, such as the intention to repurchase a product. Engagement is likely to be the superior predictor for metrics that reflect the motivation of consumers to consume more, such as consumption frequency, level, and depth of usage.

A recent example from Facebook illustrates: For 2011, Facebook received a relative low satisfaction score (66 out of 100) in an American Customer Satisfaction Index study. Yet in terms of the amount of time consumer spend on social media, Facebook is dominant. The engagement construct provides a possible explanation for those contradictory results: Facebook may be high on engagement, which translates into heavy usage, but low in other factors that affect customer satisfaction, such as unhappiness with Facebook’s privacy policy or negative comparisons relative to alternative social media sites. As a result, Facebook may be vulnerable even though it is highly engaging. Scenarios like this underscore the need to look at engagement as well as satisfaction in order to fully understand the customer’s point-of-view.
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In his landmark book *The Practice of Management*, Peter Drucker (1954) espoused a famously expansive view of marketing “as the whole business seen from the point of view of the final result, that is, from the customer's point-of-view.” Marketers have largely attempted to take this point-of-view by measuring customer satisfaction. Surveys of customer satisfaction have in fact become ubiquitous, a routine part of most companies’ evaluation of their marketing activities. Typically, consumers respond at some post-consumption point-in-time to questions about their overall evaluation of the product and/or their evaluation of specific aspects of it. Marketers interpret these responses as the customer’s view of the product.

Laudable as it is to take the customer’s point-of-view, research increasingly indicates the need to ask: *which* point-of-view? We will argue that satisfaction is indeed one point-of-view but that there are others, as well. Marketers seeking to follow Drucker’s dictum need to consider the relevance of these other points-of-view.

There are actually four relevant alternative points-of-view that consumers can have with respect to a product. One is indeed that of evaluating satisfaction. Recently, however, there has been increasing interest in another construct, *engagement*, as a complement or even an alternative to satisfaction. These two constructs constitute four points-of-view because each can be assessed on a real-time basis or a post-consumption basis. Generally, satisfaction is thought of as an evaluative, post-hoc response to product consumption (Hunt 1977; Mano and Oliver 1993), and this is the point-of-view assumed here. In this research, we take engagement as a highly personal, motivational state that, for reasons noted below, we measure on a post-consumption basis as well. We seek to clarify this concept of engagement and to show that it can offer different insights from satisfaction.

**What is Engagement and Why Does It Matter?**

Over the past fifteen years, the idea of engagement has generated substantial interest among marketers. A recent comprehensive review by Brodie, Hollebeek, Juric, and Ilic (2011) surveyed the literature from marketing and other disciplines to arrive at the following consensus definition of customer engagement: ¹

¹ Various modifiers have been attached to engagement, and the terms “customer engagement” and “consumer engagement” have often been interchanged. We use the term “engagement,”
Customer engagement (CE) is a psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive, co-creative customer experiences with a focal agent/object (e.g. a brand) … under a specific set of context-dependent conditions … and exists as a dynamic, iterative process … in which other relational concepts… are antecedents and/or consequences.

While this definition was formulated with service encounters in mind, we believe that it represents an emerging view in marketing that (1) locates engagement as a state that arises from experiences that are context-dependent, and (2) hypothesizes that engagement plays a role in a larger nomological network of explanation (Malthouse and Calder 2011). The key to the definition is that engagement arises out of the different ways in which a product or service is experienced. These experiences reflect the individual’s interaction with the product over time as a way of accomplishing personal goals. The level of engagement arising from these experiences can in turn affect other variables such as the extent to which the product is consumed in the future.

Other work supports the view that engagement arises out of all the experiences a consumer has with a product. Engagement has been characterized in broad terms as a multi-dimensional construct comprised of cognitive, emotional and behavioral facets (Higgins and Scholer 2009; Pham and Avnet 2009). And Patterson, Yu, and de Ruyter (2006), attempting to establish a more precise definition, articulated four specific experiences associated with engagement: absorption (the level of customer concentration on a focal engagement object), dedication (a customer’s sense of belonging to the organization/brand), vigor (a customer’s level of energy and mental resilience in interacting with a focal engagement object), and interaction (the two-way communications between a focal engagement subject and object).

The experiential nature of engagement is what distinguishes it from seemingly similar constructs such as involvement and loyalty. For example, one may be highly involved in selecting a new home security system, but this involvement does not necessarily entail the kind of rich experiences at the heart of the engagement construct. As another example, one might be very loyal to a particular airline without having the sort of experiences that result in engagement. Engagement flows from experiencing a product as something that leads to a larger personal goal. One experiences “a proactive, interactive customer relationship with a specific engagement object” (Calder and Malthouse 2004). Engagement reflects the qualitative experience of what

without any modifiers, in this paper to denote engagement of a customer with a product or service. Likewise, we use the terms “experience” and “satisfaction” without modifiers.
consuming the product means for the person. High engagement comes from rich qualitative experiences of this kind.

Given the conceptualization of engagement articulated above, it is obvious that the construct requires more careful elucidation to be useful. We contend that engagement reflects facets of consumption that other concepts like satisfaction do not. To test our claim, we develop a model for measuring engagement, consistent with our general conceptualization, and examine the impact of engagement on consumption. Furthermore, we investigate the relationship between engagement and satisfaction and demonstrate that the two constructs can play divergent roles in explaining consumer behavior.

**Measuring engagement arising from experiences**

The notion that engagement stems from experiential value is reflected in Brodie et al.’s (2011) consensus definition of engagement as a psychological state arising from context-dependent experiences. In order to model engagement based on this conceptualization, as we aim to do in this article, it is first necessary to determine what comprises an experience. This in itself is a major issue and an important component of the present research.

