

## Beyond the ‘like’: customer engagement of brand fans on Facebook

Tania Maree\* and G. van Heerden

Department of Marketing Management, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

\*Corresponding author: tania.maree@up.ac.za

### Abstract

**Purpose** – This study explores customer engagement (CE) in Facebook brand communities. It clusters Facebook brand fans to establish whether an existing typology holds in a diverse sample, and examines the differences in CE between the clusters. The predictive capabilities of CE on an important brand outcome, eWOM, are determined.

**Design/methodology/approach** – 493 respondents participated in an online survey. A two-step cluster analysis was conducted to determine the fan types. ANOVA was used to assess the differences in CE between the clusters. Multiple regression determined the predictive capabilities of CE on eWOM.

**Findings** – This research confirms the Facebook fan typology on a more diverse sample. Significant differences exist between the fan types on CE (captivation and gratification), and CE significantly predicts eWOM.

**Research limitations/implications** – Future research could include motivations behind brand fan behavior. Using other CE measures may bring a different view. Theoretical perspectives other than social identity theory (SIT) may elicit other insights.

**Practical implications** – Insights into brand fan segments’ behavior and engagement allow brand managers to develop targeted marketing interactions. Gratification engagement is a stronger driver of eWOM, suggesting that brands should focus on marketing actions that will encourage gratification.

**Originality/value** – This research expands on Facebook brand fan typologies, and explores CE as a multi-dimensional construct, rather than as a mere “Like” action. Additionally, it determines the predictive capabilities of CE dimensions on eWOM. The findings suggest that SIT could be useful when examining CE in brand communities.

**Keywords** – Brand fans, Brand communities, Customer engagement, electronic Word-of-mouth, Facebook, Social identity theory.

**Paper type** – Research paper

## 1. Introduction

Facebook pages for brands were introduced in 2007 as a tool to build two-way relationships with consumers and enable brands to build online communities (Facebook, 2018). The Facebook “Like” button was initially created to enable Facebook users to react to their friends’ posts. Now, if a user Likes a brand page, they become a member of that brand community and a follower of the brand.

People who Like a brand on Facebook are seen as brand fans who are part of the brand’s social network site (SNS) community. Facebook, as the global leader with 2.38 billion active members as of July 2019 (Statista, 2019), provides a viable platform to investigate the behavior of brand fans. Facebook brand pages have enabled organizations to “drive engagement with brands” (Malhotra *et al.*, 2013, p. 18). Customer engagement (CE) has the potential to be a strong predictor of brand loyalty (Hollebeek, 2009). Indeed, So *et al.* (2014) found that brand loyalty increased the more that a user engaged with the brand.

Theoretically, CE traces its roots from relationship marketing, consumer culture theory (CCT) and the service-dominant logic (S-D logic) (Hollebeek *et al.*, 2014). Other scholars suggest considering alternative theoretical perspectives, such as social identity theory and regulatory theory (Leckie *et al.*, 2016). Social identity theory (SIT) is chosen, as this study focuses on engagement from a Facebook brand fan community perspective. SIT postulates that people’s sense of self (self-image) is influenced by the groups they belong to. Membership of a brand community provides the individual with a sense of belonging and supports in-group interaction.

Wallace *et al.* (2014) highlighted the importance of brand fans on SNSs. They developed a typology of Facebook fans using a sample of Irish students, and used cluster analysis to examine “...the connection between a Fan and his or her brand” (Wallace *et al.*, 2014, p. 94). Four clusters were identified: *Fan-atics*, *Self-expressives*, *Utilitarians*, and *Authentics*. They recommended that these clusters be validated through replication research, as that would support the possible generalizability of their clusters and offer more knowledge (Wallace *et al.*, 2014). They specifically suggested that a wider profile of Facebook users be surveyed to test whether the clusters are robust, and to obtain samples from different cultures, as their sample consisted of mainly Irish students (mean age 21.2 years) and was skewed towards females (63.2%). This research answers those calls by exploring brand fan clusters in a non-Western context (Africa), using a broader age range and a more equal gender distribution.

In the study by Wallace *et al.* (2014), an engaged user is conceptualized as someone who has Liked a brand page. This study views Liking a page as the *initiation* of engagement in a Facebook brand fan community, and takes it further by considering CE as a separate construct. This study used the Wallace *et al.* (2014) study as input to explore clusters, and contributes further in the following ways: measuring CE as a specific construct; examining whether the identified clusters differ on CE; and investigating how CE predicts an important brand outcome, electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM). Additionally, it views CE in the context of Facebook brand communities using SIT as explanatory theory.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1 Customer engagement in SNS brand communities

SNSs introduced new ways for consumers and brands to interact and engage (Kabadayi and Price, 2014). This enables communication between brands and consumers, and between consumers, creating a triad that benefits all parties. In a virtual environment, engagement is defined as “interactive experiences between consumers and the brand and/or other members of the community” (Brodie *et al.*, 2013, p. 107). The importance of engagement is supported by growing scholarly and industry interest. Kumar (2015) highlights an emerging paradigm in which marketing is an integral part of an organization’s decision-making framework. CE is one of the triggers for this paradigm, probably because CE offers “superior predictability of loyalty” (Kumar, 2015, p. 4).

Some scholars view CE as a behavioral construct driven by motivations (Van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Verhoef *et al.*, 2010), while others suggest that CE includes psychological and behavioral facets (Brodie *et al.*, 2011). There is consensus that CE is multi-dimensional; and so this study used a multi-dimensional CE measurement developed by So *et al.* (2014) comprising five factors: Identification, Enthusiasm, Attention, Absorption, and Interaction (refer to Table 2). The literature asserts that studying engagement in a virtual environment is relevant, as consumer-brand relationships are more likely to be located in such environments (Van Doorn *et al.*, 2010; Rosenthal and Brito, 2017).

SNS brand pages give brands the opportunity to build a community and create economic value, and are mainly used as a communication tool (Rosenthal and Brito, 2017). Brand communities are essential to brand managers and consumers (Habibi *et al.*, 2014), and

strengthen the brand norms and values through the customer-customer-brand (triad) relationships (Muniz and O'Guinn, 2001).

