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Abstract

This study examines the relationships between brand loyalty and user intentions to Like and Unlike the Facebook Pages of brands. The relationships between brand trust as a dimension of brand loyalty and these intentions is also examined. Since the emergence of social media, online platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram have evolved into means that have proven to be powerful influencers in today’s consumer markets. However, previous literature in the field has offered much insight into how practitioners might be able to utilize this platform as part of their marketing strategies, yet very little has focused on the consumer. The current study used an online survey to collect quantitative data that showed various existing relationships between user intentions to like and unlike brand pages on Facebook and brand loyalty when considering the amount and type of content posted by the brand, as well as users’ levels of brand loyalty.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the emergence of social media, online platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram have evolved into means that have proven to be powerful influencers in today’s consumer markets. Increasing numbers of retailers and businesses have integrated social media into their marketing strategies and may even find it necessary to maintain an online presence to stay afloat in a competitive economy. A 2011 survey of 399 businesses in Europe and the United States found that 88.2% of them had begun to use social media for marketing purposes, of which 42.1% had fully integrated social media into their marketing strategies (Insites Consulting, as cited in Rapp, Skinner Beitelspacher, Grewal, & Hughes, 2013). These numbers have more than likely increased given the rapid development of the abilities and features of social media since the survey was conducted.

Another contributing factor to the rise of social media use for marketing is the popularity and usage of social media by everyday consumers. Facebook, for example, boasted 829 million daily active users on average in June 2014, 10 years after its inception, with 1.32 billion users active each month (Facebook.com, 2014). Microblogging site Twitter hosts 500 million sent tweets per day across 271 million monthly users (Twitter, Inc., 2014).

Within peer-reviewed literature, many researchers have begun to look at the implications of social media for marketing purposes. Wright and Hinson (2009) recount how shipping company FedEx, who merged their company with Kinko’s, effectively used social media, particularly social network sites (SNSs) and blogs, in a “successful
attempt to smoothly merge two highly visible brands while maintaining public confidence and acquiring market share” (p.2). In 2012, Brennan and Croft found that large stakeholder groups such as Cisco, Oracle and Intel were successfully positioning themselves as “market-driving” by efficiently utilizing business models built around mass collaboration that have gained heavy ground in business-to-consumer relationship marketing (Brennan & Croft, 2012). More specifically, in a study focused on college-aged Facebook users, Chu (2011) found that consumers that use or join Facebook groups generally have a more positive attitude toward both social media and advertising – a large contribution, no doubt, as to why many marketers opt to target the online demographic (Chu, 2011).

Social media have become popular marketing platforms for brand managers and businesses alike, becoming seemingly impossible to ignore when determining how one should market their brand. The benefits of social media use for marketing purposes are many. For example, the ability of social media to bring together likeminded individuals has encouraged brand managers to incorporate them into their marketing strategies, allowing them to easily market to their target demographic (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media?, 2013, p. 77).

Additionally, the ability for these likeminded users to engage in immediate and open conversation presents multiple avenues for businesses to promote their brands more effectively. Tracking technologies and private community panels make word-of-mouth advertising (WOM) between consumers more easily monitored and help brands identify influential users whose opinions they should carefully nurture (Ang, 2011, p. 35).
The conversational features of social media also give businesses the capability to receive live feedback from their customers, assisting the development of new products and redevelopment of existing ones to better suit their customers (Ang, 2011, p. 36). With all the benefits provided by social media in reaching specific demographics, and monitoring and influencing consumer conversations, the adoption of social media by marketers was inevitable, especially when considering cost. Most social media are free to use at the most basic user levels. Still, costs to develop additional marketing initiatives using social media are minimal, making them a cost-effective strategy when evaluating the ease at which businesses can quickly gain exposure via social media as compared to traditional advertising.

Without a brand manager or representative having to initiate or allow brand visibility, as they would, for example, in airing a television commercial or opening a physical store location during business hours, brand-specific social media accounts such as Facebook pages allow users to engage with or visit the brand at any time, on any day (Ang, 2011, p. 36). Other studies vaguely focus on brand loyalty, such as Laroche et. al. (2013), who found that a business could enhance brand loyalty by enhancing its online relationships with consumers. Similar studies found that social media participation also carried an influence on brand loyalty (Casalo, Flavian, & Guinaliu, 2010; Kardaras, Karakostas, & Paphathanassiou, 2003).