Over the past forty years, researchers have proposed a number of different definitions of experience. Nelson (1970) distinguished experience goods from search goods, noting that experience goods are judged by the feelings that they evoke rather than the functions that they perform. Pine and Gilmour (1998) suggested that “an experience occurs when a company intentionally uses services as the stage, and goods as props, to engage individual consumers in a way that creates a memorable experience.” Meyer and Schwager (2007) defined experience as “the internal and subjective response customers have to any direct or indirect contact with a company.”

Several researchers have noted that experiences are inherently subjective and personal. According to Pine and Gilmour (1999), “experiences are events that engage individuals in a personal way.” Calder and Malthouse (2008) describe an experience “as something that the consumer is conscious of happening in his or her life,” a sense of movement. In sum, the extant literature suggests that experiences are subjective, qualitative, personal, memorable, and often emotional. Building on these perspectives, we consider an experience to be a meaningful connection between a consumption episode and a consumer’s own life. We follow Higgins
(2006; 2005) in conceptualizing such experiences as motivational, in that they provide a sense of movement toward some goal.

Since experiential value is so central to engagement, we examined prior attempts at measuring experiences for potential inclusion in our measurement model. By in large, academicians and practitioners have avoided quantitative measures of the experience concept and opted instead to highlight its qualitative richness and subjectivity (e.g., Holbrook and Hirschman 1982; Pine and Gilmore 1999; Schmitt 1999; Wolf 1999). A recent exception is the brand experience scale (Brakus, Schmitt, and Zarantonello 2009), which uses ratings of the sensory, affective, intellectual, and behavioral dimensions of brand experience. These rating scales can be classified as indirect in that they did not vary based on the actual brand being rated. Brakus and his colleagues provided evidence that their scale was valid, reliable, and distinct from other brand measures. Importantly, brand experience affected satisfaction directly and indirectly through another variable, brand personality. We believe that the brand experience scale represents a major step forward in quantifying experiences.

Whereas Brakus et al. (2009) employed ratings of four indirect descriptive dimensions of consumer experience, Thomson, MacInnis, and Park (2005) viewed experiences at an even higher level as a form of emotional attachment (EA) to a brand. Using terms that describe attachment (e.g., loved, bonded, delighted), they developed a 10-item EA scale and showed that it measures three factors (affection, connection, and passion) that relate to the second-order factor of emotional attachment to a brand. And Sprott, Czellar, and Spangenberg (2009) employed an even more indirect approach. They developed an eight-item scale to measure “brand engagement in self-concept” (BESC). Engagement was conceptualized as an individual difference—a generalized propensity to include brands as part of how one thinks about oneself. An example BESC item is “I have a special bond with the brands that I like.” In contrast with this work, but consistent with the indirect approach, Mano and Oliver (1993) viewed engagement more narrowly in terms of only the affective experience of brands. Engagement, along with pleasantness, was modeled as one of two dimensions of affective experience.

In this research, we follow the same hierarchical logic used by Brakus et al. (2009) and others, but employ more proximate and contextually rich direct measures of experiences, rather than the indirect descriptive dimensions, like sensory or affective, that characterize previous work. In our measurement model, engagement is conceptualized as a higher-order factor that that
arises out of specific experiences (Calder, Malthouse, and Schaedel 2009; Malthouse and Calder 2010). Thus we use our direct experience measures to derive an overall measure of the degree of engagement. Subsequently, we examine the predictive power of the measure of engagement on consumption behavior, in isolation and in concert with the traditional marketing metric of satisfaction.

The measurement of experiences is the basis for our measurement model for engagement. As noted earlier, there are two alternative approaches to measuring experiences. One way would be to attempt the real-time description of experiences as they happen. Though potentially valuable, the problem with this approach is that measurement itself may intrude on or alter the experience. Even more importantly, there is the strong argument put forward by Kahneman, Wakker, and Sarin (1997) and Kahneman (2011) that the remembered experience determines future behavior and that much of the real-time experience is inaccessible after the immediate experience is over. Kahneman goes so far as to postulate two selves, the experiencing self and the remembering self. “The remembering self is sometimes wrong, but it is the one that keeps score and governs what we learn from living, and it is the one that makes decisions” (Kahneman 2011, p. 381). In this research, we therefore focus on the remembered experience, measured after the immediate experience.

While Kahneman’s work indicates that retrospective measures should be preferred in that they capture the accessible aspects of experiences that can affect future behavior, it is also the case that retrospective accounts necessarily involve beliefs about experiences rather than direct access to them (Robinson and Clore 2002). Thus, our engagement measures are based on beliefs about experiences.

The items we use to measure experiences are direct and context-specific; they were developed through qualitative interviews and analyzed using exploratory factor analysis and coefficient alpha. In the first study reported in this article, we examine the experience of reading a newspaper, which for our research participants is an oft-repeated behavior, one for which they have well-formed beliefs about their experiences. One experience, for instance, turns out to be social in nature and is commonly reflected by agreement or disagreement with statements such as the following: *I commonly bring up things I’ve read in this newspaper in conversations with others.* Another statement reflecting this social experience is: *I show things in this newspaper to others in my family.* Beliefs such as these can be uncovered through qualitative interviews and
used to form a scale for measuring an experience, in this case the experience of reading the newspaper for social purposes.

Our items can be instructively contrasted with the experience scale developed by Brakus and his colleagues, which uses items such as *I find this brand interesting in a sensory way* and *This brand does not appeal to my senses*. As mentioned previously, the Brakus et al. (2009) method allows measurement of experiences with scales based on four dimensions: sensory (using items like those above), affective (*The brand is an emotional brand*), behavioral (*I engage in physical actions and behaviors when I use this brand*), and intellectual (*I engage in a lot of thinking when I encounter this brand*). In effect, the experience is being described in terms of beliefs about these four dimensions. Whereas this is an entirely reasonable method for measuring experiences, and useful in that it applies widely across products, we note that it is limited to beliefs about the four abstracted dimensions of the experience. This might be called the dimensional-characterization method, as it does not attempt to directly measure beliefs about the qualitative nature of the experience.