A brand page, as a major channel and integral part of the brand's marketing campaign, assists consumer-brand interactions (Kabadayi and Price, 2014). When a user (whether a customer or not) becomes a fan of a Facebook brand page, they engage by default with a brand/organization. This presents opportunities for marketers to extend brand conversations and referrals, for example. Brand community members often share user experiences, and are likely to spread WOM (Yeh and Choi, 2011).

Social settings beyond purchase (such as brand communities) are appropriate contexts within which to study CE (Dessart *et al.*, 2015). Facebook brand fans have a strong sense of community. Higher levels of CE with brands are expected in brand communities, and the connection between members adds value to the brand experience (Brodie *et al.*, 2011). A brand might not be the primary reason for community membership; the group might be the motivation behind membership (Hammedi *et al.* 2015).

Theoretically, this study employs SIT, as it is useful in examining interaction behaviors within brand communities. Being a member of a group signifies an "in-group" for the individual; people that are not part of such a group are considered "out-groups" (McLeod, 2008). The theory explains the relations between group members in reference to the social self (Hogg *et al.*, 1995). Members of online brand communities support one another, thus engaging in prosocial behaviors (Chu and Kim, 2018). Such behaviors can enhance the self-concept of the individual in the social context, and strengthen their relationships with the in-group members. SIT has been used in research that investigated brand-related constructs such as those included in this research: brand love (Vernuccio *et al.*, 2015), brand loyalty (He *et al.*, 2012; Shirazi *et al.*, 2013), and word-of-mouth (WOM) (Chang *et al.*, 2013). It provides a useful viewpoint from which to approach an examination of brand fan behavior and CE.

## 2.2 Characteristics of a Facebook brand fan typology

Some researchers have attempted to classify Facebook brand fans as detailed in Wallace *et al.* (2014, p. 93), who argued that more insights were needed into brand fans. Wallace and colleagues compiled a typology based on several constructs: brand love; brand loyalty; homophily (attitude and status); materialism; opinion-leaders and -seekers; reasons for liking the brand (genuine interest, image creation, incentive); self-esteem; self-expressive brand

(SEB) (inner and social self); self-monitoring; social ties; and WOM. Because they recommended that the typology be validated in a broader sample, and because this research included CE as a construct rather than only as a Like action, this research asks:

*RQ<sub>1</sub>*: Does the existing typology of brand fans hold in a different context?

*RQ<sub>2</sub>*: How do Facebook brand fan groups differ in terms of CE?

The constructs that were included in the cluster analysis are outlined in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Definitions of constructs

An objective of this study was to examine the predictive influence of CE on eWOM; thus WOM is expanded upon. WOM is widely considered one of the most effective marketing tools, albeit largely outside the control of the organization. It has generated considerable research interest over the years; more recently the focus has sharpened on how it manifests online. WOM that occurs via the internet is referred to as electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) (Farías, 2017). Given the larger audiences inherent in online social interactions, eWOM has the potential for wide reach. Consumers use eWOM information gained from trusted peers to advise their purchase decisions (Chu and Kim, 2011).

The importance of eWOM for brands has been debated and proven in various studies, as attested by Chu and Kim (2018) and King *et al.* (2014). The latter assert that the dissemination of eWOM is characterized by “enhanced volume, persistence and observability” (King *et al.*, 2014, p. 171). Chu and Kim (2018) assert the need for more research on eWOM in reference to prosocial relationships. As brand community members engage in activities that support other members (thus prosocial), this study *inter alia* answers this call.

Little research has examined the relationship between CE and eWOM. Hinson *et al.* (2019) found that CE had a positive relationship with consumer-generated advertising, which was conceptualized as communication generated by consumers about a brand. Islam and Rahman (2016) found that CE influenced eWOM positively in Facebook brand communities. Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

H<sub>1</sub>: CE positively influences eWOM in Facebook brand fan communities.

**Table 1.** Definitions of constructs

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Brand love	The degree of strong emotional attachment a consumer has for a brand (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006).
Brand loyalty	The consumer's level of commitment to repurchase of a preferred brand (Grott <i>et al.</i> , 2019).
Homophily	The tendency of individuals to socialize more readily with those who are similar to them (Wallace <i>et al.</i> 2017).
Materialism	"The extent to which individuals attempt to engage in the construction and maintenance of the self through the acquisition and use of products, services, experiences, or relationships that are perceived to provide desirable symbolic value" (Shrum <i>et al.</i> , 2013).
Opinion leaders	Consumers who advise others on brands and purchases.
Opinion seekers	People who seek information or advice on brands.
Reasons for liking the brand	Reasons for liking include genuine interest, the desire to create a certain image, and responding to incentives (Wallace <i>et al.</i> , 2014).
Self-esteem	The individual's general self-assessment of their own worth (Rosenberg, 1979).
Self-expressive brands	Brands that allow a consumer to express an ideal inner or enhanced social self (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006).
Self-monitoring	The observation and control of the self as directed by social acceptability (Snyder, 1974).
Social ties	The strength of interpersonal links and obligations between individuals in a network (Chipp <i>et al.</i> , 2019).
Word-of-mouth (WOM)	WOM is the informal communication between consumers about brands.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Sample and procedure

Ethical clearance was obtained before collecting the data via an online research panel from a marketing research company. A structured online questionnaire was distributed to a sample of South African respondents aged 18 years and older, with an equal gender distribution. The final sample size was 480 (after the case-wise deletion of incomplete questionnaires). Respondents were screened to ensure that they had an active Facebook account that they had used in the previous month, and that they had Liked or Followed a brand on Facebook.

#### 3.2 Measures

Clustering measures were adopted from Wallace *et al.* (2014, pp. 107-109). CE was measured using a scale from So *et al.* (2014) (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Dimensions and items of the CE measurement (So *et al.*, 2014)

Five-point Likert-type scales were employed to measure all constructs (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). The study used Cronbach's alpha to measure reliability, with scores exceeding 0.7 considered acceptable (Pallant, 2013). Demographic questions included gender, age, ethnicity, and education.

