**Contemporary Issues in Social Media Marketing**

*Creating, Contributing, and Consuming Behaviour:*
*How Rational and Affective Appeals in Social Media Facilitate Engagement*

Dr. Rebecca Dolan
The University of Auckland
Rebecca.dolan@auckland.ac.nz

Associate Professor Jodie Conduit
The University of Adelaide

Professor John Fahy
University of Limerick

## INTRODUCTION

Social media platforms have significantly altered the way customers communicate and interact with each other, and with businesses. Platforms such as Facebook have grown rapidly; while it took 38 years for the radio to attract 50 million listeners, and 13 years for television to gain 50 million viewers, it took just 18 months for Facebook to reach 50 million participants (Nair, 2011). In 2016, there are more than 1.65 billion monthly active users on Facebook, 1 billion monthly active users of WhatsApp, 500 million monthly active users of Instagram, and 310 million monthly active users of Twitter (Statista, 2016). The interactive properties of social media have transformed consumers from passive observers of content to active participants, who create vast quantities of user generated content through their conversations, interactions and behaviours online. In line with an increased focus on research exploring customer engagement (Brodie *et al.*, 2013, Maslowska *et al.*, 2015), particularly in the digital space (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014), practitioners and academics are looking for guidance on how customer engagement may facilitated through social media. In this chapter, we explore how brands can facilitate engagement through the delivery of specific types of affective and rational social media messages.

Social media enables customers to interact with brands in various ways. Muntinga, Moorman, and Smit (2011) show that consumers 'online brand related activities' include creating, contributing, and consuming online content. Customers engage online through positively valenced and active

behaviours including leaving comments on content, sharing, and 'liking' brand related content. Customer engagement can also be more passive, whereby fans read posts, view photos and watch videos, however do not actively contribute to the content (Dolan *et al.*, 2016a). Engagement behaviour is also proposed to occur in a negatively valenced manner, where customers use social media forums to express their dissatisfaction and spread negative word of mouth (Dolan *et al.*, 2016a). Although research like this shows the ways in which customers may engage though certain behaviours, it remains unknown how brands can deliver and design their online content, such as social media posts, to enhance engagement.

In this chapter, we extend on the work of Muntinga et al. (2011) and Dolan et al. (2016a,b) to empirically investigate the effects of social media content posted by brands on the social media engagement behaviours of consumers. We investigate how different types of content (affective vs. rational) effect the intensity of a user's engagement behaviour. Engagement behaviour of low intensity is defined as consuming behaviour, moderate intensity as contributing behaviour, and high intensity as creating behaviour. The three categories of engagement intensity are derived from Muntinga *et al.* (2011), and Dolan *et al.* (2016a). This chapter develops interesting results as to how these engagement behaviours are altered by the presence of various affective and rational message appeals. As such, we address one of the challenges in the delivery and design of social media content, and focus on a Marketing Science Institute key topic of interest; to understand how social media marketing activities create customer engagement (MSI, 2014).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Consumers are increasingly becoming more active participants within social media sites. They are increasingly able to interact with each other, and with brands through real-time, two-way communication (Brodie *et al.*, 2013). The interactive properties of social media serve as an ideal forum for product and brand-related advocacy (Chu and Kim, 2011, Riegner, 2007), customer-led content generation (Vivek *et al.*, 2012) and customer-created product innovations (Hoyer *et al.*, 2010, Sawhney *et al.*, 2005). Therefore, there is a significant amount of social and network value provided

to both users and organisations through social media. Social media have become a popular topic of academic enquiry, with scholars exploring the concept from varying perspectives, including usage motivations of participants (Joinson, 2008, Raacke and Bonds-Raacke, 2008), social interactions, usage patterns (Golder *et al.*, 2007, Hsu and Lin, 2008, Lampe *et al.*, 2006) and characteristics of users (Gjoka *et al.*, 2008, Hargittai, 2007).

Less academic attention has been given to the role of social media from a strategic marketing perspective. Practitioners have largely been at the forefront of efforts to advise businesses on the design of their social media content, with an inundation of industry blogs, websites and guides on the best practice for marketing within the social network sphere emerging in recent years (Steeves, 2013). While the nature of social media influences the degree to which customers engage with the organization (Malthouse *et al.*, 2013), little research has investigated how engagement is achieved. Although recent research has explored both the antecedents and consequences of customer engagement (Gambetti *et al.*, 2012, Leckie *et al.*, 2016, van Doorn *et al.*, 2010), studies that consider engagement with social media are only beginning to emerge (Malthouse *et al.*, 2013).