In contrast, our method employs more proximate, though not real-time, measures of experiences using beliefs about the nature of the experiences. We surmise that our qualitative-belief method may be particularly effective at mitigating the numerous limitations of retrospective measures (for a discussion, see Robinson and Clore 2002). We begin with a large pool of context-specific beliefs that are then analyzed to determine underlying experience factors. These factors constitute scales for measuring experiences.

In our measurement model, engagement is a second-order factor that reflects the underlying experience factors as measured by their associated qualitative-belief scales. Items like the aforementioned *I commonly bring up things I’ve read in this newspaper in conversations with others* are used as indicators of a social experience factor that in turn combine with other experience factors to form the higher-order engagement factor. Thus, we conceptually and empirically link engagement to a number of first-order experience factors. One of the contributions of this research is to develop and explore the validity of our qualitative-belief method for measuring engagement.
Comparing engagement with satisfaction

As noted earlier, satisfaction has regularly been characterized as the final goal of marketing. As stated in an early edition of a leading marketing text, “business functions to satisfy the needs of the consumers” (Converse and Huegy 1946). In a survey of 124 large companies, Mentzer et al. (1995) found that 75% of these companies mentioned the words “customer satisfaction” explicitly in their mission statements. Consonant with its central role in marketing, the literature on satisfaction is voluminous; at the time of this writing, the term “customer satisfaction” (in quotes) returns 434,000 articles in Google Scholar, and “consumer satisfaction” returns 80,700. Even half a century after Cardozo’s (1965) seminal article on the subject, enriching our understanding of satisfaction remains an active endeavor for academicians and practitioners alike.

Despite marketers’ ongoing interest in the topic, a consensus definition of satisfaction has never been established. Giese and Cote (2000) concluded after an extensive review of the literature that satisfaction is “a summary affective response of varying intensity… directed toward focal aspects of product acquisition and/or consumption.” Researchers have generally agreed that satisfaction is a response to an evaluation process that often occurs following consumption (Giese and Cote 2000; Yi 1990). The notion of satisfaction as a summary concept or overall evaluation is well documented (Fornell 1992; Haistead, Hartman, and Schmidt 1994; Oliver 1992; Westbrook 1987). Irrespective of whether the focal object has been defined narrowly (e.g., a single product attribute or feature) or broadly (e.g., the product as a whole), satisfaction judgments appear to be both retrospective and integrative— the product of a backward-looking aggregation process on the part of the consumer.

Because satisfaction is a response to an evaluation process, it is by definition different from engagement. It is most often conceived as a post-hoc judgment about the value of a product. As such, engagement with a product may, or may not, be included in this evaluation. And factors that affect satisfaction (e.g., price) may or may not affect engagement. Based on this discussion, we can formulate the following hypothesis to be tested in Study 1:

Hypothesis 1. A direct relationship exists between engagement and consumption that is not mediated by satisfaction.
Study 1: Does Engagement Contribute Beyond Satisfaction?

In this study, we test our basic contention that both engagement and satisfaction are significantly and independently related to consumption behavior. We chose newspaper readership as the context for this study because understanding the variation among consumers in readership behavior has both theoretical and practical significance (Burgoon and Burgoon 1980; Loges and Ball-Rokeach 1993). Satisfaction is a ubiquitous industry metric. Additionally, reading a newspaper, whether in print or online, may be highly experiential. As such, it can evoke strong beliefs about the experience, making it an appropriate context for assessing engagement.

Methods

Our data sample came from a large-scale survey of newspaper readers. After first identifying newspaper readers in 52 U.S. markets, we sent a random sample of 19,575 readers a 12-page questionnaire with a $2 incentive. We received 10,858 responses, giving a 55% response rate from the list of readers. We note that this response rate is high and that there is no reason to believe non-response would affect our engagement and satisfaction results. Next, we describe the primary measures that were embedded in the questionnaire: satisfaction, engagement, and newspaper consumption.

Satisfaction. Prior research has utilized a wide array of self-reported satisfaction measures (e.g., Fornell et al. 1996; Reichheld 1996). To enhance the generalizability of our findings, we chose three common types of satisfaction measures that comprise the main ways in which satisfaction data is typically collected: a single-item measure, a multi-item measure, and a weighted multi-item measure that weights satisfaction responses by importance. The single-item measure, hereafter labeled “Overall Satisfaction,” was the following question: “Overall, what rating would you give to this newspaper?” Responses were measured on a 5-point semantic differential scale.

The multi-item satisfaction scale (“Aggregate Satisfaction”) was constructed from 42 standard satisfaction questions about the content of the newspaper. The question wording was as

2 Details of the survey, including the survey questions and the list of newspapers studied, are available at www.readership.org.
follows: “Please rate this newspaper on each of the following kinds of content. To answer use a 5-point rating scale for which ‘1’ means that it is ‘poor’ and a ‘5’ means that it is ‘excellent.’ Respondents rated 42 different aspects of content such as “Government: National,” “Comics,” “Food,” “War/International Conflict,” and “Weather.” These content areas reflect the typical structure of newspapers. We classified these items as satisfaction questions since they required respondents to evaluate different aspects of the newspaper. The scree plot from an exploratory factor analysis suggested that a single factor was reasonable. Coefficient alpha for the 42 items was .98 and decreased when any single item was removed. Our Aggregate Satisfaction measure was the simple mean of all 42 items.