Respondents were requested to indicate how much time they spent on Facebook daily; their number of Facebook friends (network size); how long they had Liked a particular brand on Facebook; and how likely they were still to Like the brand by the end of the year. All were open-ended except "Likelihood to continue liking the brand", which was measured on a five-point scale (1=Not at all likely to 5=Extremely likely).

**Table 2.** Dimensions and items of the CE measurement (So *et al.* 2014)

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Items</b>
<b>Identification</b>	When someone criticizes this brand, it feels like a personal insult.
	When I talk about this brand, I usually say ‘we’ rather than ‘they’.
	This brand’s successes are my successes.
	When someone praises this brand, it feels like a personal compliment.
<b>Enthusiasm</b>	I am heavily into this brand.
	I am passionate about this brand.
	I am enthusiastic about this brand.
	I feel excited about this brand.
	I love this brand.
<b>Attention</b>	I like to learn more about this brand.
	I pay a lot of attention to anything about this brand.
	Anything related to this brand grabs my attention.
	I concentrate a lot on this brand.
	I like learning more about this brand.
<b>Absorption</b>	When I am interacting with the brand, I forget everything else around me.
	Time flies when I am interacting with the brand.
	When I am interacting with the brand, I get carried away.
	When interacting with the brand, it is difficult to detach myself.
	In my interaction with the brand, I am immersed.
	When interacting with the brand intensely, I feel happy.
<b>Interaction</b>	In general, I like to get involved in brand community discussions.
	I am someone who enjoys interacting with like-minded others in the brand community.
	I am someone who likes actively participating in brand community discussions.
	In general, I thoroughly enjoy exchanging ideas with other people in the brand community.
	I often participate in activities of the brand community.

#### 4. Data analyses

The data were analyzed descriptively, and exploratory factor analyses (EFAs) were conducted to validate the constructs' dimensionality and reliability. After construct validation, a two-step cluster analysis was performed to determine the salient clusters evident from the data. This method was chosen because it combines hierarchical and k-means clustering, and it allows a combination of continuous (constructs, age, time spent on Facebook, network size) and categorical variables (gender) (Mooi and Sarstedt, 2011). To examine whether there were differences between the clusters on CE, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed. Finally, standard multiple regression was used to determine which of the dimensions of engagement were the strongest predictors of eWOM.

#### 5. Results

##### *5.1 Demographic and Facebook usage profile of respondents*

The gender distribution was relatively equal: 46.2% males and 53.8% females. Ages ranged between 21 and 75 ( $M=45.9$ ;  $SD=12.1$ ). Education was represented by the respondents' highest qualifications ("No schooling" to "Doctoral degree"). The majority of respondents (40.4%) hold a university degree.

The respondents spent an average of around one hour ( $M=59.4$ ,  $SD=65.38$ ) on Facebook daily, and the average network size is 281 ( $SD=388.42$ ). The respondents Liked a particular brand for more than a year ( $M=15.2$  months;  $SD=15.41$ ) and were "extremely likely" to continue being brand fans ( $M=4.4$ ;  $SD=0.78$ ).

##### *5.2 Validation of the constructs (EFAs)*

The EFAs were conducted by using principal axis factoring (PAF) with Promax rotation. Osborne (2014) recommends using PAF, as it gives results that are superior to a Principal Components Analysis, and is best-fitting when data are not normally distributed, which is the case in this research. Furthermore, he supports the use of an oblique rotation because behavior (as measured in social science research) typically renders factors that are correlated (Osborne, 2014).

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity were used to establish whether the data were suitable for factor analyses. The KMO should exceed 0.6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity should be significant ( $<0.05$ ) to indicate

suitability (Pallant, 2013). All of the constructs presented statistically significant values for Bartlett's test (0.000), and the KMO values exceeded 0.6 (ranging from 0.680 to 0.981).

EFA determined the unidimensionality of the clustering constructs, and validated the CE construct in this context. Twenty-five CE items were included, which resulted in a two-factor solution. Four items that loaded onto both factors were deleted. As the original measure by So *et al.* (2014) proposed a five-factor solution, the items that loaded on the two factors in this study were evaluated and subsequently labeled with an appropriate name deemed to be representative of the label (Hair *et al.* 2010). Factor 1, labeled “Captivation”, contained 14 items, while Factor 2, labeled “Gratification”, comprised seven items. *Captivation* is defined as the degree to which the consumer is captivated while interacting with the brand and/or other customers; and *gratification* as the consumer’s interest and excitement when interacting with the brand. The Captivation factor retained items from the Absorption, Identification, and Interaction factors from So *et al.*’s (2014) scale, and Gratification consisted of items from the Enthusiasm and Attention subscales. After considering the items and the factors they loaded upon, although different from those proposed by So *et al.* (2014), it was concluded that the identified factors were representative of the items and logically fitted where they loaded. The reliability, means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Reliability and descriptives of constructs

### 5.3 Cluster analysis

The research aimed to explore whether Wallace *et al.*’s (2014) four-cluster solution would hold in this context and on a more diverse sample. The two-step method does not permit missing values; thus 11 cases with missing values were excluded and the analysis was conducted on the remaining 469 cases. In order to select an optimal number of clusters, and to check stability, a combination of the following criteria was used (Wiese *et al.*, 2017): low Bayesian information criterion (BIC); ratio of BIC changes; high ratio of distance measures; and potentially meaningful explanations. Table 4 presents the auto-clustering table for up to six clusters (for brevity).