**Characterising Consumers' Online Brand Related Behaviour**

Previous research has focussed on traditional categorisations of 'users' of online communities, distinguishing between users who create content such as 'posters', compared to those who are members of a community but do not post, referred to as 'lurkers' (Nonnecke and Preece, 1999, Preece *et al.*, 2004). This basic categorisation of online users is limited in its general nature and fails to take into account the diverse number of possible roles available to users in dynamic platforms. Previous research categorised social media users who 'like' brands on Facebook into groups based on their brand loyalty, brand love, use of self-expressive brands, and word of mouth (Wallace *et al.*, 2014).While such investigations are practically useful, a lack of understanding remains in terms of understanding engagement intensity and actions, beyond the primary actions of 'liking' a brand on Facebook. In an attempt to define customer engagement intensity within social media, scholars have also characterised engagement behaviours on a continuum of low to high activity (Muntinga *et al.*,

2011). Muntinga et al. (2011) propose three social usage types: *consuming* (low level of brand related activity), *contributing* (medium level) and *creating* (highest level).

*Creating behaviour:* According to Muntinga et al. (2011), 'creating' behaviour represents the ultimate level of online brand-related activeness. It denotes actively producing brand-related content that other social network members can consume and contribute to. Within social media platforms, Creating users make unique, active contributions to social media content by disseminating their knowledge, resources and experiences (Brodie *et al.*, 2013). This behaviour goes beyond relaying (e.g. sharing, liking) content created by the brand and reflects a user's contribution to the brand's social media site (Dolan *et al.*, 2016b).

*Contributing behaviour:* The contributing type of online brand related behaviour is reflective of the middle level of activeness (Muntinga *et al.*, 2011). Users contribute to existing content in social media platforms (Dolan *et al.*, 2016b). Contributing sees users forward or contribute to existing content, however, they do not create any additional or new content in the form of writing a comment or post (Dolan *et al.*, 2016b). Through functions such as 'sharing' content on Facebook, and 're-tweeting' messages on Twitter, users contribute by forwarding brand content to members of their own network. Additionally, users contribute to content by indicating their preferences for specific social media content through selecting the 'Like' function on Facebook and Instagram, tagging friends and other users in comments, and functions such as the 'favourite' option on Twitter.

*Consuming behaviour:* Consumption behaviour is passive, whereby consumers exhibit a level of engagement however do not actively contribute to or create content (Dolan *et al.*, 2016b). Consuming is defined as the passive consumption of brand related content through reading reviews, discussion and comments, viewing photos, watching videos, and clicking on content and links. Consuming represents a minimum level of online-brand related activeness (Muntinga *et al.*, 2011). Through the consumption of content within social media platforms, individuals may extract individual value but their consumption will not impact on other users of the social media platform. Reading discussions (e.g. to find information) is a form of passive engagement, whereas posting comments is active

engagement (Shang *et al.*, 2006, Gummerus *et al.*, 2012).

In this chapter, we explore how the three types of consumers online brand related activities, creating, contributing, and consuming, may be influenced by the type of message delivered by brands.

**Strategically Enhancing Online Engagement Behaviour**

In social media, a brand's overt goal is to attract an audience by providing value, or gratification, through its content. Content must therefore be designed in a way that creates value for individual consumers to build engagement (Malthouse *et al.*, 2013, Dolan *et al.*, 2016b). In 2017, social network advertising spending is expected to reach $36 billion worldwide, representing 16% of all digital advertising spending globally (eMarketer, 2015). However, scholars have suggested that most of the investment into digital strategy may be largely wasted (Griffin, 2013). Supporting research has shown poor online engagement rates, with an average of only 0.07% of Facebook fans interacting with a brand's post (Gayomali, 2014). Marketing practitioners have identified that they have lack of awareness and knowledge regarding effective social media strategy, creating a significant challenge as practitioners navigate through this forum with little guidance and empirical understanding (Stelzner, 2014). Within this chapter, we extend the work of Muntinga et al. (2011) and Dolan et al., (2016a,b) to predict how online engagement behaviours (creating, contributing, and consuming behaviours) may be facilitated, mitigated or neutralised by the delivery of *affective or rational message appeals* within social media. While the nature of social media influences the degree to which customers engage with the organization (Malthouse *et al.*, 2013), little research has investigated how engagement is achieved.

*Rational message appeals*

Rational messages appeal to facts and reasoning, whereas emotional messages appeal to the consumers' feelings (Hahn *et al.*, 2016). In traditional media, researchers argue that informational properties of messages (e.g. rational message appeals), are more influential than affective/emotional appeals in generating positive responses among consumers (Holbrook, 1978). Research has shown that consumers tend to prefer rational advertisements for utilitarian products, and affective/emotional advertisements for hedonic products (Drolet and Aaker, 2002). However, Drolet *et al.* (2007) show

that for certain customers (over 65 years of age), attitudes are more favourable toward affective (vs. rational ads) regardless of the product category, whereas, for younger consumers (age 18-25) affective ads are only favoured for hedonic products. Rationally-framed message appeals include factual information related to the product (McKay-Nesbitt *et al.*, 2011). Comparatively, emotional or affective appeals can include positively framed appeals focussed on warm emotions associated with or related to the product (McKay-Nesbitt *et al.*, 2011).