Our final satisfaction measure (“Weighted Satisfaction”) was the importance-adjusted mean of these same 42 items. More specifically, after rating each of the 42 aspects of newspaper content, respondents were instructed as follows: “Then please indicate how important each is to you personally [on a 1-3 scale].” We first calculated the product of the satisfaction rating for each aspect of the newspaper and its importance to the respondent. As with the unweighted satisfaction questions, a scree plot from a factor analysis suggested a single dominant factor and coefficient alpha was .97, indicating a reliable scale. Weighted Satisfaction was computed as the simple mean of the 42 products, which was then transformed to be on a 1-5 scale.

Engagement. Our approach for measuring engagement follows the logic of our previous discussion of engagement and experiences and work by Calder, Malthouse and Schaedel (2009) conceptualizing the aggregate set of experiences that people have with a media product as engagement. Building upon the results of in-depth qualitative interviews with newspaper readers conducted previously by Calder and Malthouse (2004) and the functional explanation of media usage proposed by McQuail (1983, pp. 82-3), we developed a set of items from which we identified the following five experience factors:

---

3 The first eigenvalue was 23.4 and the next four were slightly greater than 1. The multi-factor solution is fairly interpretable, breaking out content areas such as hard news, sports, entertainment and special sections, but has many large cross-loadings. If we follow a parallel approach to our conceptualization of engagement as a second-order construct manifested in specific experiences and conceptualize satisfaction as a second-order construct manifesting itself in these first order satisfaction factors, the results are essentially identical to those from the single-factor model used here.
• **Social.** This experience involves talking about and sharing newspaper content with others. By reading the paper, readers become more interesting to other people and can better connect with others.

• **Intrinsic enjoyment.** This experience is one of having a break and forgetting about everything else, of being transported into a better mood or state of mind.

• **Utilitarian.** The newspaper provides useful advice and tips to readers, expands their world by suggesting places to see and things to do, and shows them the right way of doing things.

• **Identity.** Readers are affirming and expressing their identity by reading a particular paper.

• **Civic.** Some people believe that the newspaper is vital to the well-being of a community because it connects them and make them feel part of the community, and serves as a balance against the powerful.

Table 1 provides the exact items for the five experiences, as well as parameter estimates from the confirmatory factor analysis that we conducted on these items (Tables and figures follow References throughout). Figure 1 gives the loadings from the second-order confirmatory factor model showing how the second-order engagement construct is related to the first-order experience factors. Our estimate of engagement is the simple average of the five experience factors. Each experience is estimated by the simple average of the items loading on it.

**Consumption.** The dependent variable for our analysis was consumers’ level of newspaper readership (i.e., their usage behavior), measured by their reader behavior score (RBS, Calder and Malthouse 2003). RBS quantifies a person’s overall pattern of usage of the newspaper with a single numerical value, which allows people to be compared on a unidimensional scale of readership. Although the RBS is a single number, it incorporates how often people typically read the newspaper, how much time they spend with it, and how completely they read it. Since these questions were asked separately for the weekday and Sunday papers, a total of six RBS items appeared in the questionnaire that newspaper readers completed. Following Calder and Malthouse (2003), we used a simple average of the transformed individual items. Each of the six

---

4 Following Calder et al. (2009), we first estimated a measurement model allowing correlations between all factors, and this model fit acceptably well (GFI=.91, NFI=.91, CFI=.91, RMSEA=0.067). We then estimated a model with a single second-order factor explaining the correlations between individual experiences.
scales was transformed so as to have a maximum value of 7 and a minimum value of 1, where the value 7 indicates maximum newspaper consumption. The resulting RBS measure was unidimensional with a coefficient alpha of .78. Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for all of our measures.

Results

We tested for a direct link between engagement and RBS consumption (i.e., readership) independent of satisfaction by specifying a causal model between the constructs. Since we have a two-stage sample of newspapers and respondents, we used a hierarchical linear model. For respondent j of newspaper i, let $y_{ij}$ be the value of a dependent variable (e.g., readership), and $x_{ijk}$ be the value of predictor variable k ($k = 1$ for engagement, $k = 2$ for satisfaction) and where $\alpha$ and $\beta_k$ are the intercept and slopes across all ads, $a_i$ and $b_{ik}$ are normal random variables with means 0 and standard deviations $\sigma_a$ and $\sigma_{\beta_k}$ quantifying specific effects for newspaper i, and $e_{ij}$ is a residual with mean 0 and standard deviation $\sigma_e$. This model, shown in the equation given below, allowed us to estimate the heterogeneity in effects across newspapers.

$$y_{ij} = (\alpha + a_i) + (\beta_1 + b_{i1})x_{ij1} + (\beta_2 + b_{i2})x_{ij2} + e_{ij}$$

First, we determined that RBS consumption was related to engagement, without satisfaction being included in the model. The first row of Table 3 gives the intercept and slope for engagement, which has a $t$-statistic of 37 and is thus significantly different from zero. Second, we showed that engagement was related to satisfaction. The model was estimated using each of the three different measures of satisfaction, with the results reported in the next three rows of Table 3. In all three cases, the effect of engagement on satisfaction was highly significant. Next, we modeled the relationship between satisfaction and RBS consumption. The next three rows of Table 3 provide these results for each of the three satisfaction measures. The effect of satisfaction on RBS consumption was significantly different from zero in all cases.

Finally, we simultaneously modeled the relationship of RBS consumption on both engagement and satisfaction. These results appear in the final three rows of Table 3. The significant indirect effect of satisfaction on RBS consumption suggests that satisfaction partially explains the relationship between engagement and RBS consumption noted above. However, in support of Hypothesis 1, the direct effects of engagement on RBS consumption (coefficients of engagement in the step 4 models) were all significantly different from zero, which indicates that...
engagement incrementally explains RBS consumption beyond satisfaction alone. These results suggest that weighted satisfaction and engagement are independent indicators of newspaper RBS consumption.