Amidst the vast research that focuses on social media and marketing, most of the findings pertained to how marketers were and/or should utilize social media effectively, with very little focus on how a company maintains an online following once it has been developed. While there have been significant contributions to the field of social media
marketing in respect to strategies that marketers might employ via social media to attract consumers and relationship maintenance, there is very little research conducted on the factors that might affect consumers’ intentions to Like, and conversely to Unlike, or follow/unfollow brands on social media, particularly on Facebook. Other studies have even tried to look at the relationship between consumers’ online behaviors and purchasing or referral intentions (Poyry, Parvinen, & Malmivaara, 2013), and while offering significant implications to the field in that regard, there is still little contribution in identifying the factors that lead to these desired online behaviors. These factors are equally as important as those addressed in the aforementioned studies in helping brands figure out how to best utilize Facebook as a marketing tool, and the findings of this study will hopefully contribute to this void in social media marketing research.

The following are the objectives of this study:

1) To identify the relationship, if any, between brand loyalty and intentions to Like a brand’s Facebook page.

2) To identify the relationship, if any, between brand loyalty and intentions to Unlike a brand’s Facebook page.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In developing the foundation for this study, it is important to recognize previous research that has been conducted in similar fields. This literature review will focus on previous studies relevant to topics in three areas related to the current study. First, an overview of research that contributes to the definition of “social media” as it pertains to this study, as well as a brief history of social media and its development into its current uses as a popular networking tool, will be provided. This portion of the literature review will also present related research that focuses specifically on the social media platform analyzed in this study – Facebook – as a means to provide some background as to why it has been chosen as the focus for this study. Secondly, although briefly addressed in Chapter 1, it is necessary to delve deeper into similar research conducted in the field of social media marketing, particularly on Facebook. Lastly, this review will look at studies in the area of consumer research as it relates to online branding and marketing strategies, specifically as it relates to consumer-brand relationships on Facebook and user behaviors and intentions for Liking and Unliking brand pages.

2.1 History and Definition of Social Media

Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) trace various forms of social media back to 1979, when Tom Truscott and Jim Ellis of Duke University developed Usernet, a global discussion forum that allowed users to post public messages to the site. More than two decades later, in 1998, Bruce and Susan Abelson created Open Diary, a social networking site for online diary writers, which claimed to be the oldest interactive diary community,
hosting over 5 million diaries as of 2011, but was quickly followed by the development
and popularization of blogging websites, or “blogs” (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

LinkedIn, an online community for professionals was developed circa 2000, along
with Friendster, which was developed in competition with the then-successful online
dating site Match.com (Cohen, 2003). Based on the premise that friends of friends were
more likely to be a compatible romantic match than strangers, Friendster quickly grew to
300,00 users by May 2003 with the help of WOM (O’Shea, 2003). With the growth of
high-speed internet availability and access came popular networking sites such as
MySpace (2003) and Facebook (2004), both of which played crucial roles in coining the
term “social media” (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

The origins of social media, however, are based on that of the researchers’
definitions of the term itself. For example, boyd and Ellison (2007), by their definition,
claim that SixDegrees.com, which launched in 1997, was the first “social network site,”
as it allowed users to create a profile, and obtain and browse a network of online friends,
acquaintances, and connection on one site.

Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) argue that social media combine the ideas behind
both media and social processes, so what define and categorize social media as such are
the online features they provide their users that allow them to engage with other users of
the same media or platform. Therefore, they define social media as “a group of Internet-
based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0
and that allow the creation and exchange of User Generated Content (UGC)” (Kaplan &
Various genres exist within social media. For this study, we focus on Facebook, which is categorized as a social networking site (SNS). Therefore, it is also necessary to provide a definition of SNSs and what constitutes a social medium as such. In 2007, boyd and Ellison provided their definition of SNSs as:

“web-based services that allow individuals to (1) construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system” (boyd & Ellison, 2007).

While the authors note that this definition served a need in distinguishing SNSs from other forms of social media, they later acknowledged that the rapid evolution of SNSs and the features that define them have and will continue to present a challenge in defining what constitutes a social networking site. In addressing these rising challenges, the authors presented this updated definition in 2011:

“A social network site is a networked communication platform in which participants 1) have uniquely identifiable profiles that consist of user-supplied content, content provided by other users, and/or system-level data; 2) can publicly articulate connections that can be viewed and traversed by others; and 3) can consume, produce, and/or interact with streams of user-generated content provided by their connections on the site” (Ellison & Boyd, Sociality Through Social Network Sites, 2011).
In providing this “definition 2.0,” they also point out that while some defining features have lessened in significance, others such as the Facebook “News Feed” have actually become prominent features of SNS use.