Rational message appeals in social media include information regarding details on price, availability, location and product names (Lee *et al.*, 2013). Further, rational information may contain explanatory images referring to the brand's location, facilities and products. The rational content may also relate to brand contact details such as the provision of contact phone numbers, email addresses, links to a website and opening hours where applicable. While the importance of delivering rational content in the form of product related information through advertisements has been well recognized with respect to traditional media (Rubin, 2002), the role of rational message appeals and content in the online domain has only recently received attention. Obtaining information is one of the most important reasons consumers use the internet (Stafford *et al.*, 2004), and a positive association exists between levels of informativeness and attitude toward websites (Chen *et al.*, 2002). In social media, customers willingly select the brands they wish to follow and receive updates from, compared to traditional media in which advertisements are presented to viewers regardless of their levels of interest in the topic. It can therefore be argued that customers are more likely to be seeking information through their selected brand followings, and thus messages with a rational appeal may be more effective in social media, compared to traditional media. Recent studies have suggested a positive relationship between rational, informative content and engagement behavior in a social media context (De Vries *et al.*, 2012, Cvijikj and Michahelles, 2013, Lee *et al.*, 2013). However, these studies do not distinguish between levels of engagement intensity (e.g. creating, contributing, and consuming), nor do they examine the effects of specific types of rational content.

*Affective message appeals*

In traditional media, Brown et al (1998) argue that emotions can influence behaviour and determine greater advertising effectiveness compared to rational and informative appeals. Affective social media message appeals may include small talk, banter, or attempts to appeal to a person's emotions. Further, affective content may not focus on the brand or product, but may be written in the form of a teaser, slogan or word play, which has been found to increase the number of likes, comments and shares made on Facebook posts (Cvijikj and Michahelles, 2013). Affective message appeals such as the use of entertaining advertisements have also been found to lead to positive attitudes toward both the advertisements (Taylor *et al.*, 2011) and the brand and produce a desire to return to the websites (Raney and Janicke, 2013). Further, affectively-framed advertisements can motivate users to consume, contribute to, and create brand-related content online (Muntinga *et al.*, 2011). Social media content that attempts to appeal to a person's emotions has been empirically found to increase engagement behavior in the form of likes and comments (Lee *et al.*, 2013). However, it is unknown what types of affective appeal specifically have a greater impact on the various intensities of engagement.

While there has been significant attention paid to affective or emotional, vs. rational advertising message appeals in traditional media (Williams and Drolet, 2005, Drolet and Aaker, 2002, Drolet *et al.*, 2007), little attention has focussed on the role of these specific message appeals in influencing consumers' engagement in the online, social setting. Within this chapter, we assess how these two contrasting message appeals are used by brands within social media. We examine three dependent variables, representing the various intensity levels of consumers' online engagement behaviour.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

This study utilised Facebook Insights data from active Facebook brand pages in the Australian wine industry. Facebook Insights is a tool accessible by administrators of Facebook brand pages that enables high-level monitoring of the activities that occur on that page. It allows administrators to download data concerning the performance of a post, such as the number of people the post reached, the number of people who clicked the post, and the number of people who liked, commented on or

shared the post. If the post is a video, Insights data also shows the total number of video views, and length of video views (Facebook, 2015). Facebook Insights provides access to the engagement metrics used in this study.

As access to Facebook page insights is restricted to page administrators, an introductory email was sent to 50 Australian wine brands outlining the study and requesting access to the required data. 12 Australian wine brands were selected to participate in the study, and each provided data for a twelve-month period, beginning on the 1st of January and concluding on the 31st of December 2013. A range of brands were selected in order to ensure a representative sample, including consideration of the number of fans, region and/or location, ownership (family owned and corporate) and frequency of posting. This data enabled the researchers to access and explore the actual behavioural metrics of the engagement (creating, contributing, and consuming) and match this data with the social media content posted by the brands. The independent variables were the affective and rational message appeals presented in Table 1. The dependent variables were the engagement behaviours of creating, contributing and consuming, derived through an examination the engagement metrics available from Facebook Insights. The metrics for the dependent variables are presented in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The researchers collected and analysed a total of 2,236 Facebook posts over a 12-month period. To categorize social media content according its presence of affective and rational message appeals, we followed Neuendorf's (2002) approach to quantitative content analysis, which allows the researcher to objectively and systematically identify specified characteristics of messages (Carney, 1972). Given the significant amount of data provided through tools such as Facebook Insights and NCapture, we used automated quantitative methods of text analysis. Specifically, we employed computer coding and text analysis to make inferences about social media content. This approach generated a full coding scheme and a custom dictionary for the text analysis of each type of social media content appeal (affective and rational). After developing the full coding scheme and custom dictionaries, we coded the content in a binary manner. Where a type of social media content was present (e.g. affective

