


Dong, X., Veloutsou, C. and Morgan-Thomas, A. (2024) Negative online brand engagement: Conceptualisation, scale development and validation. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, (doi: [10.1108/JRIM-09-2023-0303](https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-09-2023-0303))



This is the author version of the work deposited here under a Creative Commons licence: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-09-2023-0303>

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/316416/>

Deposited on: 10 January 2024

**Negative online brand engagement: Conceptualisation, scale development and validation**

**Accepted for Publication:** Journal of Research in Intractive Marketing- January 2024

Xinyu Dong

Lecturer

Email: [dongxinyu@ytu.edu.cn](mailto:dongxinyu@ytu.edu.cn)

Tel: 008613156450553

School of Economics and Management, Yantai University  
30 Qingquan Road, Laishan District, Yantai City, Shandong Province, China

Cleopatra Veloutsou

Professor

Email: [Cleopatra.Veloutsou@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:Cleopatra.Veloutsou@glasgow.ac.uk)

Tel: 00441413304055

Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow  
R348 Level 1, Adam Smith Business School, Gilbert Scott Building-East, Glasgow, UK

Anna Morgan-Thomas

Professor

Email: [Anna.Morgan-Thomas@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:Anna.Morgan-Thomas@glasgow.ac.uk)

Tel: 00441413302548

Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow  
R408E Level 4, Adam Smith Business School, Gilbert Scott Building, Glasgow, UK

**Xinyu Dong** is a Lecturer at School of Economics and Management, Yantai University, China. She has a PhD from the Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow. Her research focuses on Branding, Digital Marketing and Negative Consumer Engagement.

**Cleopatra Veloutsou** is a Professor of Brand Management in the Adam Smith Business School of the University of Glasgow (UK), a Visiting Professor at Aristotle University (Greece), University of Coimbra (Portugal), University of Liège (Belgium), University of West Attica (Greece) and the Head of the Marketing Research Unit of the Athens Institute of Education and Research (ATINER) (Greece). Her primary research interest is on Brand Management and has published over 60 articles in International Journals and presented over 100 papers in International Academic Conferences. She is editing the Journal of Product and Brand Management since 2014, serves as an Associate Editor of the Journal of Business Research since 2019 and editorial board member of various academic Journals, while she has been involved in the organisation of many International Academics Conferences in Marketing and Brand Management.

**Anna Morgan-Thomas** is a Professor of Management at the Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow. Positioned at the interface of marketing and information systems, her research examines implications of digital technologies for marketing practices. Specifically, her work problematizes the relationship between technology and practice to uncover antecedents and outcomes of digital transformation in marketing and beyond. Her work has been published in Academy of Management Learning and Education, Long Range Planning, International Marketing Review, Journal of Business Research, International Small Business Journal and Journal of Product & Brand Management.

# **Negative online brand engagement: Conceptualisation, scale development and validation**

## **Abstract**

**Purpose:** Negative brand engagement represents a pervasive and persistent feature of interactivity in online contexts. Although existing research suggests that consumer negativity is potentially more impactful or detrimental to brands than its positive counterpart, few studies have examined negative brand-related cognitions, feelings and behaviours. Building on the concept of brand engagement, this study aims to operationalise negative online brand engagement.

**Design/methodology/approach:** This paper presents the results of nine studies that contributed to the development and validation of the proposed scale. Building on the concept of engagement, studies 1-3 enhanced the construct conceptualisation and generated items. Study 4 involved validation with an academic expert panel. The process of measure operationalisation and validation with quantitative data was completed in Studies 5-8. Finally, the scale's nomological validity was assessed in Study 9.

**Findings:** The results confirm the multidimensional nature of negative online brand engagement. The validated instrument encompasses four dimensions (cognition, affection, online constructive behaviour and online destructive behaviour), captured by 17 items.

**Originality/value:** Progress in understanding and dealing with negative online brand engagement has been hampered by disagreements over conceptualisation and the absence of measures that capture the phenomenon. This work enhances managerial understanding of negativity fostering strategies that protect brand engagement and improve firm performance.

**Keywords:** Negative brand engagement, Online context, Conceptualisation, Scale development, Scale Validation

**Paper type** Research paper

# Negative online brand engagement: Conceptualisation, scale development and validation

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, engagement has emerged as an important concept in marketing, garnering increasing research interest (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022). While definitions and perspectives vary, the dominant conception asserts that consumer engagement has an interactive nature and is a context-dependent construct encompassing consumers' cognitive, affective and behavioural investment in specific interactions with a focal engagement object (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023). Brands are a major focal object of engagement (Algharabat *et al.*, 2018; Wang *et al.*, 2022) in various online and offline contexts, (Dessart *et al.*, 2019; Hollebeek, 2011a, 2011b; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022; Morgan-Thomas *et al.*, 2020). Brand engagement may take in a bipolar fashion (Naumann *et al.*, 2020). Positive brand engagement occurs when consumers' brand-related cognitions, affections and behaviours are favourable to the brand (Dessart *et al.*, 2016), whilst negative brand engagement denotes unfavourable or disapproving sentiments and behaviours (Do *et al.*, 2020; Hollebeek & Chen, 2014; Stathopoulou *et al.*, 2017). Negative brand engagement offers unique insights into consumer-brand interactions that are undesirable and harmful for brands (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022, 2023).

Contrasted with significant interest in positive engagement (Cao *et al.*, 2021; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022; Tuškej & Podnar, 2018), few studies explore negativity (Azer & Alexander, 2020a, 2020b; Bitter & Grabner-Kräuter, 2016; Rahman *et al.*, 2022). Yet, compared with positive brand engagement, negativity can be more widespread (Rissanen & Luoma-Aho, 2016), potentially more impactful (Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Rodrigues & Borges, 2021) and detrimental to brands and consumers (Naumann *et al.*, 2020), particularly in the interactive online environment (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022). Consumers may develop various negative brand feelings,

such as anger and frustration (Naumann *et al.*, 2020). Their interactivity may include behaviours, such as sharing regret and publically deriding (Azer & Alexander, 2020a), harming brand performance (Naumann *et al.*, 2017a).

The connectivity of the online context, particularly social media (Schultz & Peltier, 2013; Barger *et al.*, 2016), fosters online brand engagement by affording communication and interaction at scale (Baldus *et al.*, 2015; Parihar & Dawra, 2020). Contrasted with other brand-related contexts (Morgan-Thomas *et al.*, 2020), online brand engagement is generally characterised by higher levels of participation (Swaminathan *et al.*, 2020) and engagement interactivity (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023). In essence, the online environment fosters new kinds of engagement practices affecting the phenomenon's nature and essence (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023; Morgan-Thomas *et al.*, 2020). Negative engagement in online environments, such as social media, is widespread (Dessar *et al.*, 2020; Liao *et al.*, 2023) and has an idiosyncratic nature (Lievonen *et al.*, 2022).

Despite some progress, several gaps persist in the emergent literature on negative engagement. Most existing conceptions of negativity are either theoretical (Do *et al.*, 2020) or qualitative (Heinonen, 2018), highlighting difficulties in drawing conceptual boundaries or empirically capturing the phenomenon (Bowden *et al.*, 2017). Although confirmatory research on negative engagement has begun to emerge (Azer & Alexander, 2020a, 2020b; Bitter & Grabner-Kräuter, 2016; Kulikovskaja *et al.*, 2023; Naumann *et al.*, 2020; Obilo *et al.*, 2021; Rahman *et al.*, 2022) efforts to capture negative engagement have tended to rely on either proxies (REF) or partial measures (REF). Despite its profound consequences (Baldus *et al.*, 2015; Kumar, 2021, 2022), little is known about the actual domain and boundaries of the concept. Very few studies have robustly conceptualised it and disagreements persist with some authors highlighting the behavioural dimension (Dolan *et al.*, 2016) and others suggesting multiple dimensions and

incorporating consumers' unfavourable brand-related thoughts, emotions and behaviours (Do *et al.*, 2020). As recent calls for further research illustrate (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023; Naumann *et al.*, 2020), scholars are yet to adequately define the concept in general (Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Hollebeek & Chen, 2014) and, specifically, to acknowledge variations with reference to particular objects (i.e., the brand) or contexts (e.g., online).

To address these gaps, this study aims to refine the definition of negative online brand engagement and develop a scale to capture it. Building on research on both positive and negative engagement, the study deploys a robust scale development process to offer an empirical operationalisation. The adopted four-step procedure reports the negative online brand engagement definition and item generation (Step 1), item purification (Step 2), reliability and validity (Step 3) and nomological network and discriminant validity (Step 4).

The study's contribution is threefold. Theoretically, the proposed conceptualisation and operationalisation of negative online brand engagement enhances understanding of negativity and its relationship with other concepts, namely brand disloyalty and happiness. This concurrently addresses extant gaps in the body of knowledge (Heinonen, 2018), calls for theoretical rigour (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023), and paves the way to future research on negativity (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022, 2023) contributing novel insights into the emerging negative engagement literature in marketing (Hollebeek & Chen, 2014; Naumann *et al.*, 2020). Practically, this work enhances managerial knowledge regarding strategies to control negative effects and improve firm performance (e.g., sales growth and superior profitability) (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014; Rahman *et al.*, 2022).

## **2. The need for new conceptualisation and operationalisation of negative online brand engagement**

Multiple reasons justify the need for refinement of current approaches to negative online brand

engagement. The research on consumers' negative engagement in marketing is, only now, emerging and limited (Table 1), and past studies tend to be conceptual (Do *et al.*, 2020) or qualitative (Heinonen 2018). Only rarely do the definitions refer to the negative nature of the engagement (see Table 1 for exception) and they tend to neglect the differences between online and offline contexts (Naumann *et al.*, 2017a, 2017b, 2020).

To date, a handful of quantitative papers (Azer & Alexander, 2020a, 2020b; Bitter & Grabner-Kräuter, 2016; Kulikovskaja *et al.*, 2023; Naumann *et al.*, 2020; Rahman *et al.*, 2022) have focused on consumers' negative engagement. The concept has been typically captured by proxy measures, for example, posting behaviour including negative posts (Bitter & Grabner-Kräuter, 2016; Arora & Chakraborty, 2021; Labrecque *et al.*, 2022) or the number of complaints (Rahman *et al.*, 2022). Others have used experimental designs with stimuli to demonstrate negative behaviours and investigate consumers' reactions to this material (Azer & Alexander, 2020a; 2020b), omitting the negative engagement itself. One study offered a more holistic approach and deployed an adapted scale that included items from a variety of sources but lacked thorough conceptualisation, development or validation (Naumann *et al.*, 2020).

Only one study developed a psychometric measure of negative engagement. Obilo *et al.* (2021) have suggested a scale encompassing four dimensions, two on engagement activities (content engagement, co-creation) and two on engagement valence (advocacy and negative engagement). Although useful, the instrument builds on a behavioural tradition conceiving engagement as behaviour (Algesheimer *et al.*, 2005). The scale is, therefore, misaligned with the dominant conception of engagement as a multidimensional concept that includes cognition and emotions (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022, 2023). Other concerns include specificity (the scale does not exclusively focus on negative engagement) and discriminant validity (the content



engagement and negative engagement dimensions are potentially related) (Rahman *et al.*, 2022). Given the above, further refinements to the measurement seem justified.

A closer look at the current treatment of negative engagement from other studies reveals several shortcomings. To begin with, insufficient attention has been paid to conceptual boundaries and some confusion persists between negative consumer engagement and related concepts such as disengagement. For instance, past qualitative studies identify both active and passive negative engagement but regard the latter as disengagement (Naumann *et al.*, 2017a, 2017b). However, other studies report differences between disengagement and passive negative engagement, where the former focuses on the absence of engagement and ending the relationship with focal objects (Bowden *et al.*, 2015; Florenthal, 2019; Rissanen & Luoma-Aho, 2016), while the latter reflects a lower level of engagement (Dolan *et al.*, 2019; Schamari & Schaefer, 2015; Shahbaznezhad *et al.*, 2021).