**Table 3.** Reliability and descriptives of constructs

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Cronbach's alpha</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Brand love	0.937	3.6	0.92
Brand loyalty	0.860	3.6	1.07
Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM)	0.870	3.2	0.99
Homophily: attitude	0.899	2.8	0.95
Homophily: status	0.866	2.9	0.94
Materialism	0.764	3.3	0.91
Opinion leaders	0.878	2.4	1.04
Opinion seekers	0.892	2.3	1.06
Reasons for liking brand: Genuine interest	0.795	3.5	0.96
Reasons for liking brand: Image creation	0.796	3.0	1.03
Reasons for liking brand: Incentive	0.753	2.1	0.95
Self-esteem	0.904	4.1	0.65
Self-expressive brand: Inner self	0.923	2.9	1.14
Self-expressive brand: Social self	0.924	2.8	1.15
Self-monitoring	0.858	2.6	0.87
Social ties	0.840	2.9	0.94
Customer engagement: captivation	0.972	3.3	1.03
Customer engagement: gratification	0.944	2.6	1.08

**Table 4.** Auto-clustering

Based on the lowest BIC coefficient, the highest ratio of distance measures, and potentially meaningful explanations, a four-cluster solution was considered the optimal result. This concurs with Wallace *et al.*'s solution. ANOVA showed that there were statistically significant differences across the clusters ( $p < 0.05$ ). *Post hoc* multiple comparison tests revealed that significant group differences existed among the majority of the cluster means. Table 5 presents the cluster distribution, descriptive statistics, and *post hoc* test results.

**Table 5.** Clusters

As five-point scales were used, means exceeding 3.5 are characterised as “high”, from 2.5 to 3.5 are “neutral”, and those below 2.5 are “low”; and these form the base for characterizing the clusters in terms of their overall fan-brand connections. From Table 5 some prominent aspects can be summarized. The *Authentics* were the largest cluster and the *Utilitarians* the smallest. Two single-gender clusters were found: the *Self-expressives* were all male and the *Authentics* were all female. Despite the gender difference, these two clusters reported mostly neutral levels across the constructs. In contrast, the *Utilitarians* featured the lowest means overall, and the *Fan-atics* the highest. These two clusters seem to be polar opposites: the *Utilitarians* were the oldest, spent the least amount of time on Facebook, and had the fewest Facebook friends. The *Fan-atics* were the youngest, spent the most time on Facebook, and had the most Facebook friends.

**5.3.1 Cluster profiles**

*Utilitarians*: the oldest cluster ( $M=50$  years) consisted of more females (56.4%) than males (43.6%), spent an average of 36 minutes on Facebook daily, and their average network size consisted of 177 friends. The majority of constructs had low means. Materialism ( $M=2.7$ ,  $SD=0.88$ ) and genuine interest as a reason for liking ( $M=2.6$ ,  $SD=1.02$ ) were neutral, and only self-esteem ( $M=3.9$ ,  $SD=0.81$ ) was high. Among the clusters, the *Utilitarians* may be regarded as a cluster with “low” fan-brand connections.

**Table 4.** Auto-clustering

<b>Number of Clusters</b>	<b>Schwarz's Bayesian Criterion (BIC)</b>	<b>Ratio of BIC Changes<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Ratio of Distance Measures<sup>b</sup></b>
1	7055.124		
2	6437.206	<b>1.000</b>	1.606
3	6143.064	0.476	1.169
<b>4</b>	<b>5926.065</b>	0.351	<b>2.454</b>
5	5979.740	-0.087	1.088
6	6048.455	-0.111	1.318

a. The ratios of changes are relative to the change for the two cluster solution.

b. The ratios of distance measures are based on the current number of clusters against the previous number of clusters.

**Table 5.** Clusters<sup>1</sup>

	<i>Utilitarians</i>	<i>Self-expressives</i>	<i>Authentics</i>	<i>Fan-atics</i>
<b>Cluster sizes</b>	94 (20%)	122 (26%)	158 (33.7%)	95 (20.3%)
<i>Male</i>	43.60%	<b>100%</b>	0	<b>58.90%</b>
<i>Female</i>	<b>56.40%</b>	0	<b>100%</b>	41.10%
<b>Age (mean)</b>	50 (12.6)	47.6 (13.1)	44.3 (11.0)	42.4 (10.2)
<b>Time spent on Facebook</b>	36 minutes	45 minutes	65 minutes	93 minutes
<b>Network size</b>	177	264	241	464
<b>Constructs</b>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>	<i>Mean (SD)</i>
Brand love	2.40 (0.72)	3.82 <sup>a</sup> (0.65)	3.64 <sup>a</sup> (0.62)	4.43 (0.55)
Brand loyalty	2.31 (0.95)	3.87 (0.78)	3.57 (0.82)	4.39 (0.65)
eWOM	1.98 (0.69)	3.33 (0.70)	3.07 (0.68)	4.21 (0.62)
Homophily Attitude	2.07 (0.79)	2.72 <sup>a</sup> (0.79)	2.88 <sup>a</sup> (0.79)	3.59 (0.79)
Homophily Status	2.24 (0.88)	2.88 <sup>a</sup> (0.80)	2.90 <sup>a</sup> (0.82)	3.61 (0.78)
Materialism	2.71 (0.88)	3.26 <sup>a</sup> (0.84)	3.27 <sup>a</sup> (0.85)	3.86 (0.76)
Opinion leader	1.60 (0.69)	2.30 <sup>a</sup> (0.81)	2.37 <sup>a</sup> (0.88)	3.49 (0.92)
Opinion seeker	1.60 (0.70)	2.22 <sup>a</sup> (0.92)	2.24 <sup>a</sup> (0.89)	3.17 (1.12)
Reason for liking: Genuine interest	2.59 (1.02)	3.54 <sup>a</sup> (0.80)	3.49 <sup>a</sup> (0.76)	4.28 (0.56)
Reason for liking: Image creation	1.74 (0.58)	3.13 (0.63)	2.80 (0.80)	4.12 (0.67)
Reason for liking: Incentive	1.64 <sup>b</sup> (0.68)	1.80 <sup>ab</sup> (0.71)	1.95 <sup>a</sup> (0.83)	2.88 (1.09)
Self-expressive brands: Inner	1.47 (0.53)	3.18 (0.82)	2.88 (0.76)	4.06 (0.84)
Self-expressive brands: Social	1.46 (0.55)	3.06 (0.79)	2.63 (0.82)	4.12 (0.75)
Self-esteem	3.87 <sup>bc</sup> (0.81)	4.09 <sup>ab</sup> (0.58)	4.10 <sup>ac</sup> (0.60)	4.31 (0.57)

<sup>1</sup>Constructs measured on 5-point scales. *Post-hoc* tests: clusters that do not differ significantly from one another are indicated with <sup>a</sup>, <sup>b</sup> and/or <sup>c</sup>; all others do differ significantly.