or rational appeal), it was coded as 1, while its absence was recorded as 0. In addition, each sub-category was coded as 1 or 0, which allowed for the level of content to be calculated. The individual rational and affective message elements are presented in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Binary logistic regression was applied to empirically investigate the relationships between the types of content (affective vs. rational) embedded within a social media post, and the effect on the dependent variables (creating, contributing and consuming engagement behaviours). Of the 2,236 posts, 82.6% contained rational message appeals within the content, and 50.7% contained affective message appeals within the content. The social media posts varied in the *amount* of affective or rational content present. To illustrate, whilst some posts had just one element of rational content, others had up to 11 different rational elements.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results show that various types of affective and rational message appeals within social media content have a strong and significant relationship with the online engagement behaviours of users. This section will present the results for creating behaviour, followed by contributing, and consuming behaviour including corresponding discussion of the effects of both rational and affective message appeals. Overall, 5 types of rational message appeals had an effect on creating behaviour, 7 types of rational appeals had an effect on contributing behaviour in the form of shares, 6 types of rational message appeals had an effect on contributing behaviour in the form of likes, and there were no types of rational appeals that effected consuming behaviour. Interestingly, the rational message appeals that effected contributing behaviour in the form of 'shares' were different than the appeals that caused the post to be 'liked'. In terms of affective message appeals, 8 appeals had a significant effect on creating behaviour, while only 2 types of affective message appeals influenced contributing behaviour in the form of shares, and contributing behaviour in the form of likes. There was no evidence to suggest that affective message appeals facilitate consuming behaviour.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

*Creating behaviour*

When social media users comment on statuses, videos and pictures posted by the brand, they exhibit creating behaviour. Through the creation of their comment, the user creates new content, which can facilitate the further engagement behaviour of other brand fans.

The results presented in Table 3 show that certain forms rational content facilitate creating behaviour. Specifically, the presence of a product image, location image, and details about a product award or medal, increase the odds of creating behaviour occurring. The results also show that the presence of some forms of rational content will reduce the likelihood of users exhibiting creating behaviours. This includes content in the form of a website link, and details of an event. This could be explained by the fact that provision of such information would cause the user to navigate towards an external page (e.g. the website), rather than exhibiting engagement within the Facebook platform. Overall, the most effective type of rational content shown to facilitate creating behaviour is product images, which almost double the likelihood that a user will exhibit creating behaviour (i.e. write a comment). Photos and images have a higher degree of richness, or vividness, and have been known to be more effective in facilitating attention and engagement (Cvijikj and Michahelles, 2013).

Creating behaviour can also be enhanced or mitigated by specific forms of affective content. Affective content that increases the odds of creating behaviour occurring includes, a scenic image, images of food and produce, details or images of a celebrity of social influencer, details about the weather, meme images, and animal images. The results in Table 3 show that when a brand posts affective content in the form of an image of an employee or staff member, the odds of a user exhibiting creating behaviour is almost doubled (Exp(B)=1.912). In other words, when social media content includes an image of an employee, fans as twice as likely to write a comment. This type of affective content is visually engaging, and also provides a personal representation of the brand through the image of the employee. Only one type of affective content was found to reduce creating behaviour; the provision of a fun fact, which reduced the odds of creating behaviour occurring by 71% (Exp(B)=.29).

*Contributing behaviour*

Contributing behaviour was measured in this study through two social media engagement functions; 'liking' a social media post, and 'sharing' a showing media post.

Table 3 demonstrates that rational appeals in the form of a product image increases the chances of contributing behaviour in the form of both likes and shares occurring. Similarly, including rational appeals in the form of product success such as an award or medal increases the odds of both liking and sharing occurring. Mentioning the product variety (in the case of this study, the product variety relates to the variety of wine, e.g. 'Shiraz') is a positive informational element in predicting both likes and shares. Describing the origin of the product almost doubles the likelihood that a user will 'like' the post, while describing the characteristics of the product triples the odds that the content will be 'liked' (Exp(B)=3.07). This finding demonstrates that fans are interested in product specific information, and whilst they may not comment or share the information, they are more likely to 'like' posts which possess this information.