Concept dimensionality is also an issue (see Table 1). Some scholars have taken a unidimensional approach, defining negative engagement as consumers' unfavourable behavioural manifestations during interactions (e.g., Bitter & Grabner-Kräuter, 2016; Dolan *et al.*, 2016). For example, Rahman *et al.* (2022) operationalise negativity through complaints thus disregarding negative behaviour of a different nature (Arora & Chakraborty, 2021; Labrecque *et al.*, 2022). Few empirical studies view negative engagement as a multidimensional construct incorporating cognitive, affective and behavioural aspects (e.g., Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Naumann *et al.*, 2020). The multidimensional view that aligns negative engagement with the mainstream conception of positive engagement (Dessart *et al.*, 2016; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023) seems to represent, now, the dominant approach to negativity. Nonetheless, the multidimensional view is yet to be robustly operationalised.

The absence of robust operationalisation is relevant for several reasons. Construct definition

plays a fundamental role in empirical research. The development of a coherent, robust and generalisable theory rests on clearly defined constructs (Bergkvist & Eisend, 2021; Gilliam & Voss, 2013; MacKenzie, 2003). The need for clarity is particularly acute for multidimensional constructs, such as engagement (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023). When redefining concepts, it is important to avoid two pitfalls: defining the construct solely in terms of its antecedents or outcomes, or relying on illustrative examples (MacKenzie, 2003). Unfortunately, some past studies have fallen foul of these principles (e.g., Rissanen & Luoma-Aho, 2016; van Doorn *et al.*, 2010). Clearly, a fresh perspective is needed.

---

Table 1 about here

---

Existing measures of related constructs are a natural starting point for new measure development and the concept of consumer engagement serves as a useful referent, since existing approaches are inadequate (Frikha, 2019; Haws *et al.*, 2022). Engagement has been typically conceptualised as a three-dimensional construct encompassing cognitions, emotions and behaviours (Barger *et al.*, 2016; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023) which are directed at an object of engagement, typically a brand (Azer & Alexander, 2020a, 2020b; Rahman *et al.*, 2022). Further, engagement involves a subject of engagement, typically customer or consumer (Heinonen, 2018; Naumann *et al.*, 2020) and occurs in a particular context, for example online (Dessart *et al.*, 2015; Barger *et al.*, 2016) or offline (Naumann *et al.*, 2017b, 2020).

A closer examination of engagement scales rules out adapting or mirroring instruments as possible solutions. Although similarities exist (Table 2), there are significant challenges. Considering sentiments, for instance, the affective dimension focuses on emotions with only positive valence (e.g., Dessart *et al.*, 2016; Mirbagheri & Najmi, 2019). The cognitive dimension has been primarily approached as cognitive processing; the items do not reflect its long-term, enduring characteristics (e.g., Dessart *et al.*, 2016; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014) and do

not capture negative thinking (Lourenço *et al.*, 2022). The affective dimension focuses only on positive emotions (e.g., Dessart *et al.*, 2016; Mirbagheri & Najmi, 2019). The indicative behaviours are not related to negative often destructive engagement behaviours (e.g., Azer & Alexander, 2018; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014; Naumann *et al.*, 2020; Wolter *et al.*, 2023). In addition, many positive statements have no negative equivalent, further hampering adaptation (e.g., learning) (Dessart *et al.*, 2016). Lack of context specificity also matters: although cognitions and affections may not be context specific, studies have shown that engagement behaviours do differ significantly depending on the context (Díaz *et al.*, 2017; Moon *et al.*, 2021).

In sum, the concept of negative online brand engagement requires further refinement and, for several reasons, a full process of measure development is called for. Existing definitions suffer from issues concerning conceptual boundaries and have not taken into account the differences in object contexts. The measurement of positive engagement does provide instruments that can be easily adjusted to capture negativity, even when it has brands as focal objects and the online environment as a context. Consequently, further work is needed to improve both the definition and the measurement of negative online brand engagement. The empirical work that follows addresses these tasks.

---

Table 2 about here

---

### **3. Scale development process**

Following well-established procedures for scale development (Churchill, 1979; DeVellis, 2017; MacKenzie *et al.*, 2011), the study follows a four-step process to reconceptualise negative online brand engagement. Each step consists of several activities (Table 3).

---

Table 3 about here

---

#### *3.1 Step 1: Definition of negative online brand engagement and item generation*

Step 1 includes four activities.

*Step 1 (Activity 1): Literature review: negative consumer engagement and positive consumer engagement.* The process began with the review of negative engagement (Heinonen, 2018; Hollebeek & Chen, 2014; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022). Focusing on journal articles in academic refereed journals and using five keywords (negative engagement, negative consumer engagement, negative customer engagement, negative brand engagement and negative online engagement), the search generated a total of 31 articles published at the time of review (2022). Given the limited volume of studies on negative engagement, the literature review was extended to consumer engagement, (Table 4). The search followed a narrow search strategy (Arora & Chakraborty, 2021) focusing on 68 journals ranked in the top 25% in the category “marketing” and 109 journals ranked in the top 20% in the category “strategy and management” in the Scopus 2020 CiteScore ranking, one of the most comprehensive and extensively used ranking instruments (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023; Pech & Delgado, 2020). The approach enabled a systematic search (Davis *et al.*, 2014; Snyder, 2019; Siddaway *et al.*, 2019) whilst controlling for the large volume of studies (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022) and the number of scales reporting positive engagement with various focal objects (Ferreira *et al.*, 2020; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023). The search deployed nine keywords (Table 4) developed in three stages: (a) key to positive consumer engagement relevant and the three most widely identified engagement dimensions (i.e., cognitive, affective, behavioural) themes (Dessart *et al.*, 2019; Morgan-Thomas *et al.*, 2020); (b) assessment of the potentially relevant keywords, considering the brand as the engagement object and the online focus; and, (c) discussion of the eleven generated keywords with two marketing experts (two were removed because of the irrelevance of consumer engagement). The adopted exclusion criteria ensured that selected articles relevant to the scope of this research were retained. The search generated 314 articles.

---

Table 4 about here

---

*Step 1 (Activity 2): Online observation (Study 1).* The next stage of the development process involved an online observation study. Observation reveals negative online brand engagement behaviour in a real setting generating findings to inform the guides for Study 2. Following Kozinets' (2010) recommendations for site selection (i.e., being active, having recent and regular communications) and to ensure the robustness of findings, the observation concerned consumers' negative online reviews of Samsung and Apple on one of the world's largest e-commerce marketplaces, Amazon. Samsung and Apple were chosen because: (a) they are both targets of active negative online engagement, with more negative reviews on Amazon (2019) than other brands attracting negative comments (e.g., Sony, HP, Nike, Starbucks and Nestlé); and, (b) they had anti-brand groups on Facebook with more than 1000 members. Contrasted with other brands that also attract negativity (e.g., Sony, HP, Nike, Starbucks and Nestlé), Samsung and Apple have more negative online reviews on Amazon (2019). Data collection focused on negative reviews, i.e., reviews with rankings of 1\* or 2\* on a five-point scale (1\*=least satisfied, 5\*=highest satisfied) written between July and September 2019. In addition to the standard text, the data captured textual paralanguage (e.g., emoji), use of all capital letters and punctuation marks for emphasis (e.g., "ABSOLUTE RUBBISH!!!!!!!!!!") and interjections (e.g., "umm", "hmm") to reflect deep sentiments. The data set included a total of 481 reviews (63450 words) for Samsung and 173 (9660 words) for Apple products. The data collection stopped when information saturation was reached for each brand and in total (i.e., no new themes or coding emerged for 30 posts) (Creswell, 2007; Fusch & Ness, 2015). The data set included a total of 481 reviews (63450 words) for Samsung products and 173 reviews (9660 words) for Apple products, all with rankings of 1\* or 2\* on a five-point scale (1\*=least satisfied, 5\*=highest satisfied) written from July to September 2019.

Data analysis used thematic coding with existing literature on consumer engagement providing

the list of initial codes. Line-by-line coding began with the existing but generated new codes when the existing concepts insufficiently captured the meaning (Clarke & Braun, 2017). NVivo software was used to record codes and themes and then Excel to summarise and organise findings.

*Step 1 (Activities 3 and 4): Semi-structured interviews with moderators (Study 2) and members (Study 3) of online anti-brand communities.* Interviews aimed to further inform the construct definition, its dimensionality and item generation. To secure negative online brand engagement, participants, 10 moderators (Study 2) and 15 community members (Study 3), were recruited from anti-brand communities on a social media platform (Table 5). Facebook was chosen because it is the largest and most widely used social media platform internationally (Lee *et al.*, 2018). Within anti-brand communities, the study targeted members who were highly involved (e.g., high visit frequencies, more time spent on the group) and demonstrated negative online brand engagement (Wong *et al.*, 2018), with moderators typically more involved than members with high anti-brand community activities knowledge. Moderators were contacted first because of their deep anti-brand engagement, their role in the communities and ability to help with member recruitment.

Both types of participants received invitations to take part in the study via private messages on Facebook or email. Interviews were conducted primarily through video conferencing, except for two with participants with hearing issues where text was used. Normal discussion, interjections (e.g., umm, hmm), non-standard English, voice tone (pitch) changes and vocalizations were recorded and considered in the analysis when relevant. Following data collection and analysis, five respondents were contacted to assess the accuracy of their interview transcripts and the interpretation of the quotes. The interviews with moderators and members produced a total of 40231 and 54506 words of transcription respectively (Table 5).

Data analysis deployed thematic analysis to generate codes and themes and involved back-and-forward iterations between the literature and data to ensure the credibility and thoroughness of data analysis (Clarke & Braun, 2017). It followed six steps: familiarising data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes and producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). NVivo and Excel were used when developing and organising codes and themes.

---

Table 5 about here

---

*Step 1-Outcomes.* The literature review (Step 1-Activity 1) and qualitative findings (Step 1-Activities 2-4) informed the refinement of the negative online brand engagement concept (Table 6). Considering the online context and the brand focus, negative online brand engagement is defined, here, as ***consumer negatively valenced brand-related cognition, affection and online behaviour***. The multi-dimensional view aligns with previous conceptions (Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Naumann *et al.*, 2020) and emerges from the qualitative findings. Specifically, the findings highlight differences among the three dimensions (Table 6), which have not been discussed in previous literature (e.g., Hollebeek & Chen, 2014). They reveal the idiosyncrasy of the online context, supporting the distinct focus on negative online engagement. The qualitative findings also enhance precision illuminating sub-dimensions and, thus, enhancing previous conceptualisations (e.g., Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Naumann *et al.*, 2020). An important outcome of Step 1 is a list of 171 items that potentially capture the various dimensions (Table 6).

---

Table 6 about here

---

### *3.2 Step 2: Item purification*

The second step of the development process involved purification and reductions of the 171 items. Three measures ensure the consistency, clarity and parsimony of the item pool.

First, using the definitions of the suggested sub-dimensions, face validity was assessed by six members of online anti-brand communities (four females) identified in Step 1. Taking into account relevance, usefulness and appropriateness reduced the pool of items from 171 to 160 within the three dimensions and six sub-dimensions of negative online brand engagement (Table 6).

Second, each proposed item was evaluated for clarity and alignment with the dimension and definition via thirteen 60-minute-long face-to-face meetings between co-authors. The analysis identified inaccuracies, redundancies, repetition and overlaps, particularly within the cognitive and affective dimensions. These evaluations led to further purification of the scale with poorly rated items being removed, reducing the items from 160 to 61 (Table 6).

Third, an academic expert panel (Study 4) evaluated the items. Specifically, the concept definition, dimensions and surviving 61 items were examined by a panel of academic experts who acted as judges (DeVellis, 2017; Rossiter, 2002). A total of 68 branding experts from 19 different countries were contacted and 29 responded. Using a Qualtrics-based survey with structured and open questions, the experts commented on the construct definition, proposed dimensions' and sub-dimensions' structure and definitions. They also rated the suitability of the specific 61 items in terms of clarity and reflection of the sub-dimension's definition by using five-point Likert scale questions (1=strongly disagree - 5=strongly agree).