	<i>Utilitarians</i>	<i>Self-expressives</i>	<i>Authentics</i>	<i>Fan-atics</i>
Self-monitoring	2.03 (0.75)	2.6 <sup>a</sup> (0.69)	2.55 <sup>a</sup> (0.74)	3.37 (0.88)
Social ties	2.15 (0.91)	2.76 <sup>a</sup> (0.72)	2.92 <sup>a</sup> (0.79)	3.69 (0.76)

*Self-expressives*: this exclusively male cluster's mean age was 47.6 years. *Self-expressives*' average daily Facebook use was 45 minutes, and their network size was 264. They reflected high levels of brand love ( $M=3.8$ ,  $SD=0.65$ ), brand loyalty ( $M=3.9$ ,  $SD=0.78$ ), genuine interest ( $M=3.5$ ,  $SD=0.80$ ), and self-esteem ( $M=4.1$ ,  $SD=0.58$ ). Low levels were reported for opinion-leading and -seeking ( $M=2.3$ ,  $SD=0.81$ ;  $M=2.2$ ,  $SD=0.92$ ) and incentive ( $M=1.8$ ,  $SD=0.71$ ). The other means were neutral. The results suggest a cluster that displays “neutral-high” fan-brand connections.

*Authentic*s: this all-female cluster's average age was 44.3 years; they spent just over an hour (65 minutes) on Facebook daily, and had around 241 friends. They reported high levels for brand love ( $M=3.6$ ,  $SD=0.62$ ), brand loyalty ( $M=3.6$ ,  $SD=0.82$ ), and self-esteem ( $M=4.1$ ,  $SD=0.60$ ). Opinion-leading ( $M=2.4$ ,  $SD=0.88$ ), -seeking ( $M=2.2$ ,  $SD=0.89$ ), and incentives ( $M=2.0$ ,  $SD=0.83$ ) were low. Similar to the *Self-expressives*, the majority of the constructs were neutral. However, upon inspection of the construct means that differed significantly (i.e., brand loyalty, eWOM, image creation, and SEB) between these seemingly similar clusters, the *Authentic*s presented more “neutral” fan-brand connections.

*Fan-atics*: the youngest cluster (42.4 years) featured 58.9% males and 41.1% females. Their average daily Facebook use was 93 minutes, and their network size was 464 friends. In contrast with the *Utilitarians*, they had the highest means across all constructs, and no low scores. Neutral scores were reported only for opinion-seeking ( $M=3.17$ ,  $SD=1.12$ ), incentives ( $M=2.9$ ,  $SD=1.09$ ), and self-monitoring ( $M=3.4$ ,  $SD=0.88$ ). These results suggest that the *Fan-atics* displayed “high” fan-brand connections.

### 5.3.2 Results for customer engagement (CE)

Upon completing the cluster analysis, the descriptive statistics for CE for each cluster were determined: *Utilitarians*: captivation  $M=2.1$  ( $SD=0.82$ ), gratification  $M=1.4$  ( $SD=0.52$ ); *Self-expressives*: captivation  $M=3.6$  ( $SD=0.77$ ), gratification  $M=2.8$  ( $SD=0.77$ ); *Authentic*s: captivation  $M=3.3$  ( $SD=0.77$ ), gratification  $M=2.4$  ( $SD=0.79$ ); and *Fan-atics*: captivation  $M=4.2$  ( $SD=0.70$ ), gratification  $M=3.7$  ( $SD=0.89$ ). These results support the *Utilitarians*' characterization as “low”, *Self-expressives* as “neutral-high”, *Authentic*s as “neutral”, and *Fan-atics* as “high” in terms of fan-brand connections.

### 5.3.3 Cluster parallels with Wallace *et al.* (2014)

Due to the lack of similar cluster-style studies that have explored the relations between brand fans and their preferred brand, a discussion of the parallels and differences between the clusters in this study and those of Wallace *et al.* (2014) is fitting. Table 6 presents a summary. For simplicity, the construct results are shown as low, neutral, and high, also indicating the lowest and highest for each across the clusters (in **bold**). Instances where the two studies' levels differed are indicated in *italics*.

**Table 6.** Summary of cluster results in parallel with Wallace *et al.* (2014)

Table 6 shows that the overall cluster composition and cluster patterns in this study are similar to Wallace *et al.*'s (2014), and thus support their Facebook fan typology – and answer RQ<sub>1</sub>. Some differences are present, which may be attributable to the demographic differences, as the sample for this study was more diverse.

The *Utilitarians* in this study differ somewhat from those in Wallace *et al.*'s study in some respects. Homophily (status), reasons for liking (incentive), self-esteem, and self-monitoring measured the lowest in this cluster, whereas in Wallace *et al.*'s they were neutral or high. Additionally, the *Utilitarians* were the oldest of the clusters here, whereas the *Authentics* were the oldest of Wallace *et al.*'s clusters.

Overall, the *Self-expressives* showed a general pattern of similarity to Wallace *et al.*'s in representing a “neutral-high” cluster. It is noteworthy that this cluster showed lower levels across most constructs than in Wallace *et al.*'s study (for example, eWOM was neutral rather than high; opinion leading was low rather than neutral). Notable exceptions were brand love, brand loyalty, genuine interest, and self-esteem, which were high rather than neutral in this study. This *Self-expressives* cluster was exclusively male; Wallace *et al.*'s clusters were female-dominated. The *Self-expressives* in this study spent less time on Facebook than the *Authentics*. This was the other way around in Wallace *et al.*'s sample.

The *Authentics* in both studies showed high levels for brand love, loyalty, and self-esteem, and low for opinion-leading. This study's *Authentics* were neutral across all constructs, whereas those in Wallace *et al.*'s study inclined towards variations of high or low levels within the cluster. In this study the cluster was exclusively female.