While there were 7 types of rational appeals that significantly predicted the occurrence of creating behaviour, only two types of affective message appeals predicted contributing behaviour in the form of shares. These were food and produce images, and the mention of an animal or pet. Affective message appeals in the form of a food or produce image increased the odds of the content being shared by 1.58 times, while the mention of an animal in affective message appeals increased the odds of sharing by 2.36 times. Affective message appeals regarding local weather conditions was 2.643 times more likely to be 'liked', and scenic images were 2.215 times more likely to be 'liked'. The use of casual and slang language, for example 'lol' or 'omg' within affective message appeals had a detrimental effect on contributing behaviour in the form of likes. The results show a negatively weighted beta of -.937, indicating that users are almost 60% less likely to 'like' a post which contains this form of content (Exp(B)=.392).

*Consuming behaviour*

Consuming behaviour involves online users consuming content (e.g. reading or viewing content), without any form of active reciprocation or contribution. This behaviour is an example of a passive online brand related activity. Consuming behaviour was measured though clicks to play videos, link clicks, other clicks (on a photo or status), enlarged photo views, and reading content (number of clicks to 'read more'). One limitation to mention is the inability to measure the extent to which the fans consume the content created by other fans, such as a comment. The consuming behaviours measured are all directly related to the content delivered by the brand, rather than the content added by other fans and users. The results showed that there were no message appeals that had a significant effect on consuming behaviour. This is an interesting finding as it demonstrates that the actual content of social media message appeals are not a driving factor in a fans decision to watch videos, click through photos, read comments, and read posts. Further research is needed in order to understand exactly what motivates and causes brand fans to consume content online. Investigation of factors such as the time of the day may show interesting effects, with users being more likely to consume content when they are in a relaxed frame of mind, compared to scrolling through content whilst limited for time. The amount of content the fans are exposed to may also have implications for their lack of consumption, with a potential for informational overload occurring (Eppler and Mengis, 2004).

## IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Malthouse *et al.* (2013) suggest that a brand's goal in social media strategy should be to attract an audience by providing value through social media content. The study presented in this chapter empirically demonstrates that brands are able to deliver varying types of both affective and rational message appeals within social media content in order to enhance fan engagement behaviour. We demonstrate an empirical relationship between social media content message appeals (rational and affective) and the online engagement behaviours proposed by Muntinga et al., (2011) and Dolan et al., (2016b). This demonstrates that content can be designed in a way which encourages individual consumers to exhibit a greater level of engagement (Malthouse *et al.*, 2013).

The presence of rational appeals within social media posts was found to predict the occurrence of creating and contributing behaviours. This finding was consistent with previous literature which has stated that internet users increase their usage patterns as a result of content gratifications such as information seeking, knowledge and learning (Stafford *et al.*, 2004). Similarly, the presence of affective message appeals within a social media post significantly predicted the occurrence of creating and contributing behaviour. This finding is consistent with Cvijikj and Michahelles (2013) who demonstrated that affective and entertaining content was a significant factor in increasing the number of likes, comments and shares made on social media posts. However, the effects of affective message appeals were not as strong as those observed for rational message appeals, demonstrating that there may be a benefit in brands focussing on informing their fans, rather than entertaining them.

Managers can benefit from our insights in multiple ways. First, we provide important implications regarding the strategic design and delivery of social media content and message appeals in order to facilitate creating and contributing online brand related behaviours. We show that both rational and affective message appeals can have a significant and positive effect on engagement behavior in the form of 'creating' behaviour, which was measured as the likelihood of Facebook fans to write a comment. The most effective message appeal to increase the number of comments was the use of a celebrity or social influencer which increased the odds of a fan writing a comment by 2.6 times. The results also showed that contributing behavior in the form of both likes and shares could be strategically enhanced through the use of rational and affective message appeals. The use of an affective message appeal that specifically includes discussion regarding an animal (e.g. a pet) was the most effective in terms of increasing the likelihood that the content would be shared. In terms of increasing the number of post 'likes', the rational message appeal of specifically mentioning and describing a product which has won an award had the strongest effect, with fans being almost 12 times more likely to 'like' the post. Interestingly, we did not find any significant relationships between the affective and rational message appeals and consuming behavior. This indicates that while content can be strategically designed with various message appeals to enhance the number of comments, likes, and shares, the message appeals do not appear to effect whether or not a fan will

actively consume the content.

Although Muntinga et al. (2011) and Dolan et al. (2016a) propose that consumers vary in their online brand related activities or social media engagement behaviours, little is known about how brands *strategically deliver* online content to engage consumers in these ways. This chapter empirically investigated the effects of two types of social media content posted by brands on creating, contributing, and consuming behaviours. Future research should consider the factors beyond affective and rational appeals that may be used by brands to facilitate engagement behaviours of a high intensity (e.g. creating). Future research should also investigate the consequences of creating, contributing, and consuming behaviours, and the extent to which various types of users' online behaviours lead to outcomes such as future purchase intention and behavior, brand loyalty, word-of mouth, and satisfaction would add substantial value to the body of research concerning marketing strategy and social media.