The above results were supported by a bootstrapping analysis that examined whether satisfaction mediated the relationship between engagement and RBS consumption (Preacher and Hayes 2008; Zhao, Lynch, and Chen 2010). We found a significant indirect effect of engagement on RBS consumption through weighted satisfaction (Indirect effect = 0.23, SE = 0.013, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 0.20 to 0.25), which establishes satisfaction as a mediator.\(^5\) However, the direct effect of engagement on RBS consumption (from Table 3) was also positive and significant (\(\beta = 0.38, SE = 0.020, p < .0001\)), which suggests that a direct path exists from engagement to RBS consumption independent of satisfaction. Similar results were obtained when bootstrapping was done using the other measures of satisfaction.

Next, we compared variable “importance” using t-statistics (Bring 1994).\(^6\) The t-statistic for engagement exceeded those for overall and aggregate satisfaction (34 versus 5.7 and 32 versus 7.7, respectively). In the case of importance-weighted satisfaction, the t-statistic for engagement (25.05) was also greater than that for satisfaction (18.83). For each satisfaction measure, we performed a formal test of the hypothesis \(H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2\) by estimating a “reduced” model with the constraint that \(\beta_1 = \beta_2\). The difference in the deviances between the reduced and full model has an approximate chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom. The difference in deviances for the overall satisfaction models was 31505 – 30998 = 507 with \(p < .0001\), indicating that the effect of engagement on RBS consumption was stronger than the effect of overall satisfaction. The difference in deviances for aggregate satisfaction was 31259 – 30994 = 265, and the difference for importance-weighted satisfaction was 30177 – 30140 = 37 (\(p’s < .0001\)). Thus, irrespective of which satisfaction measure was used in the model, we determined that engagement was the more powerful explanatory variable.

---

\(^5\) The test of the indirect effect using overall satisfaction has a value of 0.023 (se = 0.0090) and a 95% confidence interval of (0.0055, 0.041), which does not include 0 indicating that the indirect effect is significantly different from 0. The test using aggregate satisfaction has a value of 0.070 (se=0.011) and a 95% confidence interval of (0.048, 0.091), which also does not include 0.

\(^6\) The units of measurement are different for importance-weighted satisfaction, since it is the product of importance measured on 1-3 scale and satisfaction measured on 1-5 scales. This measure of satisfaction thus ranges from 1-15, while the experience measures range from 1-5.
Discussion

Based on the results of Study 1, we conclude that engagement significantly predicts consumption behavior as measured by RBS. Not only did engagement incrementally predict consumption beyond satisfaction alone, it was a superior predictor of consumption than any of the three satisfaction measures. This result serves to validate the basic premise of this research that engagement is a useful construct in explaining consumer behavior in that it can account for more than satisfaction alone does and that it can be measured retrospectively in a rigorous but rich way based on specific consumer experiences.

Despite the results of Study 1, we would not want to argue that engagement is necessarily always a better indicator of consumption than satisfaction. In fact, our earlier discussion of the conceptual differences between engagement and satisfaction suggests that satisfaction may be more strongly related to some variables of interest than engagement. Next, we describe an example in which satisfaction may have greater predictive power than engagement.

Imagine that you recently attended a music concert that is held annually. The sponsors of the concert want to ascertain whether attendees will return to the concert the following year. If your engagement with the concert this year was high, this should positively influence your intention to come back. And if you were highly engaged, this should also positively impact your satisfaction with this year’s concert. But your satisfaction rating may also reflect an integrative and retrospective evaluation of many other factors besides engagement. For example, you may have been more or less satisfied with the price of admission or the day chosen for the concert or any of a variety of items that might have had little impact on your experience of the concert itself and your engagement with it. But, when determining whether to go to the concert next year, all of these factors could be very relevant given that you could easily choose other concerts to attend, more affordable concerts, concerts on more convenient dates, etc. In such a case, we would expect that satisfaction might predict your intention to return to next year’s concert even more than engagement. Relative to engagement, we posit that satisfaction represents a more global evaluation facilitating the comparison of choice alternatives.

Of course, engagement may be a stronger determinant of other consumption measures, such as the level and depth of usage of the newspaper in Study 1. The issue for readers was more specific: is the consumer motivated to spend more time, more often, and more completely with
the newspaper? In such cases, we would expect engagement with the product to be more predictive than satisfaction.

According to our theorizing, satisfaction is a post-hoc judgment about the value of a product. Although engagement with a product may factor into this evaluation, additional factors (e.g., the product’s price, availability, and other such attributes) are also likely to impact one’s satisfaction. Because consumers may use satisfaction as a primary input when comparing choice alternatives, we predict that satisfaction will be a superior indicator when consumers make choices among products. Engagement, on the other hand, will be a superior indicator when consumers determine levels or magnitudes of consumption based on their motivations to consume more of a product or product category. We propose the following hypotheses, which we will examine empirically in Study 2:

Hypothesis 2. For consumption behaviors that involve comparisons among choice alternatives, satisfaction will be a stronger predictor than engagement.

Hypothesis 3. For consumption behaviors that involve motivations to consume more of a product or product category, engagement will be a stronger predictor than satisfaction (consistent with the results of Study 1).