**Table 1.** Definitions of constructs

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Brand love	The degree of strong emotional attachment a consumer has for a brand (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006).
Brand loyalty	The consumer's level of commitment to repurchase of a preferred brand (Grott <i>et al.</i> , 2019).
Homophily	The tendency of individuals to socialize more readily with those who are similar to them (Wallace <i>et al.</i> 2017).
Materialism	"The extent to which individuals attempt to engage in the construction and maintenance of the self through the acquisition and use of products, services, experiences, or relationships that are perceived to provide desirable symbolic value" (Shrum <i>et al.</i> , 2013).
Opinion leaders	Consumers who advise others on brands and purchases.
Opinion seekers	People who seek information or advice on brands.
Reasons for liking the brand	Reasons for liking include genuine interest, the desire to create a certain image, and responding to incentives (Wallace <i>et al.</i> , 2014).
Self-esteem	The individual's general self-assessment of their own worth (Rosenberg, 1979).
Self-expressive brands	Brands that allow a consumer to express an ideal inner or enhanced social self (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006).
Self-monitoring	The observation and control of the self as directed by social acceptability (Snyder, 1974).
Social ties	The strength of interpersonal links and obligations between individuals in a network (Chipp <i>et al.</i> , 2019).
Word-of-mouth (WOM)	WOM is the informal communication between consumers about brands.

The *Fan-atics* in this research concurred with those of Wallace *et al.* for all of the constructs except homophily (attitude) and reasons for liking (incentive). Among this study's clusters, *Fan-atics* had the highest means for these variables, whereas for Wallace *et al.* incentive was neutral and homophily (attitude) was the highest for the *Authentics*. *Fan-atics* had the largest network size across the clusters in this study, for Wallace *et al.* it was the *Self-expressives*.

#### 5.4 ANOVA results for customer engagement

Having shown that Wallace *et al.*'s typology seems to hold in a different context, RQ<sub>2</sub> could be pursued: "How do Facebook brand fan groups differ in terms of CE?" The research employed ANOVA to explore the differences among the clusters on the CE dimensions. Levene's test for homogeneity of variances was significant ( $p < 0.001$ ), indicating that the standard deviation among the groups was not equal. Therefore, Welch's adjusted F-ratio was examined, showing that there were significant differences among the means of the clusters for both dimensions of engagement: Captivation:  $F(3, 238.84) = 121.52, p = 0.00$ ; Gratification:  $F(3, 242.58) = 183.21, p = 0.00$ . The effect sizes (omega squared) were large (captivation 0.4; gratification 0.5), suggesting practical significance. Games-Howell *post hoc* tests revealed that the means of all of the clusters differed statistically significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) with one another for both dimensions of CE.

For captivation, the means for the *Utilitarians* ( $M=2.1; SD=0.82$ ) differed significantly from those of the *Self-expressives* ( $M=3.6; SD=0.77$ ), *Authentics* ( $M=3.3; SD=0.77$ ), and *Fan-atics* ( $M=4.2; SD=0.70$ ). Similarly, the means for the *Utilitarians* ( $M=1.4; SD=0.52$ ) differed significantly from those of the *Self-expressives* ( $M=2.8; SD=0.77$ ), *Authentics* ( $M=2.4; SD=0.79$ ) and *Fan-atics* ( $M=3.7; SD=0.89$ ) for gratification.

These results contribute to the literature on CE in that they show that segments in a brand community can vary in their engagement with the brand, which is an important insight for brand managers. This is expanded upon in the discussion section.

#### 5.5 Multiple regression

A standard multiple regression was employed to establish the predictive capabilities of CE on eWOM, thus testing H<sub>1</sub> (Table 7).

**Table 7. Results of multiple regression analysis**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b><i>Beta (t-value)</i></b>
Captivation	0.276 (5.333)**
Gratification	0.499 (9.63)**
<b><i>Model summary</i></b>	
$R^2$	0.547
$F$	288.2**

\*\*  $p < 0.001$

**Table 7.** Results of multiple regression analysis

The overall correlation coefficient (R Square) indicated that the two CE dimensions explain 54.7 per cent of the variability in eWOM. Both were statistically significant predictors of eWOM, with gratification being the strongest ( $\beta=0.50$ ), and captivation contributing  $\beta=0.28$ .  $H_1$  is thus supported.

## 6. Discussion

The clusters were not engaged with the brand to the same degree, and the results indicated that the clusters differed statistically significantly on both CE dimensions. *Fan-atics* showed the overall highest engagement, with engagement levels exceeding  $M=3.5$  for both dimensions. In contrast, the *Utilitarians* were the least engaged with the brand, reporting engagement levels below  $M=2.5$ . The *Self-expressives* reported high captivation and neutral gratification. The *Authentic's* level of captivation was neutral, and gratification low.

The significant differences could be ascribed to the unique characteristics of each cluster. Examining these characteristics may reveal how to enhance engagement within a cluster and to stimulate more interaction. For example, the *Utilitarians* showed higher levels for genuine interest than for the other reasons for liking. As they were the least engaged with the brand, leveraging their real interest may draw *Utilitarians* into more interaction with the brand. This could be achieved by authentic campaigns that employ a more direct appeal.

The *Fan-atics* reported high engagement levels and the highest scores on all variables, which may make them the most attractive from a segmentation perspective. Their characteristics – especially their high brand love, loyalty, and inclination to spread eWOM – make them ideal candidates for brand advocacy. As they reported high levels of SEB social and image creation, they should be good targets for campaigns featuring aspirational brand messages and appeals to their ego. *Fan-atics* likely become brand fans for the purpose of impression management (Wallace *et al.*, 2014).

The all-male *Self-expressives* follow the *Fan-atics*, in that they have the second-largest network and the second-highest brand love, loyalty, and eWOM. They were the only other

cluster that reported high engagement (captivation). Other characteristics that may be useful in leveraging their persuasive power include their propensity to use brands as self-expression, for image creation and high self-esteem. These characteristics suggest individuals who are concerned with how they are seen, and they may be likely to “shop and tell” – i.e., show off purchases that support their self-esteem.