Table 1. Facebook Insights Metrics for Creating, Contributing, and Consuming.

| Engagement Behaviour | Facebook Insights Metric (per post) |
| --- | --- |
| Creating | Number of comments made on post |
| Contributing | Number of posts that are 'liked' or 'shared' |
| Consuming | Clicks to play videos<br>Link clicks<br>Other clicks (photo, status)<br>Photo view<br>Reading content (measured by no. of clicks to 'read more') |

Table 2. Rational vs. Affective Message Appeals Coded

| Rational Message Appeals Coded | Affective Message Appeals Coded |
| --- | --- |
| Product Image | Discussion of local weather |
| Location Image | Fun/entertaining fact |
| Website information/link | Scenic imagery |
| Product medal/award | Food and product images/discussion |
| Event information | Use of celebrity of influential person |
| Brand name information | Meme image (humour) |
| Product variety information | Animal image |
| Service related information | Animal mentioned/discussed |
| Product origin information | Relaxed and casual language used |
| Product description | Employee image used |

Table 3. Binary logistic regression results for social media content types and engagement behaviours

| | Type | Creating | | Contributing (shares) | | Contributing (likes) | | Consuming | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | b | Exp(B) | b | Exp(B) | b | Exp(B) | b | Exp(B) |
| **Rational Message Appeals** | Product image | **.690** *** | **1.99** | **.60** *** | **1.82** | **.55** * | **1.74** | -.419 | .658 |
| | location image | **.314** * | **1.37** | **.183** *** | **1.201** | .473 | 1.604 | -.169 | .845 |
| | Website link | **-.472** *** | **.62** | -.165 | .848 | -.119 | .888 | 1.122 | 3.070 |
| | Product medal/award | **.551** ** | **1.73** | **.66** *** | **1.94** | **2.47** * | **11.77** | 16.067 | NR |
| | Event details | **-.824** *** | **.44** | **-.61** * | **.545** | -.505 | .604 | -.194 | .284 |
| | Brand name | .28 | 1.33 | **.350** ** | **1.42** | .95 | 1.64 | 1.156 | 3.178 |
| | Product variety | .171 | 1.18 | **.44** * | **1.55** | **.95** * | **2.58** | .665 | 1.945 |
| | Service details | .278 | 1.321 | **.46** * | **1.59** | **1.90** * | **6.69** | .202 | 1.224 |
| | Product origin | .163 | 1.177 | .221 | 1.248 | **.73** * | **2.07** | 1.382 | 3.984 |
| | Wine description | .137 | 1.147 | .192 | 1.212 | **1.12** * | **3.07** | 16.825 | NR |
| **Affective Message Appeals** | Weather | **.397** * | **1.487** | .205 | 1.228 | **.972** * | **2.643** | 1.381 | 3.980 |
| | Fun fact | **-1.24** * | **.29** | -.017 | .983 | -.868 | .420 | 17.020 | NR |
| | Scenic image | **.485** * | **1.625** | 0.12 | 1.012 | **.795** * | **2.215** | -.409 | .665 |
| | Food/produce image | **.297** * | **1.345** | **.462** * | **1.587** | .045 | 1.046 | -.416 | .660 |
| | Celebrity/influencer | **.966** * | **2.628** | .867 | 2.380 | 18.601 | NR | 17.087 | NR |
| | Meme image | **.640** * | **1.897** | .495 | 1.641 | .309 | 1.362 | 17.010 | NR |
| | Animal image | **.497** * | **1.644** | .398 | 1.489 | .535 | 1.707 | .486 | 1.626 |
| | Animal mentioned | .858 | 2.359 | **.858** * | **2.359** | 18.66 | NR | 16.671 | NR |
| | Slang language | -.443 | .642 | -.488 | .614 | **-.937** * | **.392** | -.712 | .491 |
| | Employee image | **.648** *** | **.912** | .082 | 1.085 | .464 | 1.590 | -.291 | .747 |

NR = Exp(B) not reported when > 10 and non-significant

REFERENCES

Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B. & Hollebeek, L. (2013). "Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis". *Journal of Business Research,* 66**,** 105-114.

Brown, S. P., Homer, P. M., & Inman, J. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of relationships between ad-evoked feelings and advertising responses. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 114-126.

Carney, T. F. (1972). *Content analysis: A technique for systematic inference from communications*, University of Manitoba Press. New York

Chen, Q., Clifford, S. J. & Wells, W. D. (2002). "Attitude toward the site II: new information". *Journal of Advertising Research,* 42**,** 33-46.

Chu, S.-C. & Kim, Y. (2011). "Determinants of consumer engagement in electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites". *International Journal of Advertising,* 30**,** 47-75.