All expert respondents supported the definition and the suggested dimensionality. A threshold of 75% (above 3.75) for clarity and reflection score was used to retain items (Hardesty & Bearden, 2004). Consequently, 29 items that did not meet the threshold were removed. A total of 32 items, 9, 13 and 10 for the cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions respectively, were retained (Table 6).

### *3.3 Step 3: Reliability and validity*



The third step of the scale development process was to address the reliability and validity of the developed scale. Quantitative data from an online questionnaire were collected using the retained 32 anchored on seven-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree - 7=strongly agree).

The instrument was pre-tested for clarity with 20 marketing researchers at a UK-based university using Qualtrics (Study 5). Comments included: (a) a few minor issues (e.g., wording and grammatical errors); (b) restructuring suggestions to minimise fatigue and confusion; (c) the inclusion of encouraging statements (e.g., you are doing great); and, (d) the replacement of some attention check questions because they required knowledge that some respondents might not have (e.g., The sun rotates around the earth). Thus, several adjustments were made.

To detect any possible issues with the questionnaire missed by the researchers and make further adjustments (van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2002), a pilot study was also conducted (Study 6). Qualtrics survey links were sent through e-mails to a convenience sample (author's network and snowballing). A screening question to ensure that participants satisfied the study requirements was added (if they have engaged negatively with a brand online). The pilot generated 41 usable responses over the period of one month.

Following initial evaluation, the main data collection included two different samples accessed through different methods (Churchill, 1979; Gerbing & Anderson, 1988). First, members of social media (Facebook) anti-brand groups were approached as they actively and negatively engage with brands (Wong *et al.*, 2018). In total, 52 anti-brand moderators agreed to share survey links in their groups. The responses comprise the calibration sample. Second, the snowball method was adopted to recruit participants from the authors' contacts on social media (Facebook and LinkedIn). For this validation sample, the screening question '*Have you interacted negatively online with a brand (e.g., reading, writing or posting negative comments about the brand)?*' was added to ensure respondents' negative online brand engagement. All respondents were fluent in English (mother tongue or commonly used foreign language) and

were asked to complete the questionnaire focusing on a specific brand. The calibration respondents focused on a target brand within the anti-brand community; the validation response considered a brand target of negative interaction within the last six months.

Forcing respondents to answer all content questions and avoid missing data (Décieux et al., 2015) resulted, as expected, in high dropout rates (Wright, 2005; Beynon et al., 2010). Out of 1356 individuals who started answering the questionnaire, 502 responses were retained, with only non-scale development related demographic information missing responses – as expected. Further, respondents who failed to answer any of the attention check questions were excluded, resulting in a usable sample of 410 cases (Table 7).

---

Table 7 about here

---

Data collection deployed several means of addressing the common method variance (Tehseen *et al.*, 2017). In terms of procedural remedies: (a) data were collected from different samples; (b) the anonymity of the respondents was protected to reduce evaluation apprehension; (c) the questionnaire pre-testing supported clear instructions and simple, specific, and concise questions; and, (d) the items capturing constructs were mixed and the order of variables measurement counterbalanced to neutralise method bias related to items' embeddedness. Further statistical remedies are presented in section 3.4 below.

In line with guidelines (Churchill, 1979; Gerbing & Anderson, 1988), the calibration sample (205 responses) was used to examine the patterns of data in Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The validation sample (205 responses) served as validation material for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) (Study 8) and for the testing the scale's nomological network and discriminate validity (Study 9). Considering 32 items that form the scale, each sample generates a sufficient item to response ratio (Gorsuch, 1983; Cottrell *et al.*, 2007), specifically 6.4:1 cases per item. The samples meet *Bartlett's test of*

sphericity ( $p < 0.05$ ) (Sun *et al.*, 2020) and exceed the *Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy* (KMO) recommended minimum of 0.6 (Şahan *et al.*, 2019) with 0.938 for the calibration sample and 0.907 for the validation sample.

Study 7 involved exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to reveal the structure of the negative online brand engagement scale (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Factors were extracted using *Maximum likelihood* with eigenvalues greater than one (Henson & Roberts, 2006) and *promax rotation*, as the set of loadings with this method frequently reveals a simple structure (Finch, 2006). The analysis was performed in two rounds. In the EFA first round, five items were excluded due to cross-loadings (T1, T2, T4) and low loadings (T3, NED7). Further, data revealed that only the behavioural dimension can be measured with sub-dimensions (online constructive behaviour, online destructive behaviour), while the items of cognitive (attention, thinking) and affective (diversity of negative feelings, negative emotion demonstration) sub-dimensions loaded on one factor each, rather than the theorised sub-dimensions. Based on those results, the cognitive and affective dimensions were measured without sub-dimension.

Parsimony is an important criterion when developing a scale (Ferreira *et al.*, 2020). The data show that behavioural sub-dimensions reflect two different drives of action: one aiming to solve problems and sustain the relationship, the other intending to harm the brand (Kim & Lim, 2020; Naumann *et al.*, 2017b). Both were retained as two separate dimensions. Consequently, the measure of negative online brand engagement, developed here, has four dimensions namely: affective (12 items), cognitive (5 items), online destructive behaviour (5 items) and online constructive behaviour (5 items). EFA using only the retained items shows that the four factors explain 78% of the overall variance each with an *eigenvalue* higher than one (Table 8). The items load at 0.565 or over, onto one dimension with no cross-loadings. The dimensions exhibit good reliability, with Cronbach's  $\alpha$  values above 0.916, higher than the advocated cut-off point

of 0.70 (Al-Osail *et al.*, 2015; Hair *et al.*, 2013, 2019).

---

Table 8 about here

---

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) verified the dimensionality of the negative online brand engagement scale (Jackson *et al.*, 2009; Ou *et al.*, 2016). Using both calibration and validation samples, Study 8 estimated the regression coefficients between the items and the latent constructs. Two different methods of estimation were used: covariance-based (CB) and composite-based PLS Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) (Astrachan *et al.*, 2014; Dash & Paul, 2021). Considering item structure and loading, both methods produced the same results. Considering that covariance-based SEM is preferred for factor models (Rigdon *et al.*, 2017), the manuscript reports CB results and the details of PLS SEM (SmartPLS) can be found in the supplementary online appendix. The initial CFA on the calibration sample exhibited poor model fit. Redundant or irrelevant items were deleted through model re-specifications with the modification indices. A total of 10 items were deleted and the reduced 17-item scale exhibited a good fit with both calibration and validation samples (with CMIN=158.112, DF=113, CMIN/DF=1.399, CFI=0.987, NFI=0.957, TLI=0.985 and RMSEA=0.044 and CMIN=211.949, DF=111, CMIN/DF=1.909, CFI=0.968, NFI=0.936, TLI=0.961 and RMSEA=0.067 respectively). All the standardised regression weights were above the acceptable threshold of 0.5 (Hair *et al.*, 2006) (Table 10).

---

Table 9 about here

---

Further tests of the reliability and validity of the calibration and validation samples (Table 11) demonstrate that the negative online brand engagement dimensions attain good composite reliability (CR) exceeding the recommended level of 0.7 (Bacon *et al.*, 1995; Hair *et al.*, 2006). Convergent validity with the average variance extracted (AVE) ranges from 0.727-0.883 for the calibration sample and 0.618-0.858 for the validation sample, exceeding the minimum

acceptable value of 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The square root of AVE for each scale dimension is higher than any of the associated correlations, evidencing discriminant validity (Voorhees *et al.*, 2016).

---

Table 10 about here

---

No multicollinearity issues are observed between the scale's dimensions with the variance inflation factors (VIF) (O'Brien, 2007) values below 2.0 (Table 12).

---

Table 11 about here

---

#### *3.4 Step 4: Nomological network and discriminant validity*

Testing the scale's relationship with other constructs evidences nomological validity (Study 9). To this end, the study examined the relationship of negative online brand engagement with two concepts: brand disloyalty and happiness. Brand disloyalty (a brand related construct) was chosen because negatively engaged consumers may reduce, or deliberately avoid, purchasing brand-related products or services (Naumann *et al.*, 2017b; Heinonen, 2018). Happiness (a consumer related construct) was used because existing literature suggests that consumers can gain emotional benefits through engaging in brand-related activities (van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Marbach *et al.*, 2016).

To capture brand disloyalty, the three items brand loyalty scale developed by Lin *et al.* (2019) was adapted (reversed), with the term 'never' added in each item to fit the research context and construct definition. To measure consumer happiness, three items from Li & Atkinson (2020) were adapted to fit the research context, with the term 'book' replaced by 'my negative engagement with this brand'. All items were captured on a seven-point Likert scale. Both constructs demonstrated high reliability in previous studies. The SEM model included 23 items in the analysis, 17 items capturing online negative brand experience and three items for each outcome. Item to case ratio for a sample of 205 responses is acceptable at 8.9:1 (Gorsuch, 1983;

Cottrell *et al.*, 2007).

Three statistical tests for common method variance assure the lack of bias (Tehseen *et al.*, 2017). First Harman's single factor test produced a factor explaining 42% and 34% of the total variance for the calibration and validation samples respectively, amounting to less than the 50% threshold (Chang *et al.*, 2010). A marker variable on healthy and balanced diet scale (Zakowska-Biemans *et al.*, 2019) did produce significant change in the model fit indices for both calibration and validation samples ( $\Delta$ RMSEA=0.010/0.002,  $\Delta$ CFI=0.031/0.030,  $\Delta$ TLI=0.036/0.035). Finally, SmartPLS produced an insignificant p-value in the path coefficients for the marker variable in both calibration and validation samples. Contrasting models versus model without the marker showed insignificant change (less than 0.05). Therefore, common method bias does not seem to be an issue in this study (Chang *et al.*, 2010; Chin *et al.*, 2013).

To test the relationships, the validation sample was used. The SEM model provides support for both hypothesized negative online brand engagement outcomes, with brand disloyalty ( $\beta=0.201$ ;  $p<0.001$ ) and consumer happiness ( $\beta=0.256$ ;  $p<0.001$ ). The model demonstrated good fit (with CMIN=428.269, DF=221, CMIN/DF=1.938, CFI=0.953, NFI=0.909, TLI=0.946 and RMSEA=0.068). All factor-loading estimates were statistically significant and ranged from 0.651 to 0.986 ( $p<0.001$ ). The t-values ranged from 10.14 to 19.35. The Cronbach's alpha values for each scale varied from 0.859 to 0.961 and composite reliabilities ranged from 0.864 to 0.961, indicating the internal consistency of the scales. The AVE values ranged from 0.616 to 0.893 and the square root of the AVE is higher than any of the associated correlations demonstrating discriminant validity. The results support the nomological validity of the negative online brand engagement scale and indicate that the new scale is reliable and valid.

#### **4. Discussion and theoretical contribution**

This paper aimed to enhance the understanding of negative online brand engagement by addressing its conceptualisation and operationalisation. The study adopted a robust approach to measure development relying on theoretical insights from consumer engagement literature and empirical data from nine studies. The development process drew on experts in the micro-area (academic panel) and in marketing (pilot test) as well as consumers engaging negatively in many online contexts including online commerce (Amazon complainers), social media (anti-brand communities' moderators and members) and in a broader context (researchers' network and snowballing active on social media). Given consumers' extensive engagement in social media platforms (Schultz & Peltier, 2013; Barger *et al.*, 2016), also evidenced for negative engagement (Liao *et al.*, 2023; Lievonon *et al.*, 2022), the scale development secured high participation in the process from social media users.

The findings offer several contributions to the existing knowledge. The first contribution relates to the nature and conception of negative online brand engagement. This paper advances the understanding of negativity by offering a four dimensional notion of the concept which embraces cognitions, affections, online constructive behaviours and online destructive behaviours. Contrasted with past studies that simply considered the behavioural dimension (Azer & Alexander, 2020a, 2020b; Obilo *et al.*, 2021), this paper enhances precision and integrates diverse approaches. The new conceptual definition focuses specifically on negative online brand engagement, paving pathways for comparative studies of customer/consumer engagement with various objects (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2022, 2023). The conception stresses that both objects and the context of engagement are relevant (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023). The attention to online context as a moderator of behaviours advances past definitions (Hollebeek & Chen, 2014), providing more detailed explanations of negative online brand engagement.