The *Authentics*, characterized as the most neutral group, were the largest cluster. Due to their size and high levels of brand love and brand loyalty, they could be a viable segment to target, specifically to participate in conversations about the brand. Consistent with Wallace *et al.*'s (2014) findings, *Authentics* seem, from their SEB scores, to be genuine brand fans, signifying that their interest in the brand is less about impression management and more about true brand support. *Authentics* might be influenced to purchase more or even spread eWOM if targeted with suitable campaigns that focus on their genuine support of the brand.

Both dimensions of CE were significant predictors of eWOM, and explained more than half of the variance of eWOM. Gratification was the strongest predictor, which suggests that this dimension plays a more important role in stimulating eWOM. Brands therefore need to focus on strengthening the gratification elements when engaging with the brand community. The results further suggest that the motivations behind gratification engagement may vary more than those of captivation. This calls for further examination to determine how this can be used to the advantage of the brand.

## 7. Managerial implications

The results show that there are different types of brand fans, and that each of these contributes in various ways to the brand community. The findings suggest that, in order for brand managers to launch effective social media marketing campaigns, it is important to know what types of fan comprise the brand's Facebook brand community. This knowledge will allow brand page managers to develop more appropriate content and activities to appeal to different fan segments – in particular, to the *Fan-atics*, a small but highly influential segment with great potential to mobilize other consumers even outside the brand community.

The *Fan-atics* were the only cluster for whom the highest levels were for brand love and loyalty rather than self-esteem. These aspects could be leveraged to the advantage of the brand, especially as *Fan-atics* are the most engaged with the brand, and are very likely to act as

opinion leaders and to spread eWOM. Brand managers should value *Fan-atics* for their potential as brand advocates and influencers within and outside the brand community. Furthermore, brand page managers should identify these fans in their community, establish the specific factors that stimulate their eWOM activities, and encourage brand conversations both on- and offline. This approach has the potential to acquire new customers and to strengthen ties with current consumers. The challenge from a content perspective is to develop brand messages that speak to their love for and loyalty to the brand, as well as their ego, supported by their high self-esteem, all of which make them likely to gravitate towards upmarket brands or those that promise an enhanced self-image. This segment, however, would probably not be likely to promote “unsexy” brands, and would therefore not be a good target for less glamorous product categories.

From the brand page managers’ perspective, the *Utilitarians* may not be the most attractive segment to target due to their generally low levels across all variables, which render them unlikely to spread eWOM or initiate any actions that could be leveraged. A different approach should be taken with this cluster, focusing on self-esteem-related activities that may be most valuable to them. Content and activities relating to the individual and how they can benefit from that should be the focus of the content created for this cluster.

Brand page managers can use the *Self-expressives*’ desire to create ideal pictures of themselves on Facebook as input in targeting them effectively. They should respond well to messages about how the brand enhances one’s image, thus expressing their self-brand connection. As they are highly captivated by the brand, such appeals may lead to eWOM.

The *Authentics*’ high levels of brand love and loyalty make them good targets for brand building. Any support they verbalize for a brand would be credible, rendering subsequent conversations about the brand valuable to others in their sizeable network. Brand page managers need carefully to observe and track the conversations of the *Authentics*. This is to initiate meaningful dialogue that supports resonance with the brand and its communications. The challenge for marketers would be to fine-tune the messaging to suit this segment’s characteristics and lifestyle, and to get them actually to promote the brand.

The results on how CE influences eWOM show that gratification engagement is a larger driver of eWOM. Brand managers should identify the aspects of gratification that are unique to the brand within each brand community; these could be triggers for engaging consumers more effectively. Exciting and informative campaigns should be specifically developed when

promoting new offers – for example, providing interesting and useful new information about the brand, or initiating exciting promotions or activities to encourage interaction with the brand.

## 8. Limitations and directions for future research

This study used non-probability sampling, and so the results cannot be generalized. A cross-sectional design provides merely a snapshot; longitudinal research could provide insight into changes over time. It is advised that future research avoid common method variance and consider, for example, using actual measures of instead of self-reported eWOM. It is recommended that offline WOM also be considered, perhaps compared with eWOM, as Eisingerich *et al.* (2015) found that consumers were less likely to engage in eWOM when compared with their likelihood to spread traditional WOM. Due to the lack of similar cluster-style studies, comparisons with the literature are difficult to make. The scope of the study excluded the motivations behind brand fan behavior, which would be an ideal avenue for future research. Motivations may provide more insight into why these clusters differ on engagement. Since several alternative CE measures are available, it may be that a different view on engagement may arise if other measures were used; this could be explored in future studies. This study used SIT as a theoretical lens; other theories have been used in the literature to examine CE. To date, consensus on the theoretical backbone of CE has not been found, although it seems that the S-D logic is increasingly preferred (refer to Hollebeek *et al.*, 2019).

## 9. Concluding remarks

This research confirmed that the typology of Facebook brand fans developed by Wallace *et al.* (2014) seems to hold in a non-Western cultural context and on a sample of broader age range and equal gender distribution. The examination of a multi-dimensional CE measure yields insight for brand page managers on Facebook, and could also be useful to brand managers on other social media. From a theoretical perspective, the study provides support for a SIT approach to studying CE in the context of brand communities. The literature shows that self-image and the social self are influenced by individuals' in-groups – e.g., their brand communities. CE finds similar relevance in SIT due to its interactive nature in reference to both brand and other consumers in the brand community. The results provide interesting insights

into various potential segments in a Facebook brand page, and into how these groups differ in CE. Insights into how CE drives eWOM provides impetus for designing communication strategies for brand pages.