Cvijikj, I. P. & Michahelles, F. (2013). "Online engagement factors on Facebook brand pages". *Social Network Analysis and Mining,* 3**,** 843-861.

De Vries, L., Gensler, S. & Leeflang, P. S. (2012). "Popularity of brand posts on brand fan pages: An investigation of the effects of social media marketing". *Journal of Interactive Marketing,* 26**,** 83-91.

Dolan, R., Conduit, J. & Fahy, J. (2016a). "Social Media Engagement: A Construct of Positively and Negatively Valenced Engagement Behaviours". *In:* BRODIE, R. J., HOLLEBEEK, L. & CONDUIT, J. (eds.) *Customer Engagement: Contemporary Issues and Challenges.* New York: Routledge

Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J. & Goodman, S. (2016b). "Social media engagement behaviour: a uses and gratifications perspective". *Journal of Strategic Marketing***,** 1-17.

Drolet, A. & Aaker, J. (2002). "Off-target? Changing cognitive-based attitudes". *Journal of Consumer Psychology,* 12**,** 59-68.

Drolet, A., Williams, P. & Lau-Gesk, L. (2007). "Age-related differences in responses to affective vs. rational ads for hedonic vs. utilitarian products". *Marketing Letters,* 18**,** 211-221.

Emarketer. (2015). "Social Network Ad Spending to Hit $23.68 Billion Worldwide in 2015" [Online]. Available at: http://www.emarketer.com/Article/Social-Network-Ad-Spending-Hit-2368-Billion-Worldwide-2015/1012357 [Accessed August 23 2015].

Eppler, M. J. & Mengis, J. (2004). "The concept of information overload: A review of literature from organization science, accounting, marketing, MIS, and related disciplines". *The Information Society,* 20**,** 325-344.

Facebook. (2015). "Page Post Metrics" [Online]. Available at: https://www.facebook.com/help/336143376466063/. Accessed 14 September 2015

Gambetti, R. C., Graffigna, G. & Biraghi, S. (2012). "The grounded theory approach to consumer-brand engagement". *International Journal of Market Research,* 54**,** 659-687.

Gayomali, C. (2014). "Brands are Wasting Time and Money on Facebook and Twitter" [Online]. Available at: http://www.fastcompany.com/3038801/brands-are-wasting-time-and-money-on-facebook-and-twitter-report-says. Accessed 3 April 2016

Gjoka, M., Sirivianos, M., Markopoulou, A. & Yang, X. Poking facebook: characterization of osn applications. Proceedings of the first workshop on Online social networks, 2008. ACM, 31-36.

Golder, S. A., Wilkinson, D. M. & Huberman, B. A. (2007). "Rhythms of social interaction: Messaging within a massive online network". *Communities and Technologies 2007.* Springer, London

Griffin, C. 2013. Social Media: Why it's a Big Fat Waste of Time and Money. Available from: https://www.socialmediaexplorer.com/social-media-marketing/social-media-why-its-a-big-fat-waste-of-time-and-money/.

Gummerus, J., Liljander, V., Weman, E. & Pihlström, M. (2012). "Customer engagement in a Facebook brand community". *Management Research Review,* 35**,** 857-877.

Hahn, M. H., Lee, K. C. & Chae, S. W. An Eye-Tracking Approach to Evaluating Decision-Makers' Cognitive Load and Need-for-Cognition in Response with Rational and Emotional Advertising Stimuli. International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, 2016. Springer, 209-215.

Hargittai, E. (2007). "Whose space? Differences among users and non-users of social network sites". *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication,* 13**,** 276-297.

Holbrook, M. B. (1978). "Beyond attitude structure: Toward the informational determinants of attitude". *Journal of marketing research***,** Vol.15, No. 4, pp. 545-556.

Hollebeek, Glynn, M. S. & Brodie, R. J. (2014). "Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation". *Journal of Interactive Marketing,* 28**,** 149-165.

Hoyer, W. D., Chandy, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M. & Singh, S. S. (2010). "Consumer cocreation in new product development". *Journal of Service Research,* 13**,** 283-296.

Hsu, C.-L. & Lin, J. C.-C. (2008). "Acceptance of blog usage: The roles of technology acceptance, social influence and knowledge sharing motivation". *Information & Management,* 45**,** 65-74.

Joinson, A. N. 2008. Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people?: motives and use of facebook. *Proceeding of the twenty-sixth annual SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems.* Florence, Italy: ACM.

Lampe, C., Ellison, N. & Steinfield, C. A Face (book) in the crowd: Social searching vs. social browsing. Proceedings of the 2006 20th anniversary conference on Computer supported cooperative work, 2006. ACM, 167-170, Banff, Alberta, Canada.