2.2 Facebook

Perhaps the most prominent and sustaining social media platform in current society is Facebook. As previously mentioned, Facebook currently hosts over 800 million daily active users. Facebook also notes on Facebook.com that, as of June 30, 2014, 81.7% of their daily active users were outside the United States and Canada – a testimony to their immense global growth and popularity (Facebook.com, 2014).

Founded in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg as an online network limited to Harvard students, Facebook’s mission is to “give people the power to share and make the world more open and connected. People use Facebook to stay connected with friends and family, to discover what’s going on in the world, and to share and express what matters to them” (Facebook.com, 2014). Facebook gives its users the ability to share photos, connect with friends and other users or find those with mutual acquaintances, message and chat instantly with other users, host a Profile page, and share information with their networks through the Facebook “status update.”

The core features of Facebook include the News Feed, which includes an updated feed of their network’s status updates in real time, and the Profile page, which allows users to share selected personal information about themselves with other users through various privacy settings. By 2011, the site had added additional features such as photo and video sharing, and more relevant to the topic of this study, pages.
Pages are brand profiles administered by companies, brands, public figures, musicians, and artists, allowing them to connect with the Facebook community. When a user Likes a Facebook page, updates and shared information from the brand’s page will show up on the user’s News Feed. With these capabilities, in addition to Facebook’s vast accommodation to mobile use through the development of multiple mobile applications, it is no surprise that a large number of brands take advantage of Facebook pages. More than 700,000 active pages had been created by 2010.

2.3 Facebook Use

According to the social networking site, in September 2014, Facebook averaged 864 million daily active users, with 703 million mobile daily active users. As of the end of that same month, the site was boasting 1.35 billion monthly users and 1.12 mobile; 82% of Facebook’s users are located outside of the United States and Canada (Facebook, 2014).

With such a high user rate, many researchers identified a need to understand trends and patterns amongst users. Wells and Link (2014) recently compared usage amongst various social media and found that Facebook measured the highest usage at 49.9%. Additionally, the researchers looked at other characteristics that could be linked to usage patterns. In their analysis of demographical and behavioral data, Wells and Link found that Facebook usage was highest among females, teens, whites, and adults with at least a high school diploma, where the likelihood of usage was found to generally increase with educational attainment.
Similar results were found by Valenzuela, Park and Kee (2009), who explored potential links between college students’ use of Facebook and their bridging social capital. In addition to consistent findings that female students were more likely to use Facebook than males, they also found that younger students were also heavier users of Facebook than older cohorts of the study, and that the intensity of use was positively correlated with life satisfaction and social trust (Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009).

Similar studies delved deeper into the apparent link between Facebook use and feelings or satisfactions of social influence. One such study examined the extent, if any, to which the contributions made by others to one’s Profile (through comments, photos, etc.) produce an effect observers’ impressions and evaluations of the profile maker (Walther, Van Der Heide, Kim, Westerman, & Tong, 2008). The study’s findings suggested that “other-generated” descriptions are seen as more truthful to observers that those generated by the Profile maker. All of these findings shared important implications for marketers who have adopted Facebook as part of their branding and marketing strategies, as the results provide significant information on the patterns and trends in Facebook use that could be helpful to marketers in understanding what audiences are using Facebook.

2.4 Marketing on Facebook Using Brand Pages

Several studies have documented the increasing adoption of social media by marketing practitioners and brand managers. A 2010 HRFocus report asked respondents to discuss how they are using various forms of social media to market their business through the Web, in which most indicated that they believe that in order to keep up with
other competitors in their market, they must be active with at least one online social platform (HRFocus, 2010).

The adoption rate of Facebook by marketing practitioners has grown exponentially since the addition of pages in late 2007. Since then, Facebook has catered to the marketing needs of businesses by offering additional opportunities to reach the millions of consumers active on the site through paid advertising strategies, such as Ads, where a business can pay for multiple advertisements that target specific users according to their stated goals, and Boost, which allows page managers to place specific posts to their page higher on News Feeds to increase their reach. Facebook even has a web page dedicated to the success stories of various businesses that have benefited from hosting a page and utilizing the site’s advertising features.

Much of the recent research in this arena has focused on developing suggestions for marketing practitioners to use social media more effectively as part of their overall marketing strategies. deVries, et.al. (2012) provide managerial implications on how page managers can increase Likes and comments based on post content and placement, as they found that the Likes and comments generated by followers on a brand post are forms of WOM, visible opinions of the brand that might affect others’ evaluation of the brand.