## References

- Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Jurić, B. and Ilić, A. (2011), "Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 252-271.
- Brodie, R.J., Ilić, A., Jurić, B. and Hollebeek, L. (2013), "Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 105-114.
- Carroll, B.A. and Ahuvia, A.C. (2006), "Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 79-89.
- Chang, A., Hsieh, S.H. and Tseng, T.H. (2013), "Online brand community response to negative brand events: The role of group eWOM", *Internet Research*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 486-506.
- Chipp, K., Carter, M. and Chiba, M. (2019), "Through the pyramid: Implications of interconnectedness in Africa", *European Business Review*, Vol. No. 3, pp. 289-303.
- Chu, S.-C. and Kim, J. (2018), "The current state of knowledge on electronic word-of-mouth in advertising research", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 1-13.
- Chu, S.-C. and Kim, Y. (2011), "Determinants of consumer engagement in electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites", *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 47-75.
- 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.
- Eisingerich, A.B., Chun, H.H., Liu, Y., Jia, H.M. and Bell, S.J. (2015), "Why recommend a brand face-to-face but not on Facebook? How word-of-mouth on online social sites differs from traditional word-of-mouth", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 120-128.

- Facebook (2018), “Facebook unveils Facebook Ads”, available at: <https://newsroom.fb.com/news/2007/11/facebook-unveils-facebook-ads/> (accessed 19 October 2018).
- Fariás, P. (2017), “Identifying the factors that influence eWOM in SNSs: The case of Chile”, *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp. 852-869.
- Habibi, M.R., Laroche, M. and Richard, M.-O. (2014), “Brand communities based in social media: How unique are they? Evidence from two exemplary brand communities”, *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 123-132.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., Pearson, London.
- Hammedi, W., Kandampully, J., Zhang, T.T. and Bouquiaux, L. (2015) “Online customer engagement: Creating social environments through brand community constellations”. *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 777-806.
- He, H., Li, Y. and Harris, L. (2012), “Social identity perspective on brand loyalty”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 65 No. 5, pp. 648-657.
- Hinson, R., Boateng, H., Renner, A. and Kosiba, J.P.B. (2019). “Antecedents and consequences of customer engagement on Facebook: An attachment theory perspective”, *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 204-226.
- Hogg, M.A., Terry, D.J. and White, K.M. (1995), “A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory”, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 58 No. 4, pp. 255-269.
- Hollebeek, L.D. (2009), “Demystifying customer engagement: Toward the development of a conceptual model”, *ANZMAC 2009 conference*. Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.
- 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., Srivastava, R.K. and Chen, T. (2019), “SD logic-informed customer engagement: integrative framework, revised fundamental propositions, and application to CRM”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 161-185.
- Islam, J.U. and Rahman, Z. (2016). “Linking customer engagement to trust and word-of-mouth on Facebook brand communities: An empirical study”, *Journal of Internet Commerce*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 40-58.

- Kabadayi, S. and Price, K. (2014), "Consumer–brand engagement on Facebook: Liking and commenting behaviors", *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 203-223.
- King, R.A., Racherla, P. and Bush, V.D. (2014), "What we know and don't know about online word-of-mouth: A review and synthesis of the literature", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 3, 167-183.
- Kumar, V. (2015), "Evolution of marketing as a discipline: What has happened and what to look out for", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 79 No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Leckie, C., Nyadzayo, M.W. and Johnson, L.W. (2016), "Antecedents of consumer brand engagement and brand loyalty", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 32 No. 5-6, pp. 558-578.
- Malhotra, A., Malhotra, C.K. and See, A. (2013), "How to create brand engagement on Facebook", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 18-20.
- McLeod, S. (2008), *Social identity theory*, available at: [www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html](http://www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html) (accessed 3 March 2018).
- Mooi, E. and Sarstedt, M. (2011), *A concise guide to market research: The process, data, and methods using IBM SPSS statistics*, Berlin, Springer.
- Muniz, A.M. and O'Guinn, T.C. (2001), "Brand community", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 412-432.
- Osborne, J.W. (2014), *Best practices in exploratory factor analysis*, Charleston, SC, CreateSpace.
- Pallant, J. (2013), *SPSS survival manual*, Berkshire, McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Rosenberg, M. (1979), *Conceiving the self*, New York, Basic Books.
- Rosenthal, B. and Brito, E.P. (2017), "How virtual brand community traces may increase fan engagement in brand pages", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 60 No. 3, pp. 375-384.
- Shirazi, A., Zeinvand Lorestani, H. and Karimi Mazidi, A. (2013), "Investigating the effects of brand identity on customer loyalty from social identity perspective", *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 153-178.
- Shrum, L., Wong, N., Arif, F., Chugani, S.K., Gunz, A., Lowrey, T.M., Nairn, A., Pandelaere, M., Ross, S.M. and Ruvio, A. (2013), "Reconceptualizing materialism as identity goal pursuits: Functions, processes, and consequences", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 8, pp. 1179-1185.
- Snyder, M. (1974), "Self-monitoring of expressive behavior", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 526.

- So, K.K.F., King, C. and Sparks, B. (2014), "Customer engagement with tourism brands: Scale development and validation", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 304-329.
- Statista (2019), "Most famous social network sites 2019, by active users", available at: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/> (accessed 28 October 2019).
- 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.
- Verhoef, P.C., Reinartz, W.J. and Krafft, M. (2010), "Customer engagement as a new perspective in customer management", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 247-252.
- Vernuccio, M., Pagani, M., Barbarossa, C. and Pastore, A. (2015), "Antecedents of brand love in online network-based communities: A social identity perspective", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 24 No. 7, pp. 706-719.
- Wallace, E., Buil, I. and De Chernatony, L. (2017), "Consumers' self-congruence with a 'liked' brand: Cognitive network influence and brand outcomes", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51 No. 2, pp. 367-390.
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., De Chernatony, L. and Hogan, M. (2014), "Who 'likes' you... and why? A typology of Facebook fans", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 92-109.
- Wiese, M., Van Heerden, G. and Maree, T. (2017), "Dynamite in small packages: The Engaged Elite as an Facebook emerging niche market", *The African Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 36-61.
- Yeh, Y.-H. and Choi, S.M. (2011), "Mini-lovers, maxi-mouths: An investigation of antecedents to eWOM intention among brand community members", *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 145-162.