Leckie, C., Nyadzayo, M. W. & Johnson, L. W. (2016). "Antecedents of consumer brand engagement and brand loyalty". *Journal of Marketing Management***,** Vol. 32, no. 5-6, pp.1-21.

Lee, D., Hosanagar, K. & Nair, H. (2013). "The effect of advertising content on consumer engagement: evidence from Facebook" [Online]. Available at: http://www.researchgate.net/publication/257409065.

Malthouse, E. C., Haenlein, M., Skiera, B., Wege, E. & Zhang, M. (2013). "Managing customer relationships in the social media era: Introducing the social CRM house". *Journal of Interactive Marketing,* 27**,** 270-280.

Maslowska, E., Malthouse, E. & Collinger, T. (2015). "The Customer Engagement Ecosystem". *Available at SSRN 2694040.*

Mckay-Nesbitt, J., Manchanda, R. V., Smith, M. C. & Huhmann, B. A. (2011). "Effects of age, need for cognition, and affective intensity on advertising effectiveness". *Journal of Business Research,* 64**,** 12-17.

Msi. (2014). "2014-2016 Research Priorities " [Online]. Available at: http://www.msi.org/uploads/files/MSI_RP14-16.pdf [Accessed 21.08 2014].

Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M. & Smit, E. G. (2011). "Introducing COBRAs". *International Journal of Advertising,* 30**,** 13-46.

Nair, M. (2011). "Understanding and measuring the value of social media". *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance,* 22**,** 45-51.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook,* Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.

Nonnecke, B. & Preece, J. (1999). "Shedding light on lurkers in online communities". *Ethnographic Studies in Real and Virtual Environments: Inhabited Information Spaces and Connected Communities, Edinburgh*, 123-128.

Preece, J., Nonnecke, B. & Andrews, D. (2004). "The top five reasons for lurking: improving community experiences for everyone". *Computers in human behavior,* 20**,** 201-223.

Raacke, J. & Bonds-Raacke, J. (2008). "MySpace and Facebook: Applying the uses and gratifications theory to exploring friend-networking sites". *CyberPsychology & Behavior,* 11**,** 169-174.

Raney, A. & Janicke, S. (2013). "How we enjoy and why we seek out morally complex characters in media entertainment". *In:* TAMBORINI, R. (ed.) *Media and the Moral Mind.* London: Routledge.

Riegner, C. (2007). "Word of Mouth on the Web: The Impact of Web 2.0 on Consumer Purchase Decisions". *Journal of Advertising Research,* 47**,** 436-447.

Rubin, A. M. (2002). "The uses-and-gratifications perspective of media effects". *In:* JENNINGS, B. (ed.) *Media effects: Advances in theory and research.* 2 ed. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Sawhney, M., Verona, G. & Prandelli, E. (2005). "Collaborating to create: The Internet as a platform for customer engagement in product innovation". *Journal of interactive marketing,* 19**,** 4-17.

Shang, R.-A., Chen, Y.-C. & Liao, H.-J. (2006). "The value of participation in virtual consumer communities on brand loyalty". *Internet research,* 16**,** 398-418.

Stafford, T. F., Stafford, M. R. & Schkade, L. L. (2004). "Determining Uses and Gratifications for the Internet". *Decision Sciences,* 35**,** 259-288.

Statista. (2016). "Statistics and Market Data on Social Media & User-Generated Contetn" [Online]. Available at: https://www.statista.com/markets/424/topic/540/social-media-user-generated-content/ [Accessed 13 June 2016].

Steeves, N. (2013). "Best practices: posting and analyzing effective facebook content" [Online]. Available at: http://www.nimble.com/blog/posting-and-analyzing-on-facebook/ 2014].Accessed 4 September 2015

Stelzner, M. 2014. 2014 Social Media Marketing Industry Report: How marketers are using social media to grow their businesses. Social Media Examiner. Accessed 2 June 2014, p. 1-22

Taylor, D. G., Lewin, J. E. & Strutton, D. (2011). "Friends, Fans, and Followers: Do Ads Work on Social Networks?". *Journal of Advertising Research,* 51**,** 258-275.

Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P. & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). "Customer Engagement Behavior: Theoretical Foundations and Research Directions". *Journal of Service Research,* 13**,** 253-266.

Vivek, S., Beatty, S. & Morgan, R. (2012). "Customer Engagement: Exploring Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase". *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice,* 20**,** 122-146.

Wallace, E., Buil, I., De Chernatony, L. & Hogan, M. (2014). "Who Likes You and Why? A typology of Facebook Fans". *Journal Of Advertising Research.* 54(1), 92-109

Williams, P. & Drolet, A. (2005). "Age-related differences in responses to emotional advertisements". *Journal of consumer research,* 32**,** 343-354.