The second contribution concerns the operationalisation of negative online brand engagement. Responding to calls for increased rigour in scale development for engagement constructs (Ferreira *et al.*, 2020; Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023), this paper makes important headway in building on qualitative insights to develop a valid and reliable scale for the construct. This endeavour offers a major contribution to the existing literature on negative engagement measurement (e.g., Naumann *et al.*, 2020) which, to date, remains limited, in spite of some progress (Obilo *et al.*, 2021). The empirical validation advances, thus far, partial and contested understanding of dimensionality, with some scholars focusing on the behavioural dimension (e.g., Dolan *et al.*, 2016; Obilo *et al.*, 2021) and others supporting three dimensions (e.g., Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Villamediana-Pedrosa *et al.*, 2020). This newly developed four-dimension scale provides a potential explanation of the exact meaning and applications of negative online brand engagement and differentiates it from the positive side.

The new instrument captures the varying nature of negativity in cognitive and affective engagement, thereby advancing Obilo *et al.*'s (2021) focus on behaviour. The developed measures of the cognitive dimension show consumers' negatively valenced attention and thinking about certain brands, reflecting a dynamic process. The affective dimension captures a range of brand-related negative feelings which have not been identified in previous consumer engagement literature.

Important theoretical advancement concerns the behavioural dimension. Whereas past scholarship tended to view consumers' destructive behaviours as an aspect of negative consumer engagement (Bowden *et al.*, 2017; Nangpiire *et al.*, 2020; Naumann *et al.*, 2020; Zhang *et al.*, 2018), the treatment of constructive behaviours was inconsistent. Some authors identified constructive behaviour as a sub-dimension of negative behavioural engagement (Naumann *et al.*, 2017a, 2017b), whilst others assigned them to positive engagement



behaviours (Azer & Alexander, 2018). Negative engagement behaviour on social media takes various forms and might even aim to brand experience enhancement (Lievonen *et al.*, 2022). The current research confirms that consumer sharing of negativity online has both destructive and constructive aims and both are related to their negative engagement. In providing a valid and reliable measurement, this paper highlights the unique traits of the behavioural dimension and enhances recent research findings by detailing different types of negative engagement behaviours (Obilo *et al.*, 2021). This observation reconciles previously conflicting findings (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023).

An important contribution concerns the portability of the scale. Although the new measure reflects both the idiosyncrasies of the brand as an engagement object and the online environment as an engagement context, the scale seems to be adaptable to different contexts and objects, enhancing existing operationalisations (see Oblio *et al.*; 2021). Specifically, all four dimensions can incorporate negative feelings, thinking and behaviours for other engagement objects, akin to some positive engagement scales (Dessart *et al.*, 2016). The validated items seem to be adaptable to other contexts, aligning with calls to treat the online environment as a distinct context of consumer brand interaction (Dwivedi *et al.*, 2023) and paying attention to engagement as context specific. Therefore, the specific uniqueness of the developed measure lies in the negative valence of the engagement spectrum, which remains a strong contribution of this work.

The nomological validity tests reveal a novel relationship between negativity and brand disloyalty. Past studies focusing on brand disloyalty tended to be qualitative (Naumann *et al.*, 2017b). To the researcher's best knowledge, this paper is the first to offer empirical support for the link between these two constructs. The findings have important implications because the inclusion of loyalty moves engagement closer to purchasing behaviour (Bowden *et al.*, 2015;

Hollebeek *et al.*, 2023). Surprisingly, this study also uncovers the positive effect of negative online brand engagement on happiness. The findings suggest that consumers feel pleased after engaging negatively with the brand online. The relationship offers an additional explanation of how consumers' negative brand-related cognitions, feelings and behaviours positively affect consumers' average level of satisfaction but have significant negative effects on the brand value and firm performance.

### **5. Managerial contribution**

This research offers several implications for marketing practice. Given that consumers engage with brands negatively online, this work offers a valid and reliable measure of the phenomenon that practising managers can use to estimate the intensity of this primarily unwanted engagement for companies. The longitudinal measure of negative online brand engagement can provide managers with temporal trends of how the sentiments towards their brand change over time. For example, managers could use the 17-item scale combined with sentiment analysis tools as a useful applicable tool to automatically track negative comments online across a wide range of sites and platforms.

The scale can assist managers in examining the marketing tactics' effects on consumer behaviour, and help them grasp consumers' negative brand engagement in social media in particular, but also widely online. Understanding the nature of negative online brand engagement and its components, affective, cognitive and constructive and distractive behaviour, can be advantageous for brand managers who need to appreciate that unpleasant thoughts and feelings can be associated with behaviours of different character, all seen on the surface as similar. Not all consumers intent to harm brands when engaging negatively online, and this scale enables managers to evaluate the nature of the negative behaviours and act appropriately. Examining what could drive negative online constructive behavioural

engagement can be highly beneficial, since it could help the brands improve even when the sentiment seems overall negative. The clear identification of the profile of customers and the reasons for developing constructive or distractive brand online negative brand behaviour is needed. Appreciating the triggers leading to negative online brand engagement can help brands to develop appropriate response tactics and a possible reduction of the intended negative online destructive behaviours.

## **6. Limitations and directions for future research**

Despite its contributions, the paper has several limitations concerning sampling and the generalisability of results. Several suggestions are made to advance research in this emerging domain. The first limitation concerns sampling in the quantitative surveys. To gain rich insights into negative online brand engagement, the selection of participants followed non-random principles (i.e., online anti-brand groups and the authors' contacts). Future studies may consider using larger samples or the application of random sampling.

Considering negative engagement in other contexts and with other objects would extend the findings and enhance their generalisability. Future studies may examine offline negative brand engagement and investigate the differences between online and offline engagement. Given the emergence of new online environments, such as the metaverse, examining negative brand engagement in different online contexts will also be of interest. Other engagement objects should be considered and possible candidates include, for example, brand communities and brand community members. Given that qualitative findings highlight the interplay of negative brand engagement and brand community engagement (Bowden *et al.*, 2017), researchers should seek to further investigate negative relationships between different engagement objects.

Given that the scale introduces two different behavioural dimensions, constructive and distractive behaviour, researchers should also further examine the nature of these behaviours

and possible antecedents and mediators that can lead to these. For example, it will be interesting to see if the relational history of consumers with the brand may be influencing their intention to engage with these two, different in nature, behaviours.

## References

- Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U. M. and Herrmann, A. (2005), "The social influence of brand community: Evidence from European car clubs", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 69 No. 3, pp. 19-34.
- Algharabat, R., Rana, N.P., Dwivedi, Y.K., Alalwan, A.A. and Qasem, Z. (2018), "The effect of telepresence, social presence and involvement on consumer brand engagement: An empirical study of non-profit organizations", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 40, pp. 139-149.
- Al-Osail, A.M., Al-Sheikh, M.H., Al-Osail, E.M., Al-Ghamdi, M.A., Al-Hawas, A.M., Al-Bahussain, A.S. and Al-Dajani, A.A. (2015), "Is Cronbach's alpha sufficient for assessing the reliability of the OSCE for an internal medicine course?", *BMC research notes*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 582-582.
- Arora, S.D. and Chakraborty, A. (2021), "Intellectual structure of consumer complaining behavior (CCB) research: A bibliometric analysis", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 122, pp. 60-74.
- Astrachan, C.B., Patel, V.K. & Wanzenried, G. (2014), "A comparative study of CB-SEM and PLS-SEM for theory development in family firm research", *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 116-128.
- Azer, J. and Alexander, M.J. (2018), "Conceptualizing negatively valenced influencing behavior: forms and triggers", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 468-490.
- Azer, J. and Alexander, M. (2020a), "Negative customer engagement behaviour: the interplay of intensity and valence in online networks", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 36 No. (3-4), pp. 361-383.
- Azer, J. and Alexander, M. (2020b), "Direct and indirect negatively valenced engagement behavior", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 7, pp. 967-981.
- Bacon, D. R., Sauer, P. L. and Young, M. (1995), "Composite Reliability in Structural Equations Modeling", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 394-406.
- Baldus, B. J., Voorhees, C. and Calantone, R. (2015), "Online brand community engagement: Scale development and validation", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 68 No. 5, pp. 978-985.
- Barger, V., Peltier, J.W. and Schultz, D.E. (2016), "Social media and consumer engagement:

- a review and research agenda”, *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 268-287.
- Beynon, M.J., Moutinho, L. and Veloutsou, C. (2010), “Gender differences in supermarket choice: An expositional analysis in the presence of ignorance using CaRBS”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 44, No. 1/2, pp. 267-290.
- Bergkvist, L. and Eisend, M. (2021), “The dynamic nature of marketing constructs”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 521-541.
- Bitter, S. and Grabner-Kräuter, S. (2016), “Consequences of customer engagement behavior: when negative Facebook posts have positive effects”, *Electronic Markets*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 219-231.
- Bowden, J. L. H., Gabbott, M. and Naumann, K. (2015), “Service relationships and the customer disengagement--engagement conundrum”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 31 No. 7-8, pp. 774-806.
- Bowden, J.L., Conduit, J., Hollebeek, L.D., Luoma-aho, V. and Solem, B.A. (2017), “Engagement valence duality and spillover effects in online brand communities”, *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 877-897.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006), “Using thematic analysis in psychology”, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp.77-101.
- Cao, D., Meadows, M., Wong, D. and Xia, S. (2021), “Understanding consumers’ social media engagement behaviour: An examination of the moderation effect of social media context”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 122, pp. 835-846.
- Chang, S., Eden, L. and Witteloostuijn, A.V. (2010), “From the Editors: Common method variance in international business research”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 178-184.
- Chin, W. W., Thatcher, J. B., Wright, R. T. and Steel, D. (2013), “Controlling for common method variance in PLS analysis: the measured latent marker variable approach”, Abdi, H. (Ed.), *New Perspectives in Partial Least Squares and Related Methods*, Springer, New York, NY, pp. 231-239.
- Churchill, G.A. (1979), “A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp.64-73.
- Clarke, V. and Braun, V. (2017), “Thematic analysis”, *Journal of Positive Psychology*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 297-298.
- Costello, A. B. and Osborne, J. W. (2005), “Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis:

- Four Recommendations for Getting the Most from Your Analysis”, *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, Vol. 10 No. 7, pp.1-9.
- Cottrell, S.A., Branstetter, S., Cottrell, L., Harris, C.V., Rishel, C. and Stanton, B.F. (2007), “Development and Validation of a Parental Monitoring Instrument: Measuring How Parents Monitor Adolescents' Activities and Risk Behaviors”, *The Family Journal (Alexandria, Va.)*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 328-335.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007), *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Dash, G. & Paul, J. (2021), “CB-SEM vs PLS-SEM methods for research in social sciences and technology forecasting”, *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, Vol. 173, pp. 121092.
- Davis, J., Mengersen, K., Bennett, S. and Mazerolle, L. (2014), “Viewing systematic reviews and meta-analysis in social research through different lenses”, *SpringerPlus*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2017), *Scale Development. Theory and Applications (Fourth)*. Sage Publications.
- de Villiers, R. (2015), “Consumer brand enmeshment: Typography and complexity modeling of consumer brand engagement and brand loyalty enactments”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 68 No. 9, pp. 1953-1963.
- Décieux, J.P., Mergener, A., Neufang, K.M. and Sischka, P. (2015), “Implementation of the forced answering option within online surveys: Do higher item response rates come at the expense of participation and answer quality?” *Psihologija*, Vol. 48 No. 4, pp. 311-326.
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C. and Morgan-Thomas, A. (2015), “Consumer engagement in online brand communities: a social media perspective”, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 28-42.
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C. and Morgan-Thomas, A. (2016), “Capturing consumer engagement: duality, dimensionality and measurement”, *Journal of Marketing Management*. Vol. 32 No. 5-6, pp. 399-426.
- Dessart, L., Aldás-Manzano, J. and Veloutsou, C. (2019), “Unveiling heterogeneous engagement-based loyalty in brand communities”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 53 No 9, pp. 1854-1881.
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C. and Morgan-Thomas, A. (2020), “Brand negativity: a relational perspective on anti-brand community participation”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.