**Study 2: Can Satisfaction Predict Certain Types of Consumption Better than Engagement?**

In Study 1, newspaper readers reported both their satisfaction and engagement with their local newspaper. The dependent variable, their RBS consumption, measured the extent to which they consumed more or less of that newspaper. In Study 2, we examine the experience of concert attendees at a single event, the Chicago Jazz Festival. The main dependent variable of interest in this study is attendees’ intention to return to the concert the following year. This question was chosen because repeat intention is a commonly used and important marketing metric. But note that the repeat intention question is not just asking about engagement during the Festival. To answer this question, the respondent must reflect on the likelihood of attending the Festival again versus choosing to do other things from a host of possible entertainment alternatives, many of which would be equally engaging. The question is really asking respondents to decide whether they would attend or whether they would choose something else to do instead. Prior research has shown that when making repurchase decisions, consumers consider relevant choice alternatives
(Seiders et al. 2005), even when these alternatives are not explicitly provided to them (Gronhaug 1993). Based on our previous discussion, we predict that satisfaction will be a better indicator of this repeat intention variable than engagement. To further support our theorizing, we include a second dependent variable in Study 2 that more closely resembles the RBS consumption variable of Study 1. We predict that engagement will be a better predictor of this second dependent variable, which we describe in detail in the next section.

To summarize, the primary objective of Study 2 is thus to show that engagement and satisfaction may each be more predictive of consumption behaviors depending upon the situation of interest. If evaluation of alternatives is of primary concern, satisfaction will be superior. If motivation to consume the product or product category is more the issue, engagement will be superior.

Methods

We collaborated with the Jazz Institute of Chicago to collect data from concertgoers approximately six weeks after they attended the Chicago Jazz Festival. We emailed 7,020 jazz enthusiasts in the Chicago area who were on the Jazz Institute’s email distribution list and asked them to complete an online survey if they had attended the Jazz Festival. In exchange for their participation, all respondents were promised entry into a raffle where they could win one of several $50 or $100 gift cards. A total of 490 Jazz Festival attendees completed our survey, which is equal to a response rate of 7.0%.

Satisfaction. We used two single-item measures of satisfaction that were combined to form a satisfaction index (Cronbach’s alpha = .84). The first satisfaction measure asked participants to rate their “experience at the Chicago Jazz Festival” using an unmarked slider ranging from “the worst concert experience ever” to “the best concert experience ever.” The second satisfaction measure required consumers to rate their “overall satisfaction with [their] Chicago Jazz Festival experience this year” on an unmarked scale ranging from “not very satisfied” to “very satisfied.” Responses for both questions were later translated into numerical ratings ranging from 0 to 100.

Engagement. Following the same logic and procedures outlined in Study 1, we identified the following three experiences of artistic events.

- Social. This experience involves co-consuming, talking about, and sharing an arts event with others.
• *Discovery.* This experience involves learning about one’s tastes, preferences, and interests, particularly as they relate to the arts.

• *Transportation.* This experience is one of perceiving the event as an active participant rather than a passive observer.

Tables 4 and 5 provide the exact questionnaire items for the three experiences, as well as parameter estimates from an exploratory (Table 4) and confirmatory factor analysis (Table 5) of these items.\(^7\) Figure 2 gives the loadings from the second-order confirmatory factor model showing how the second-order engagement construct is related to the first-order experiences. Our estimate of engagement is the simple average of the three experiences, with each experience estimated by the simple average of the items loading on it.

*Repeat intention.* As indicated, the dependent variable was anticipated repeat consumption. Specifically, respondents were asked to rate how likely they would be “to attend the Chicago Jazz Festival next summer” on an unmarked scale with anchors at “very unlikely” and “very likely.” This question required consumers to evaluate the Festival relative to other activities in which they might engage, perhaps even those that provide equivalent engagement as the Festival.

*Category-level consumption.* In order to strengthen Study 2 by having an internal comparison, we also collected another, nonequivalent dependent variable that we expected to be conceptually comparable to the one in Study 1. Specifically, we asked respondents to recall the total number of instances in which they attended classical music concerts, art museums, live jazz concerts, and dance performances during the past year. We reasoned that these frequency estimates of past participation in arts events would be a measure of consumers’ overall level of arts consumption (conceptually comparable to the extent of consumers’ consumption of their local newspaper, which was the dependent variable used in Study 1). The sum of the frequency estimates indeed formed a unidimensional scale of “Category-Level Consumption.”\(^8\) In contrast to the repeat intention measure, we expected engagement to be a stronger indicator than

---

\(^7\) Following Calder et al. (2009) we first estimated a measurement model allowing correlations between all factors, and this model fit acceptably well (GFI = .95, NFI = .92, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .089). We then estimated a model with a single second-order factor explaining the correlations between individual experiences.

\(^8\) More precisely, we factor analyzed the log number of times that the respondent attended each of classical music, dance, art museums, ballet and live jazz concerts in the previous year. Only one eigenvalue was greater than 1 and all of the loadings were greater than .55. Coefficient alpha was .66 on the five items.
satisfaction of this measure in that engagement reflects the motivation to consume more whereas satisfaction implicates more the evaluation of alternatives.

Our choice of dependent variables assumes that in comparison to category-level consumption questions, repeat intention questions are more likely to generate comparisons among choice alternatives and less likely to involve motivations to consume more of a product or product category. To validate this assumption, we conducted a pretest with a group of 128 online participants (39.8% female; mean age = 30.2 years) who did not overlap with the participants in the main study. After encountering either a repeat intention question or a category-level consumption question, pretest participants rated both the extent to which they had considered choice alternatives and the extent to which they had reflected on their motivations to consume more of the experience, using two 9-point scales ranging from “not at all” to “a great deal.” A 2 x 2 mixed ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between question type and rating type; F(1, 126) = 37.86, p < .001. The results of our pretest indicated that participants were more likely to consider choice alternatives when answering a repeat intention question versus a category-level consumption question; M = 5.22 vs. M = 4.20; F(1, 126) = 5.58, p = .02. However, participants were less likely to reflect on their motivations to consume the same or similar experiences when answering a repeat intention question versus a category-level consumption question; M = 4.33 vs. M = 5.17; F(1, 126) = 3.84, p = .05.