- 54 No. 7, pp. 1761-1785.
- Díaz, A., Gómez, M. and Molina, A. (2017), "A comparison of online and offline consumer behaviour: An empirical study on a cinema shopping context", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 38, pp. 44-50.
- Dijkmans, C., Kerkhof, P. and Beukeboom, C.J. (2015), "A stage to engage: Social media use and corporate reputation", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 47, pp. 58-67.
- Do, D.K.X., Rahman, K. and Robinson, L.J. (2020), "Determinants of negative customer engagement behaviours", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 117-135.
- Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J. and Goodman, S. (2016), "Social media engagement behaviour: a uses and gratifications perspective", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. (3-4), pp. 261-277.
- Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Frethey-Bentham, C., Fahy, J. and Goodman, S. (2019), "Social media engagement behavior: A framework for engaging customers through social media content", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 53 No. 10, pp. 2213-2243.
- Dwivedi, Y.K., Hughes, L., Wang, Y., Alalwan, A.A., Ahn, S.J., Balakrishnan, J., Barta, S., Belk, R., Buhalis, D., Dutot, V., Felix, R., Filieri, R., Flavián, C., Gustafsson, A., Hinsch, C., Hollensen, S., Jain, V., Kim, J., Krishen, A.S., Lartey, J.O., Pandey, N., Ribeiro-Navarrete, S., Raman, R., Rauschnabel, P.A., Sharma, A., Sigala, M., Veloutsou, C. and Wirtz, J. (2023), "Metaverse marketing: How the metaverse will shape the future of consumer research and practice", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 750-776.
- Fang, Y. (2017), "Beyond the Usefulness of Branded Applications: Insights from Consumer-Brand Engagement and Self-Constraint Perspectives", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 40-58.
- Ferreira, M., Zambaldi, F. and Guerra, D.D.S. (2020), "Consumer engagement in social media: scale comparison analysis", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 491-503.
- Finch, H. (2006), "Comparison of the Performance of Varimax and Promax Rotations: Factor Structure Recovery for Dichotomous Items", *Journal of Educational Measurement*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 39-52.
- Florenthal, B. (2019), "Young consumers' motivational drivers of brand engagement behavior on social media sites: A synthesized U&G and TAM framework", *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 351-391.
- Fornell, C. and Larcker, D. F. (1981), "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with



- Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50.
- Frikha, A. (2019), *Measurement in marketing: operationalization of latent constructs*, ISTE, Ltd, London, UK.
- Fusch, P. I. and Ness, L. R. (2015), “Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research”, *The Qualitative Report*, Vol. 20 No. 9, pp. 1408-1416.
- Gebauer, J., Füller, J. and Pezzei, R. (2013), “The Dark and the Bright Side of Co-creation: Triggers of Member Behavior in Online Innovation Communities”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 9, pp. 1516-1527.
- Gerbing, D. W. and Anderson, J. C. (1988), “An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 186-192.
- Gilliam, D.A. and Voss, K. (2013), “A proposed procedure for construct definition in marketing”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47 No. (1/2), pp. 5-26.
- Gorsuch, R.L. (1983), *Factor Analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hair, J., Bush, R. and Ortinau, D. (2006), *Marketing research within a changing environment*, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Hair J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. (2013), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th International Edition, Pearson Higher Education.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. and Anderson, R. E. (2019), *Multivariate data analysis*, 8th ed. Hampshire, UK Cengage Learning.
- Hardesty, D. M., and Bearden, W. O. (2004), “The use of expert judges in scale development: Implications for improving face validity of measures of unobservable constructs”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 57, pp. 98-107.
- Haws, K.L., Sample, K.L. and Hulland, J. (2023), “Scale use and abuse: Towards best practices in the deployment of scales”, *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 33 No.1, pp. 226-243.
- Heinonen, K. (2018), “Positive and negative valence influencing CE”, *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 147-169.
- Henson, R.K. and Roberts, J.K. (2006), “Use of Exploratory Factor Analysis in Published Research: Common Errors and Some Comment on Improved Practice”, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 66 No. 3, pp. 393-416.
- Hollebeek, L. D. (2011a), “Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty nexus”, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 27 No. 7-8, pp. 785-807.

- Hollebeek, L. (2011b), "Exploring customer brand engagement: Definition and themes", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 7, pp. 555-573.
- Hollebeek, L., and Chen, T. (2014), "Exploring positively-versus negatively-valenced brand engagement: a conceptual model", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 62-74.
- Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S. and Brodie, R. J. (2014), "Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 149-165.
- Hollebeek, L.D., Sharma, T.G., Pandey, R., Sanyal, P. and Clark, M.K. (2022), "Fifteen years of customer engagement research: a bibliometric and network analysis", *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 293-309.
- Hollebeek, L.D., Sarstedt, M., Menidjel, C., Sprott, D.E. and Urbonavicius, S. (2023), "Hallmarks and potential pitfalls of customer- and consumer engagement scales: A systematic review", *Psychology & Marketing*, pp. 1-15.
- Jackson, D.L., Gillaspay, J.A. and Purc-Stephenson, R. (2009), "Reporting Practices in Confirmatory Factor Analysis: An Overview and Some Recommendations", *Psychological Methods*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 6-23.
- Jahn, B. and Kunz, W. (2012), "How to transform consumers into fans of your brand", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 344-361.
- Kim, Y. and Lim, H. (2020), "Activating constructive employee behavioural responses in a crisis: Examining the effects of pre-crisis reputation and crisis communication strategies on employee voice behaviours", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 141-157.
- Kozinets, R. (2010), *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*. London: Sage publications.
- Kulikovskaja, V., Hubert, M., Grunert, K.G. and Zhao, H. (2023), "Driving marketing outcomes through social media-based customer engagement", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 74, 103445.
- Kumar, V. and Pansari, A. (2016), "Competitive Advantage Through Engagement", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 497-514.
- Kumar, J. (2021), "Understanding customer brand engagement in brand communities: an application of psychological ownership theory and congruity theory", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 55 No. 4, pp. 969-994.

- Kumar, J. (2022), “Understanding the ties between brand gender and brand engagement in online brand communities: the moderating role of consumers’ biological sex”, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 761-779.
- Labrecque, L.I., Markos, E., Yuksel, M. and Khan, T.A. (2022), “Value Creation (vs Value Destruction) as an Unintended Consequence of Negative Comments on [Innocuous] Brand Social Media Posts”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 57 No. 1, pp. 115-140.
- Lee, D., Hosanagar, K. and Nair, H.S. (2018), “Advertising Content and Consumer Engagement on Social Media: Evidence from Facebook”, *Management Science*, Vol. 64 No. 11, pp. 5105-5131.
- Li, D. & Atkinson, L. (2020), “The role of psychological ownership in consumer happiness”, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 37 No. 6, pp. 629-638.
- Liao, J., Chen, J., Zhao, H. and Li, M., (2023), “Fanning the flames: Transmitting negative word of mouth of rival brands”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 154, 113318.
- Lievonen, M., Bowden, J. and Luoma-aho, L., (2022), “Towards a typology of negative engagement behavior in social media”, *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 3-4, pp. 238-259.
- Lin, C., Wang, K., Chang, S. and Lin, J. (2019), “Investigating the development of brand loyalty in brand communities from a positive psychology perspective”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 99, pp. 446-455.
- Lourenço, C.E., Hair, J.F., Zambaldi, F. and Ponchio, M.C. (2022), “Consumer brand engagement concept and measurement: Toward a refined approach”, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 68, 103053.
- MacKenzie, S.B. (2003), “The dangers of poor construct conceptualization”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 323-326.
- MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. and Podsakoff, N.P. (2011) “Construct measurement and validation procedures in MIS and behavioral research: Integrating new and existing techniques”, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 293-334.
- Marbach, J., Lages, C. R. and Nunan, D. (2016), “Who are you and what do you value ? Investigating the role of personality traits and customer- perceived value in online customer engagement”, *Journal of Marketing Management*. Vol. 32 No. 5-6, pp. 502-525.
- Mirbagheri, S. and Najmi, M. (2019), “Consumers' engagement with social media activation campaigns: Construct conceptualization and scale development”, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 36 No. 4, pp. 376-394.

- Moon, J., Choe, Y. and Song, H. (2021), "Determinants of Consumers' Online/Offline Shopping Behaviours during the COVID-19 Pandemic", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 1593.
- Morgan-Thomas, A., Dessart, L. and Veloutsou, C. (2020), "Digital ecosystem and consumer engagement: A socio-technical perspective", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 121, pp. 713-723.
- Nangpiire, C., Silva, J. and Alves, H. (2022), "Customer engagement and value co-creation/destruction: the internal fostering and hindering factors and actors in the tourist/hotel experience", *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 173-188.
- Naumann, K., Bowden, J.L. and Gabbott, M. (2017a), "A Multi-Valenced Perspective on CE Within a Social Service", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 171-188.
- Naumann, K., Bowden, J.L. and Gabbott, M. (2017b), "Exploring customer engagement valences in the social services", *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 890-912.
- Naumann, K., Bowden, J. and Gabbott, M. (2020), "Expanding customer engagement: the role of negative engagement, dual valences and contexts", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 7, pp. 1469-1499.
- Obilo, O.O., Chefor, E. and Saleh, A. (2021), "Revisiting the consumer brand engagement concept", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 126, pp. 634-643.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007), "A Caution Regarding Rules of Thumb for Variance Inflation Factors", *Quality & Quantity*, Vol. 41, pp. 673-690.
- Ou, H., Lin, C., Erickson, S.R. and Balkrishnan, R. (2016), "Refined comorbidity index based on dimensionality of comorbidity for use in studies of health-related quality of life", *Quality of Life Research*, Vol. 25 No. 10, pp. 2543-2557.
- Parihar, P. and Dawra, J. (2020), "The role of customer engagement in travel services", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 29 No. 7, pp. 899-911.
- Pech, G. and Delgado, C. (2020), "Assessing the publication impact using citation data from both Scopus and WoS databases: an approach validated in 15 research fields", *Scientometrics*, Vol. 125 No. 2, pp. 909-924.
- Plé, L. and Cáceres, R.C. (2010), "Not always co-creation: introducing interactional co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic" *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 24 No.