Results

Repeat intention. We first report the results using repeat intention as the dependent variable. As predicted, we found a highly significant indirect effect of satisfaction on recalled consumption of the arts (Indirect effect = 0.52, SE = 0.077, 95% confidence interval 0.37, 0.67), which establishes satisfaction as a mediator. This mediation can be classified as complementary (Zhao, Lynch, and Chen 2010, 200) because the direct effect of engagement on consumption was also positive and significant (β = 0.25, SE = 0.12, p < .04).

The t-statistic for satisfaction (1.00, SE = 0.094) was greater than that for engagement (0.25, SE = 0.12). For the satisfaction measure, we performed a formal test of the hypothesis H₀: β₁ = β₂ by estimating a “reduced” model with the constraint that β₁ = β₂. The difference between
the two is $-0.75 (p < .0001)$, indicating that the effect of satisfaction on anticipated repeat consumption was stronger than the effect of engagement.

**Category-level consumption.** We also conducted a mediation analysis using the category-level consumption (i.e., general art consumption) dependent measure. The first step was to show that the initial variable, engagement, was correlated with the outcome, category-level consumption. Table 6 shows a significant correlation (.12*). The second step was to show that engagement was correlated with the mediator (satisfaction), and Table 6 shows that it is (.42**). The third step was to show that the mediator (satisfaction) was correlated with the outcome (category-level consumption), but the correlation was not significant (.03). The first bootstrapping analysis, using experiential consumption as the dependent variable, yielded results that were consistent with our theorizing. Specifically, we found no indirect effect of satisfaction on recalled consumption of the arts (Indirect effect = $-0.0077$, SE = 0.013, 95% confidence interval ($-0.034, 0.018$)). However, the direct effect of engagement on category-level consumption was positive and significant ($\beta = 0.079$, SE = 0.031, $p < .02$).

Next, we compared variable “importance” using t-statistics (Bring 1994). The t-statistic for engagement (2.51) was greater than that for satisfaction (−0.58). For the satisfaction measure, we performed a formal test of the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2$. The difference is borderline significant, with $t = 1.96 (p = .05)$, confirming that the effect of engagement on experiential consumption is stronger than the effect of satisfaction.

**Discussion**

Study 2 provides evidence that satisfaction is a better indicator for consumption metrics that reflect the evaluation of alternatives, such as the intention to attend an annual concert next year, than engagement. These results support our reasoning that satisfaction enters more into evaluating choices among alternatives than does engagement.

Engagement, on the other hand, is the superior predictor for consumption metrics that reflect the motivation of consumers to consume more, such as the frequency of attending arts events (Study 2) or the level of readership for a newspaper (Study 1). This supports our reasoning that engagement entails a motivation to consume more of a product or, in the case of this study, even a category of products (arts events).
Taken together, the results of the two studies reported in this article suggest that satisfaction and engagement are complementary constructs that provide unique insights into the customer’s point-of-view. Even when both constructs are measured following consumption, our measurement model reveals that satisfaction and engagement are superior predictors of different types of consumption behavior. The capability of our model to isolate differences between these two similar constructs speaks to the value of the direct qualitative-belief method for measuring experiences that we have advocated.

**General Discussion**

The terms consumer engagement and experience have been popularized far more than systematically studied. The research has sought to provide a better foundation for using them in marketing practice. The following general perspective emerges.

Certainly consumers are attracted to products through hedonic pleasure. That we want and like things that give us pleasure and avoid things that do not is an age-old idea, and one that marketers have employed in many forms. The Greeks referred to this as *hedonia*. As Berridge and Kringelbach (2011) point out, *hedonia* was distinguished from *eudaimonia*, which referred to experiencing life as being meaningful. Whereas the former has been much studied, even to the point of progress in understanding the brain mechanisms involved, the latter has not. In our view, engagement can play an important role in marketing theory by representing *eudaimonia* and balancing the long-standing focus on *hedonia*. Take the Social experience in Study 1 where some people believe that talking about and sharing the content of a newspaper with others makes them more interesting and better connected to others. Or the Civic experience where some people believe that reading a newspaper empowers them and makes them apart of their community. Such experiences give rise to a sense of engagement in which reading the newspaper gives increased meaning to their lives. Contrast this with how much a person likes the newspaper overall or likes the Food section or other parts of it. It is not that one construct is necessarily more important to marketers than the other. But it is key not to lose the potential importance of engagement by focusing only on the hedonic evaluation.

In this paper we develop a methodology for measuring engagement as it follows from the beliefs people have about the different experiences they have with a product. While compatible
with the work of Brakus et al. (2009), our approach uses direct (rather than indirect) beliefs about experiences that are potentially qualitatively meaningful to the consumer. We show that these measures of different experiences themselves are related to a higher-order common factor that reflects the overall level of meaningful experience with the product, that is to say, the consumer’s level of engagement with it.

We chose to compare this engagement measure with satisfaction because the latter is the most prevalent hedonic measure used in marketing. To be useful, any measure of engagement must contribute to our understanding of consumer behavior beyond considering satisfaction alone. Our research indicates that engagement can relate to certain variables that are of interest to marketers more strongly than satisfaction, and this effect is not merely mediated by the relationship between engagement and satisfaction.

As stated above, however, our purpose is not to deny the importance of hedonic concepts and measures. Satisfaction may well be related to other variables of marketing interest more than engagement. The present research indicates as such that satisfaction may well affect choices involving comparison among alternatives more strongly. In our view this finding underscores the need to work with both eudaimonia and hedonia constructs and to explore their differences. But given the ubiquity of satisfaction and other hedonic metrics, more attention should be given to the construct of engagement and its measurement via consumer experiences.

On a practical note, the applicability of considering both types of metrics is apparent from a consideration of a product like Facebook. At this writing Facebook has just received a relative low satisfaction score (66 out of 100) in an American Customer Satisfaction Index study (Wong 2011). This result is in sharp contrast to Facebook’s dominance of the amount of time consumers spend with social media. While there could be different explanations for this, it seems plausible to us that the missing link may be that Facebook is high on engagement, which translates into heavy usage. The low satisfaction scores may reflect factors other than engagement, such as consumers’ unhappiness with Facebook’s privacy policy or negative comparisons relative to alternative social media sites. As a result, Facebook may be vulnerable even though it is highly engaging. Scenarios like this underscore the need to look at engagement as well as satisfaction in order to fully assume the customer’s point-of-view.
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### Table 1: Question Wording and Parameter Estimates from Confirmatory Factor Analysis Measurement Model (STUDY 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>I bring up things I’ve read in this NP in conversations with others.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(α = .81)</td>
<td>I like to talk about national news and current events from the NP.</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to give advice and tips based on what I read in this NP.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I show things in this NP to others in my family.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic enjoyment</strong> (α = .85)</td>
<td>It’s a treat for me.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to kick back and wind down with it.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When I read this NP I lose myself in the pleasure of reading it.</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel less stressed after reading it.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading it is my way of not being bothered by other things.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading the NP is my reward for doing other things</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic</strong></td>
<td>Reading the NP makes me a better citizen.</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(α = .74)</td>
<td>I think people who don’t read this NP are at a disadvantage in life.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our society would be weaker without NPs like this one.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I count on this NP to investigate wrongdoing.</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilitarian</strong> (α = .80)</td>
<td>This NP has columns that give good advice.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a way to learn about new products.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It shows me how other people live their lives.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learn about things to do or places to go.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You learn how to improve yourself in this newspaper.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>A big reason I read it is to make myself more interesting to other people.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(α = .85)</td>
<td>Reading this newspaper is a little like belonging to a group.</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like for other people to know that I read this newspaper.</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics (STUDY 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Overall Satisfaction</th>
<th>Aggregate Satisfaction</th>
<th>Importance Weighted Satisfaction</th>
<th>Consumption (RBS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min / Max</td>
<td>1 / 5</td>
<td>1 / 5</td>
<td>1 / 5</td>
<td>1.09 / 5</td>
<td>1 / 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall Sat.</th>
<th>Aggregate Sat.</th>
<th>Imp. Wgt. Sat.</th>
<th>Consumption (RBS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Sat.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Sat.</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Wgt. Sat.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption (RBS)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note–Each correlation was estimated with approximately 10,000 observations and was highly significant ($p < .0001$). The sample sizes varied due to missing values. The minimum sample size was 9,671 and the maximum was 10,544.
Table 3: Parameter Estimates from HLM (STUDY 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Satisfaction Type</th>
<th>Intercept Slope (t-stat)</th>
<th>Engagement Slope (t-stat)</th>
<th>Satisfaction Slope (t-stat)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consumption (RBS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.98 (26)</td>
<td>.878 (39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Overall Sat.</td>
<td>1.64 (29)</td>
<td>.591 (40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate Sat.</td>
<td>2.03 (57)</td>
<td>.505 (47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imp. Weighted Sat.</td>
<td>1.03 (30)</td>
<td>.592 (53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consumption (RBS)</td>
<td>Overall Sat.</td>
<td>3.68 (56)</td>
<td>.287 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate Sat.</td>
<td>3.15 (40)</td>
<td>.433 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imp. Weighted Sat.</td>
<td>2.91 (46)</td>
<td>.627 (34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consumption (RBS)</td>
<td>Overall Sat.</td>
<td>1.84 (23)</td>
<td>.828 (34)</td>
<td>.083 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate Sat.</td>
<td>1.71 (20)</td>
<td>.786 (32)</td>
<td>.156 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imp. Weighted Sat.</td>
<td>1.64 (21)</td>
<td>.636 (25)</td>
<td>.383 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note–All results are significant at the .0001 level.
### Table 4: Question Wording and Exploratory Factor Loadings (STUDY 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It made me feel more connected other people and the community</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed talking with someone else about it</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt personally involved with it</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed going to it with family and friends</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned about what kind of jazz I like best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It motivated me to listen to more jazz and learn more about it</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gave me a broader, richer perspective</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked to imagine myself being on stage</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It made me think of actually playing an instrument or singing myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note–Values less than .3 are not printed.
Table 5: Question Wording and Parameter Estimates from Confirmatory Factor Analysis Measurement Model (STUDY 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social (α = .71)</td>
<td>It made me feel more connected to other people and the community</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoyed talking with someone else about it</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoyed going to it with family and friends</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt personally involved with it.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery (α = .81)</td>
<td>It motivated me to listen more jazz and learn more about it</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It gave me a broader, richer perspective</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned about what kind of jazz I like best</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (α = .83)</td>
<td>I liked to imagine myself being on the stage</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It made me think of actually playing an instrument or singing myself</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Descriptive Statistics, n=405 (STUDY 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Repeat intention</th>
<th>Category-level consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min / Max</td>
<td>1.67 / 7</td>
<td>1 / 7</td>
<td>0 / 10</td>
<td>0 / 3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Repeat intention</th>
<th>Category-level consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat intention</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category-level</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

consumption

Note—** indicates significance at the p < .05 level; * indicates significance at the p < .01 level.
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Figure 1: Second-order Confirmatory Factor Analysis Standardized Loadings (STUDY 1)
Figure 2: Second-order Confirmatory Factor Analysis Standardized Loadings (STUDY 2)