- 6, pp. 430-437.
- Rahman, M., Faroque, A.R., Sakka, G. and Ahmed, Z.U. (2022), "The impact of negative customer engagement on market-based assets and financial performance", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 138, pp. 422-435.
- Raïes, K., Mühlbacher, H. and Gavard-Perret, M. L. (2015), "Consumption community commitment: Newbies' and longstanding members' brand engagement and loyalty", *Journal of Business Research*, pp. 2634-2644.
- Rigdon, E.E., Sarstedt, M., and Ringle, C.M., 2017, "On Comparing Results from CB-SEM and PLS-SEM", *Journal of Research and Management*, Vol. 39, pp. 4-16
- Rissanen, H. and Luoma-Aho, V. (2016), "(Un)willing to engage? First look at the engagement types of millennials", *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 500-515.
- Rodrigues, P. and Pinto Borges, A. (2021), "Negative emotions toward a financial brand: the opposite impact on brand love", *European Business Review*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 272-294.
- Romani, S., Grappi, S. and Bagozzi, R.P. (2013), "My anger is your gain, my contempt your loss: explaining consumer responses to corporate wrongdoing", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 12, pp. 1029-1042.
- Rossiter, J.R. (2002), "The C-OAR-SE procedure for scale development in marketing", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 305-335.
- Şahan, C., Baydur, H. and Demiral, Y. (2019), "A novel version of Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire-3: Turkish validation study", *Archives of Environmental & Occupational Health*, Vol. 74 No. 6, pp. 297-309.
- Schamari, J. and Schaefer, T. (2015), "Leaving the Home Turf: How Brands Can Use Webcare on Consumer-generated Platforms to Increase PCE", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. Vol. 30, pp. 20-33.
- Schivinski, B., Christodoulides, G. and Dabrowski, D. (2016), "Measuring Consumers' Engagement with Brand-Related Social-Media Content: Development and Validation of a Scale that Identifies Levels of Social-Media Engagement with Brands", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 56 No. 1, pp. 64-80.
- Schultz, D.E. and Peltier, J. (2013), "Social media's slippery slope: challenges, opportunities and future research directions", *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 86-99.
- Shahbaznezhad, H., Dolan, R. and Rashidirad, M. (2021), "The Role of Social Media Content

- Format and Platform in Users' Engagement Behavior”, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp. 47-65.
- Siddaway, A.P., Wood, A.M. and Hedges, L.V. (2019), “How to Do a Systematic Review: A Best Practice Guide for Conducting and Reporting Narrative Reviews, Meta-Analyses, and Meta-Syntheses”, *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 70 No. 1, pp. 747-770.
- Snyder, H. (2019), “Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 104, pp. 333-339.
- Sprott, D., Czellar, S. and Spangenberg, E. (2009), “The Importance of a General Measure of Brand Engagement on Market Behavior: Development and Validation of a Scale”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 92-104.
- Stathopoulou, A., Borel, L., Christodoulides, G. and West, D. (2017), “Consumer Branded #Hashtag Engagement: Can Creativity in TV Advertising Influence Hashtag Engagement”, *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 448-462.
- Sun, S., Geng, Y., Tang, F., Zhang, T., Yin, C. and Zhou, Y. (2020), “Development and Validation of Psychological Contract Scale for Hospital Pharmacists”, *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, Vol. 13, pp. 1433-1442.
- Swaminathan, V., Sorescu, A., Steenkamp, J.E.M., O’Guinn, T.C.G. and Schmitt, B. (2020), “Branding in a Hyperconnected World: Refocusing Theories and Rethinking Boundaries”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 84 No. 2, pp. 24-46.
- Tehseen, S., Ramayah, T. and Sajilan, S. (2017), “Testing and Controlling for Common Method Variance: A Review of Available Methods”, *Journal of Management Sciences*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 142-168.
- Tuškej, U. and Podnar, K. (2018), “Consumers’ identification with corporate brands: Brand prestige, anthropomorphism and engagement in social media”, *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 3-17.
- van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P. and Verhoef, P. C. (2010), “Customer engagement behavior: theoretical foundations and research directions”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 253-266.
- van Teijlingen, E. and Hundley, V. (2002), “The importance of pilot studies”, *Nursing Standard*, Vol. 16 No. 40, pp. 33-36.
- Villamediana-Pedrosa, J.D., Vila-López, N. and Küster-Boluda, I. (2020), “Predictors of tourist engagement: Travel motives and tourism destination profiles”, *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, Vol. 16, pp. 1-18.

- Vivek, S.D., Beatty, S.E., Dalela, V. and Morgan, R.M. (2014), “A Generalized Multidimensional Scale for Measuring Customer Engagement”, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 401-420.
- Voorhees, C. M., Brady, M. K., Calantone, R. and Ramirez, E. (2016), “Discriminant validity testing in marketing: an analysis, causes for concern, and proposed remedies”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 119-134.
- Wang, T., Limbu, Y.B. & Fang, X. (2022), “Consumer brand engagement on social media in the COVID-19 pandemic: the roles of country-of-origin and consumer animosity”, *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 45-63.
- Wolter, J.S., Bacile, T.J. and Xu, P. (2023), “How Online Incivility Affects Consumer Engagement Behavior on Brands’ Social Media”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 103-119.
- Wong, T.C., Haddoud, M.Y., Kwok, Y.K. and He, H. (2018), “Examining the key determinants towards online pro-brand and anti-brand community citizenship behaviours: A two-stage approach”, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, Vol. 118 No. 4, pp. 850-872.
- Wright, K.B. (2005), “Researching Internet-Based Populations: Advantages and Disadvantages of Online Survey Research, Online Questionnaire Authoring Software Packages, and Web Survey Services”, *Journal of Computer-mediated Communication*, Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 1-10.
- Żakowska-Biemans, S., Pieniak, Z., Kostyra, E. and Gutkowska, K. (2019). “Searching for a Measure Integrating Sustainable and Healthy Eating Behaviors”, *Nutrients*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
- Zhang, T., Lu, C., Torres, E. and Chen, P. (2018), “Engaging customers in value co-creation or co-destruction online”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 57-69.

**Table 1. Existing definitions of negative engagement with various objects**

| Articles                       | Paper type   | Objects                     | Construct                                | Context         | Definitions  |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| van Doorn <i>et al.</i> , 2010 | conceptual   | brand                       | customer engagement behaviour            | N/A             | Customers' <b>behavioural</b> manifestation toward a brand or firm, beyond purchase, resulting from motivational drivers.  |
| Hollebeek & Chen 2014          | qualitative  | brand                       | brand engagement                         | online          | Consumers' unfavourable brand-related <b>thoughts, feelings, and behaviours</b> during brand interactions.   |
| de Villiers 2015               | qualitative  | brand                       | consumer brand engagement                | online          | Consumers' negatively valenced <b>cognitions, emotions and behaviours</b> toward the brand, which can be active or passive.  |
| Dolan <i>et al.</i> , 2016     | conceptual   | brand                       | social media engagement behaviour        | online          | Consumers' unfavourable brand-related <b>behaviours</b> during interactions.   |
| Bitter & Grabner-Kräuter 2016  | quantitative | brand                       | customer engagement behaviour            | online          | The <b>behavioural</b> manifestations of customer engagement on social networking sites.   |
| Rissanen & Luoma-Aho 2016      | qualitative  | organisation                | consumer engagement                      | online          | Negative <b>behavioural</b> manifestations such as protests and sharing negative information about the organisation.   |
| Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2017a  | qualitative  | service provider, community | consumer engagement                      | offline         | Consumers' strong negative <b>thoughts, feelings and behaviours</b> toward their service provider.   |
| Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2017b  | qualitative  | organisation, community     | customer engagement                      | offline         | A negatively valenced manifestation of engagement consisting of <b>cognitive, emotional and behavioural</b> components.  |
| Bowden <i>et al.</i> , 2017    | qualitative  | brand, brand community      | consumer engagement                      | online          | A consumer's negatively valenced <b>cognitive, emotional and behavioural</b> investments during or related to interactions with focal objects or agents.   |
| Azer & Alexander 2018          | qualitative  | brand                       | customer engagement behaviour            | online          | Negative engagement <b>behaviours</b> include discrediting, deriding, expressing regret, endorsing competitors, dissuading, warning.   |
| Heinonen 2018                  | qualitative  | interests                   | consumer engagement                      | online          | Community members' <b>cognitive, emotional, and behavioural</b> investments in a specific area of interest.  |
| Do <i>et al.</i> , 2020        | conceptual   | brand                       | customer engagement behaviour            | offline         | A customer's unfavourable <b>thoughts, feelings and behaviours</b> towards a service brand or provider result from negative critical events that cause perceived threats to customers.   |
| Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2020   | quantitative | brand, brand community      | customer engagement                      | online, offline | Consumers' unfavourable <b>thoughts, feelings, and behaviours</b> towards the dual focal objects.  |
| Azer & Alexander 2020a         | quantitative | service provider            | negative customer engagement behaviour   | online          | Customer contributions of resources such as knowledge, skills, experience, and time negatively affect other actors' knowledge, expectations, and perception about a focal service provider.  |
| Azer & Alexander 2020b         | quantitative | service provider            | negatively valenced engagement behaviour | online          | Customers beyond the transactional negative <b>behavioural</b> manifestations.   |
| Rahman <i>et al.</i> , 2022    | quantitative | brand                       | negative customer engagement             | online          | Customers' motivation to invest time and resources to bring disappointing service experiences to the attention of relevant authorities in the form of formal <b>complaints</b> to negatively affect other actors' service perception about the firm in question. |



**Table 2. Indicative articles that reported a quantitative scale development for positive engagement**

| Article                          | Focus                              | Construct                 | Dimensions of positive engagement and number of items  |   |   |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---|
|                                  |                                    |                           | Cognitive  | Affective   | Behavioural   |
| Algesheimer <i>et al.</i> , 2005 | community                          | community engagement      | -  | -   | <b>Community engagement</b> (4 items)   |
| Sprott <i>et al.</i> , 2009      | brand                              | brand engagement          | -  | <b>Brand engagement in self-concept</b> (8 items)   | -   |
| Jahn & Kunz 2012                 | fanpage                            | customer engagement       | -  | -   | <b>Fan-page engagement</b> (5 items)  |
| Hollebeek <i>et al.</i> , 2014   | brand                              | consumer brand engagement | <b>Cognitive processing:</b> a consumer's level of brand-related thought processing and elaboration in a particular consumer/brand interaction. (3 items)                      | <b>Affection:</b> a consumer's degree of positive brand-related affect in a particular consumer/brand interaction. (4 items)  | <b>Activation:</b> a consumer's level of energy, effort and time spent on a brand in a particular consumer/brand interaction. (3 items)   |
| Vivek <i>et al.</i> , 2014       | brand                              | customer engagement       | <b>Conscious attention:</b> the degree of interest the person has or wishes to have in interacting with the focus of their engagement. (3 items)                               | <b>Enthusied participation:</b> the zealous reactions and feelings of a person related to using or interacting with the focus of their engagement. (4 items)  | <b>Social connection:</b> enhancement of the interaction based on the inclusion of others with the focus of engagement. (3 items)         |
| Dijkmans <i>et al.</i> , 2015    | social media activities            | online engagement         | Familiarity with social media activities (1 item)  | -   | Online following of these activities (1 item)   |
| Dessart <i>et al.</i> , 2016     | brand, brand community             | consumer engagement       | Set of enduring and active mental states that a consumer experiences. <b>Attention</b> (2 items); <b>Absorption</b> (4 items)  | Summative and enduring level of emotions experienced by a consumer. <b>Enthusiasm</b> (3 items); <b>Enjoyment</b> (3 items)   | Behavioural manifestations towards an engagement partner. <b>Sharing</b> (3 items); <b>Learning</b> (3 items); <b>Endorsing</b> (4 items) |
| Schivinski <i>et al.</i> , 2016  | brand-related social-media content | consumer engagement       | -  | -   | Consumption, Contribution, Creation (17 items)  |
| Kumar & Pansari 2016             | customer, firm                     | customer engagement       | -  | -   | Customer purchase, Referral, Influencer, Knowledge behaviour (16 items)   |
| Mirbagheri & Najmi 2019          | social media activation campaigns  | consumer engagement       | <b>Attention:</b> the extent to which a consumer concentrates on, is attentive to, thinks about, and is absorbed or engrossed in a social media activation campaign. (4 items) | <b>Interest and enjoyment:</b> the extent to which consumers become interested in, or excited about a social media activation campaign, as well as the extent to which they derive pleasure and joy from their experiences with it. (4 items) | <b>Participation:</b> consumers' willingness to spend effort and time during the campaign on activities (4 items)                         |
| Lourenço <i>et al.</i> , 2022    | brand                              | brand engagement          | <b>Cognitive</b> (3 items)   | <b>Emotion</b> (3 items)  | <b>Behaviour</b> (3 items)  |

**Table 3. Scale development process (four-step)**

| Steps   |            | Methods  | Data   | Results   |
|---|------------|--|--|---|
| Step 1: Definition of negative online brand engagement, Item generation | Activity 1 | Literature review on (a) negative and (b) positive consumer engagement                       | For the period 2000-2020 all papers on negative engagement (31 articles) and 314 articles on positive engagement were selected using a systematic approach (Table 4) | Construct definition, dimensionality and dimensions definitions (Table 6)<br>Generation of the initial set of 171 items |
|   | Activity 2 | Online observation (Study 1)   | A total of 654 Amazon reviews (73110 words).   |   |
|   | Activity 3 | Semi-structured interviews with moderators of online anti-brand communities (Study 2)        | 10 moderators produced 40231 words of transcription (Table 5)  |   |
|   | Activity 4 | Semi-structured interviews with members of online anti-brand communities (Study 3)           | 15 community members produced 54506 words of transcription (Table 5)   |   |
| Step 2: Item purification   | Activity 1 | Face validity  | Ask six anti-brand community members if the item pool is relevant to, can be useful and appropriate for what it intends to measure.                                  | Reduced the 171 to 160 items  |
|   | Activity 2 | Research team meeting  | Thirteen 60-minute-long face-to-face meetings between co-authors.  | Reduced the 160 to 61 items   |
|   | Activity 3 | Academic experts panel (Study 4)   | 29 academic researchers in branding  | Reduced the 61 to 32 items  |
| Step 3: Reliability and validity  | Activity 1 | Pre-test (Study 5)   | 20 marketing researchers at the UK-based University  | All 32 items were retained  |
|   | Activity 2 | Pilot study (Study 6)  | A convenience sample (author's network and snowballing) generated 41 usable responses  | No reliability or any other issues concerning administration or response  |
|   | Activity 3 | Item reduction - Exploratory Factor Analysis (Study 7)                                       | Calibration sample collected from Social Media anti-brand communities (N=205) (Table 7)  | Reduced the 32 to 27 items (Table 8)  |
|   | Activity 4 | Item reduction - Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Study 8)                                      | Both Calibration sample collected from Social Media anti-brand communities (N=205) and Validation sample collected via snowballing in Social Media (N=205) (Table 7) | Reduced the 27 to 17 items<br>The 17-item scale exhibited a good fit and properties (Tables 9 and 10)                   |
| Step 4: Nomological network, Discriminant validity                      | Activity 1 | Negative online brand engagement relationships with brand disloyalty and happiness (Study 9) | Validation sample collected from snowballing in Social Media (N=205) (Table 7)   | Nomological validity supported indicating reliable and validity with good fit and properties (Tables 11 and 12)         |

**Table 4. Criteria for selecting articles on positive consumer engagement**

|   | <b>Marketing</b>   | <b>Strategy and Management</b> |
|---|--|--------------------------------|
| <b>Inclusion criteria #1</b> - Data source  | Scopus top 25%   | Scopus top 20%                 |
| <b>Inclusion criteria #2</b> - Keywords   | consumer engagement OR customer engagement OR positive engagement OR online engagement OR brand engagement OR cognitive engagement OR emotional engagement OR affective engagement OR behavioural engagement |                                |
| <b>Inclusion criteria #3</b> - Time period  | 2000-2020  |                                |
| <b>Inclusion criteria #4</b> - Language   | English  |                                |
| <b>Retreated</b>  | 320  | 87                             |
| <b>Exclusion criteria #1</b> - Articles with key field mistakes or missing author names                   | 29   | 43                             |
| <b>Retained articles</b>  | 291  | 44                             |
| <b>Exclusion criteria #2</b> - Articles outside the marketing/branding areas                              | 3  | 7                              |
| <b>Retained articles</b>  | 288  | 37                             |
| <b>Exclusion criteria #3</b> - Articles not focusing on engagement or consumers as the engagement subject | 3  | 8                              |
| <b>Retained articles</b>  | 285  | 29                             |

**Table 5. Qualitative phase: respondents' demographics (10 moderators & 15 members of social media hosted anti-brand communities)**

| No | Name         | Gender | Nationality | Age Group | Employment          | Facebook Group                         | Number of words (transcript) | Interview duration (mins) |
|----|--------------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1  | Moderator 1  | F      | US          | 36-45     | At the hotel        | I Hate Walmart With A Passion          | 4322                         | 36                        |
| 2  | Moderator 2  | M      | UK          | 26-35     | Engineer            | We hate BT broadband speed/Openreach   | 5198                         | 41                        |
| 3  | Moderator 3  | F      | UK          | 56-65     | Manager             | Nestle Boycott                         | 1669                         | 13                        |
| 4  | Moderator 4  | M      | US          | 26-35     | Financial Advisor   | Boycott Disney's Star Wars             | 4771                         | 35                        |
| 5  | Moderator 5  | F      | UK          | 56-65     | Lecturer            | Nestle Boycott                         | 4352                         | 28                        |
| 6  | Moderator 6  | M      | UK          | 56-65     | Retired             | BT broadband sucks                     | 5828                         | 39                        |
| 7  | Moderator 7  | M      | UK          | 26-35     | Vehicle repair      | I Hate Apple                           | 3805                         | 27                        |
| 8  | Moderator 8  | M      | Kuwait      | 26-35     | Manager             | I hate Google (page)                   | 3272                         | 23                        |
| 9  | Moderator 9  | M      | UK          | 36-45     | Engineer            | Boycott Amazon the tax avoiding pricks | 1963                         | 17                        |
| 10 | Moderator 10 | M      | UK          | 26-35     | Insurance           | Apple Sucks (page)                     | 5051                         | 35                        |
| 11 | Member 1     | F      | US          | 46-55     | Bus driver          | I Hate Walmart With A Passion          | 3587                         | 30                        |
| 12 | Member 2     | F      | US          | 36-45     | Social worker       | I Hate Walmart With A Passion          | 5281                         | 42                        |
| 13 | Member 3     | M      | UK          | 26-35     | Fun expert          | I Hate Apple                           | 4615                         | 37                        |
| 14 | Member 4     | F      | Canada      | 66-75     | Retired             | I Hate Walmart With A Passion          | 4692                         | 53                        |
| 15 | Member 5     | M      | US          | 36-45     | Engineer            | I Hate Apple                           | 5158                         | 36                        |
| 16 | Member 6     | M      | UK          | 66-75     | Retired             | Nestle Boycott                         | 2848                         | 24                        |
| 17 | Member 7     | M      | Denmark     | 36-45     | Engineer            | I Hate Apple                           | 4712                         | 39                        |
| 18 | Member 8     | M      | UK          | 26-35     | Self-employed       | BT broadband sucks!                    | 2774                         | 22                        |
| 19 | Member 9     | M      | UK          | 26-35     | Recycling officer   | Nestle Boycott                         | 2892                         | 24                        |
| 20 | Member 10    | M      | US          | 46-55     | Disabled            | Nestle Boycott                         | 5904                         | 58                        |
| 21 | Member 11    | F      | UK          | 56-65     | Library assistant   | Nestle Boycott                         | 5700                         | 48                        |
| 22 | Member 12    | M      | US          | 46-55     | IT tech             | I Hate Apple                           | 960                          | by text                   |
| 23 | Member 13    | M      | US          | 18-25     | At grocery store    | Nestle Boycott                         | 2472                         | 23                        |
| 24 | Member 14    | M      | Singapore   | 26-35     | software consultant | I Hate Apple                           | 3871                         | 30                        |
| 25 | Member 15    | F      | UK          | 36-45     | stay-at-home mother | Nestle Boycott                         | 1049                         | by text                   |

**Table 6. Dimensions of negative online brand engagement**

| Dimension  | Sub-dimension   | Literature influencing the definition  | Supporting quotes from Study 1-3  | Number of items |                   |                   |                   |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|  |   |  |   | Step1 Generated | Step 2 Activity 1 | Step 2 Activity 2 | Step 2 Activity 3 |
| <b>Cognitive dimension:</b> the level of a consumer's negatively valenced brand-related attention and thinking.                                | <b>Attention:</b> the extent of a consumer being negatively attended to the brand in the online environment.  | Vivek <i>et al.</i> , 2014; Hollebeek <i>et al.</i> , 2014; Dessart <i>et al.</i> , 2015, 2016   | 'As the years progressed, I started to realise that Google is now attracted to the way Apple does which kind of puts me off' (Moderator 10, 31). -Study 2<br>'The first impression of the Tab A in white was cheap and nasty.' (Samsung 1) -Study 1   | 32              | 30                | 10                | 4                 |
|  | <b>Thinking:</b> the extent of a consumer considering negatively of a brand in their mind.  | Hollebeek & Chen 2014; Dessart <i>et al.</i> , 2015, 2016; Fang 2017; Tathopoulou <i>et al.</i> , 2017; Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2017a          | 'They thought that the overall storytelling was so poor, that it needs to be recognized that it was poor storytelling. And it ruined their Star Wars experience' (Moderator 4, 30). -Study 2<br>'Samsung limits the watch too much and forces you to use what they want. This isn't right' (Samsung 2). -Study 1  | 18              | 14                | 7                 | 5                 |
| <b>Affective dimension:</b> the degree of a consumer's negative feelings and emotions toward the brand.  | <b>Diversity of negative feelings:</b> the collection of consumers' overall negative feelings about the brand.  | Hollebeek & Chen 2014; Raïes <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Baldus <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Dessart <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2017a    | 'And I am also disappointed in the way that they behave... I think they are holding the industry back in a lot of ways' (Member 5, 44). -Study 3<br>'I had my doubts as soon as I powered it on but now after a panel failure after just 3 months I am worried about its longevity' (Samsung 4). -Study1  | 42              | 40                | 23                | 6                 |
|  | <b>Negative emotion demonstration:</b> the extent of consumers consciously surface their negative emotions.   | Hollebeek & Chen 2014; Raïes <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Baldus <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Dessart <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2017a    | 'ABSOLUTE RUBBISH!!!!!!!!!!!! BROKE AFTER A WEEK OF USING THEM! WHAT.....A.....WASTE.....OF.....MONEY' (Apple 1). -Study 1<br>'The connection is TERRIBLE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!' (Samsung 5). -Study 1  | 20              | 20                | 11                | 7                 |
| <b>Behavioural dimension:</b> the consumer's negatively valenced constructive and destructive behaviours to a brand in the online environment. | <b>Online constructive behaviour:</b> consumers' positively oriented online actions to solve the brand's problem considering one's own concern as well as those of the brand. | Romani <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2017a, 2017b; Kim & Lim 2020  | 'I've written many multi-paragraph essays in the group, so if Apple is monitoring the group or anything like that, then they have certainly gotten my opinion in that respect' (Member 5, 44). -Study 3<br>'The screen locked and the waiting circle log in the middle of a black screen kicked in....and ran for 12 hours during which time I could not do anything' (Apple 2). -Study 1 | 34              | 32                | 5                 | 5                 |
|  | <b>Online destructive behaviour:</b> consumers' negatively oriented online actions to harm the brand considering one's own concerns.  | Plé & Cáceres 2010; Gebauer <i>et al.</i> , 2013; Dolan <i>et al.</i> , 2016; Naumann <i>et al.</i> , 2017a, 2017b; Chang <i>et al.</i> , 2018 | 'Sometimes, people can be a little aggressive but it is I HATE Walmart with a passion, so people have that passion...' (Moderator 1, 39) -Study 2<br>'It ended up with a logo that said, killer Kit Kat and several members change their pro-Facebook profile to the killer profile and posted on Nestle's Facebook page' (Moderator 3, 61). -Study 2                                     | 25              | 24                | 5                 | 5                 |
| <b>Total</b>   |   | -  | -   | <b>171</b>      | <b>160</b>        | <b>61</b>         | <b>32</b>         |

**Table 7. Participants' demographics**

|                                   | <b>Calibration sample (N=205) -<br/>Facebook anti-brand groups</b> | <b>Validation samples (N=205) -<br/>the authors' contacts</b> |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Gender</b>                     |  |   |
| Female                            | 119 (58%)  | 129 (63%)   |
| Male                              | 86 (42%)   | 76 (37%)  |
| <b>Age</b>                        |  |   |
| 18-24                             | 45 (21%)   | 31 (15%)  |
| 25-34                             | 73 (36%)   | 100 (49%)   |
| 35-44                             | 36 (18%)   | 31 (15%)  |
| 45-54                             | 23 (11%)   | 30 (15%)  |
| Over 55                           | 28 (14%)   | 13 (6%)   |
| <b>Education</b>                  |  |   |
| High school                       | 18 (9%)  | 29 (14%)  |
| Technical training                | 7 (3%)   | 12 (6%)   |
| Professional qualification        | 27 (13%)   | 22 (11%)  |
| Undergraduate degree              | 53 (26%)   | 80 (39%)  |
| Postgraduate degree               | 83 (41%)   | 57 (28%)  |
| Other                             | 17 (8%)  | 5 (2%)  |
| <b>Employment</b>                 |  |   |
| Student                           | 46 (22%)   | 38 (19%)  |
| Self-employed                     | 17 (9%)  | 21 (10%)  |
| Working full-time                 | 84 (41%)   | 117 (57%)   |
| Working part-time                 | 20 (10%)   | 5 (2%)  |
| Out of work                       | 10 (5%)  | 10 (5%)   |
| Retired                           | 19 (9%)  | 12 (6%)   |
| Others                            | 5 (2%)   | -   |
| N/A                               | 4 (2%)   | 1 (<1%)   |
| <b>Country of residence</b>       |  |   |
| Canada                            | 5 (2%)   | 1 (<1%)   |
| China                             | 32 (16%)   | 157 (77%)   |
| India                             | 10 (5%)  | 1 (<1%)   |
| UK                                | 56 (27%)   | 3 (1%)  |
| US                                | 32 (16%)   | 1(<1%)  |
| Others                            | 61 (30%)   | 23 (11%)  |
| N/A                               | 9 (4%)   | 19 (9%)   |
| <b>Respondents selected brand</b> |  |   |
| Nestle                            | 25 (12%)   | -   |
| Apple                             | 16 (8%)  | -   |
| HM                                | 8 (4%)   | 18 (9%)   |
| Nike                              | 6 (3%)   | 28 (14%)  |
| Adidas                            | -  | 4 (2%)  |
| Zara                              | -  | 3 (1%)  |
| Others                            | 150 (73%)  | 152 (74%)   |

**Table 8. EFA scale development-Pattern Matrix (Second Round)**

| Measured items  | Factor       |              |              |              |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Affective (Cronbach's <math>\alpha = 0.966</math>)</b>   |              |              |              |              |
| DNF1: This brand arouses intense negative emotions.   | <b>0.964</b> | -0.074       | -0.020       | 0.053        |
| DNF4: I feel uncomfortable when I think about this brand.   | <b>0.899</b> | -0.019       | -0.075       | 0.012        |
| NED2: My negative feelings about this brand could show on my face.  | <b>0.853</b> | -0.071       | -0.115       | -0.022       |
| DNF5: I can use many negative words to describe my feelings towards the brand.  | <b>0.845</b> | 0.009        | 0.135        | 0.031        |
| NED3: People can tell my negative feelings about the brand from my face, body or voice.                               | <b>0.842</b> | -0.113       | -0.059       | -0.019       |
| DNF2: I always feel critical about this brand.  | <b>0.838</b> | 0.131        | -0.006       | -0.041       |
| NED5: This brand can make me upset.   | <b>0.817</b> | -0.061       | -0.056       | 0.053        |
| NED1: I experience my negative emotions about this brand very strongly.   | <b>0.804</b> | 0.075        | 0.003        | 0.074        |
| DNF3: I cannot tolerate this brand.   | <b>0.804</b> | 0.106        | 0.101        | -0.058       |
| NED4: I cannot hide my negative feelings about this brand.  | <b>0.780</b> | 0.025        | -0.087       | -0.101       |
| NED6: People can read my negative feelings about this brand.  | <b>0.778</b> | -0.070       | 0.080        | 0.065        |
| DNF6: I detest this brand.  | <b>0.763</b> | 0.103        | 0.129        | -0.044       |
| <b>Cognitive (Cronbach's <math>\alpha = 0.925</math>)</b>   |              |              |              |              |
| A2: If there is anything damning about the brand, I tend to notice it.  | 0.012        | <b>0.964</b> | 0.020        | -0.006       |
| A3: I become aware of anything negative about the brand.  | 0.028        | <b>0.911</b> | -0.012       | 0.007        |
| A4: I tend to observe anything negative about the brand.  | 0.101        | <b>0.910</b> | -0.037       | 0.000        |
| A1: My mind is attracted by anything critical about the brand.  | 0.025        | <b>0.858</b> | 0.021        | 0.025        |
| T5: I consider the negative issues related to the brand.  | 0.287        | <b>0.565</b> | 0.022        | 0.030        |
| <b>Online destructive behaviour (Cronbach's <math>\alpha = 0.973</math>)</b>  |              |              |              |              |
| DB2: If I have the opportunity, I express online my negative thoughts to hurt or damage the brand.                    | 0.034        | -0.039       | <b>0.971</b> | -0.010       |
| DB1: If I have the opportunity, I express online my negative feelings to hurt or damage the brand.                    | -0.015       | 0.003        | <b>0.949</b> | -0.030       |
| DB4: If I have the opportunity, I post online negative views to hurt or damage the brand.                             | 0.049        | -0.025       | <b>0.939</b> | 0.006        |
| DB3: If I have the opportunity, I share online negative comments I noticed to hurt or damage the brand.               | -0.044       | 0.045        | <b>0.904</b> | 0.008        |
| DB5: If I have the opportunity, I take part in online movements against the brand aiming to hurt or damage the brand. | 0.006        | 0.020        | <b>0.898</b> | -0.029       |
| <b>Online constructive behaviour (Cronbach's <math>\alpha = 0.916</math>)</b>   |              |              |              |              |
| CB2: If I have the opportunity, I express online my negative thoughts to help or improve the brand.                   | 0.000        | -0.023       | -0.079       | <b>0.932</b> |
| CB4: If I have the opportunity, I post online negative views to help or improve the brand.                            | 0.037        | -0.008       | -0.047       | <b>0.931</b> |
| CB3: If I have the opportunity, I share online negative comments to help or improve the brand.                        | 0.047        | -0.057       | -0.006       | <b>0.916</b> |
| CB1: If I have the opportunity, I express online my negative feelings to help or improve the brand.                   | -0.055       | 0.074        | -0.052       | <b>0.873</b> |
| CB5: If I have the opportunity, I take part in online movements against the brand to help or improve the brand.       | -0.021       | 0.082        | 0.273        | <b>0.656</b> |

**Table 9. CFA: Negative online brand engagement - covariance-based SEM**

| Items  | Calibration sample              |         | Validation sample               |         |
|--|---------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------|
|  | Estimate                        | t-value | Estimate                        | t-value |
| <b>Affective</b>   | Alpha=0.93, AVE=0.73<br>CR=0.93 |         | Alpha=0.94, AVE=0.73<br>CR=0.93 |         |
| This brand can make me upset. (NED5)   | 0.756                           | 12.51   | 0.877                           | 15.64   |
| I experience negative emotions about this brand very strongly. (NED1)  | 0.889                           | 16.04   | 0.930                           | 17.24   |
| I detest this brand. (DNF6)  | 0.899                           | 16.37   | 0.807                           | 13.68   |
| I can use many negative words to describe my feelings towards the brand. (DNF5)  | 0.889                           | 16.05   | 0.872                           | 15.50   |
| This brand arouses intense negative emotions. (DNF1)   | 0.822                           | 14.16   | 0.773                           | 12.89   |
| <b>Cognitive</b>   | Alpha=0.93, AVE=0.73<br>CR=0.93 |         | Alpha=0.89, AVE=0.62<br>CR=0.89 |         |
| My mind is attracted by anything critical about the brand. (A1)  | 0.832                           | 14.51   | 0.671                           | 10.39   |
| If there is anything damning about the brand, I tend to notice it. (A2)  | 0.900                           | 16.48   | 0.820                           | 13.85   |
| I become aware of anything negative about the brand. (A3)  | 0.922                           | 17.18   | 0.870                           | 15.16   |
| I tend to observe anything negative about the brand. (A4)  | 0.934                           | 17.57   | 0.887                           | 15.62   |
| I consider the negative issues related to the brand. (T5)  | 0.657                           | 10.41   | 0.651                           | 10.05   |
| <b>Online constructive behaviour</b>   | Alpha=0.93, AVE=0.82<br>CR=0.93 |         | Alpha=0.95, AVE=0.86<br>CR=0.95 |         |
| If I have the opportunity, I post online negative views to help or improve the brand. (CB4)                            | 0.918                           | 16.80   | 0.883                           | 15.97   |
| If I have the opportunity, I share online negative comments to help or improve the brand. (CB3)                        | 0.924                           | 16.99   | 0.986                           | 19.33   |
| If I have the opportunity, I express online my negative thoughts to help or improve the brand. (CB2)                   | 0.868                           | 15.38   | 0.907                           | 16.67   |
| <b>Online destructive behaviour</b>  | Alpha=0.97, AVE=0.88<br>CR=0.97 |         | Alpha=0.95, AVE=0.84<br>CR=0.96 |         |
| If I have the opportunity, I take part in online movements against the brand aiming to hurt or damage the brand. (DB5) | 0.930                           | 17.55   | 0.905                           | 16.67   |
| If I have the opportunity, I post online negative views to hurt or damage the brand. (DB4)                             | 0.970                           | 18.96   | 0.946                           | 18.03   |
| If I have the opportunity, I share online negative comments I noticed hurt or damage the brand. (DB3)                  | 0.907                           | 16.79   | 0.935                           | 17.63   |
| If I have the opportunity, I express online my negative thoughts to hurt or damage the brand. (DB2)                    | 0.951                           | 18.27   | 0.879                           | 15.86   |



**Table 10. Negative online brand engagement CFA model - covariance-based SEM**

|                    |                               | CR    | AVE   | Affective    | Cognitive    | CB           | DB           |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Calibration sample | Affective                     | 0.930 | 0.727 | 1            |              |              |              |
|                    | Cognitive                     | 0.931 | 0.731 | 0.614***     | 1            |              |              |
|                    | Online constructive behaviour | 0.930 | 0.817 | 0.087        | 0.158*       | 1            |              |
|                    | Online destructive behaviour  | 0.968 | 0.883 | 0.646***     | 0.589***     | 0.020        | 1            |
|                    | The square root of the AVE    | -     | -     | <b>0.853</b> | <b>0.855</b> | <b>0.904</b> | <b>0.940</b> |
| Validation sample  | Affective                     | 0.930 | 0.729 | 1            |              |              |              |
|                    | Cognitive                     | 0.888 | 0.618 | 0.394***     | 1            |              |              |
|                    | Online constructive behaviour | 0.948 | 0.858 | 0.182*       | 0.354***     | 1            |              |
|                    | Online destructive behaviour  | 0.955 | 0.840 | 0.215**      | 0.342***     | 0.237**      | 1            |
|                    | The square root of the AVE    | -     | -     | <b>0.854</b> | <b>0.786</b> | <b>0.926</b> | <b>0.917</b> |

\*p<0.050; \*\*p<0.010; \*\*\*p<0.001

**Table 11. Variance inflation factors - covariance-based SEM**

|  | VIF                |                   |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|
|  | Calibration sample | Validation sample |
| <b>DV: Affective</b>                     |                    |                   |
| Cognitive                                | 1.588              | 1.237             |
| Online constructive behaviour            | 1.033              | 1.165             |
| Online destructive behaviour             | 1.553              | 1.159             |
| <b>DV: Cognitive</b>                     |                    |                   |
| Affective                                | 1.567              | 1.059             |
| Online constructive behaviour            | 1.008              | 1.087             |
| Online destructive behaviour             | 1.558              | 1.095             |
| <b>DV: Online constructive behaviour</b> |                    |                   |
| Affective                                | 1.802              | 1.160             |
| Cognitive                                | 1.783              | 1.265             |
| Online destructive behaviour             | 1.797              | 1.141             |
| <b>DV: Online destructive behaviour</b>  |                    |                   |
| Affective                                | 1.543              | 1.156             |
| Cognitive                                | 1.568              | 1.275             |
| Online constructive behaviour            | 1.023              | 1.143             |