A Harvard Business Review article also provided its suggestions for why even the CEOs of a business should adopt a “personal social media strategy” (Dutta, 2010). The author provides three reasons as to why a CEO might consider maintaining a personal Profile page: first, to build a personal brand to help users feel more connected to the brand; second, to engage with their consumers rapidly and simultaneously in a transparent and direct way; and third, to take advantage of the opportunity to learn from
the instant information and feedback provided by consumers about their brand. While still they still provide contributions to the field in providing suggested strategies and marketing initiatives within social media use, what these articles lack are empirical data that prove that these suggestions will work. To bridge that gap, many researchers have attempted to gather data on consumers. The following section presents some of this recent research.

2.5 Consumer Research

In attempting to understand how to fulfill the needs of their online consumers, researchers have also looked at why people use social media in the first place. In doing so, the subject of social identification is often addressed. Kim, Han, and Park (2001) note that social identification is defined in social psychology as the phenomenon in which an individual uses various factors to identify him/herself as a member of a society. The authors further explain that “many people are likely to express themselves and/or enhance themselves by selecting particular brands. The degree to which the brand expresses and enhances their identity is determined by their level of brand identification.”

Other important research relevant to this study has looked at the various factors of online relationship behaviors and social media use by consumers. Collectively, a number of researchers have contributed four specific reasons or purposes that users have in deciding to participate in social media:

i. To feel socially connected. Sarason, 1974 as cited in (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media?, 2013)
ii. To fulfill the need to be recognized as associated with certain groups or symbols. Elliott & Wattanasuwan, 1998 as cited in (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media?, 2013).

iii. To fulfill a need of belonging. Gangadharbhatla, 2008 and Tardini & Cantoni, 2005 as cited in (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media?, 2013).

iv. Desire for social interaction. Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, & Gremier, 2004 as cited in (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media?, 2013).

Studies that have focused specifically on motivations for Facebook use have produced findings that support the research on general social media use and motivations. Ellison, Steinfeld, and Lampe (2007) contributed to identifying intensity of use by conducting a series of studies that looked at Facebook users within a college campus. They created a Facebook intensity scale that measured the use of Facebook among the participants, while helped them to identify positive interactions between intensity of Facebook use and self-esteem and satisfaction with campus life when bridging social capital, which allows users to draw upon resources within their social network. A follow-up study by the same researchers further suggests that through its features, Facebook provides the technological support necessary for social interactions, including “Wall” posts, “pokes,” and messaging functions between users, as well as facilitates offline
communication by providing traditional contact information on a user’s profile that would allow another user to contact them by phone, for example (Steinfeld, Ellison, & Lampe, 2008). Therefore, the studies suggest that increased Facebook and SNS use is positively correlated with motivations to bridge social capital, and contributes other unique affordances for those with low self-esteem or low satisfaction with life.

Much of the recent consumer research in this field has also looked at word-of-mouth marketing, or WOM, as an important factor of online marketing research. Kietzmann et.al. describe corporate communication as having been “democratized,” with its control no longer belonging to the corporations, but to consumers through online communities, blogs, and the content-sharing capabilities upon which social media are based (Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, & Silvestre, 2011, p. 242). Facebook, for example, promotes engagement between its users in the form of posts, comments, and even “Likes.” Rather than the one-way output of information accomplished by traditional media, social media promotes multi-way conversation amongst and between users.

Furthermore, Mangold and Faulds (2009) compared and contrasted new and traditional media marketing, noting that social media is more a hybrid element because while in a traditional sense, companies are still given the ability to converse with their customers, while in a nontraditional sense, through social media, customers are also able, and encouraged, to have direct conversations with each other about a brand or product.

However, this aspect of social media has proven to be both beneficial and disadvantageous to marketers. Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), for example, pointed out how Amazon.com faced public criticisms from consumers through online reviews and
commentary in regards to their pricing system, deemed by the online community as “unfair.” Marketers, therefore, must be knowledgeable not only in the various features of social media, but also how to best use them to their advantage in influencing the consumer conversations that occur online.

There is no question among researchers that content posted on Facebook can affect the perceptions of its users. In 2014, Facebook manipulated content to study consumers, disclosing that during one week in January of 2012, the SNS allowed researchers to modify the News Feeds of 689,000 users to be either more positive or negative in order to study how these changes might have affected their moods (Associated Press, 2014). It is no wonder why brands have begun to direct their attentions toward strategizing content with the purpose of strengthening relationships between brands and their consumers.

The findings of these studies in the field of consumer research speak more generally to reasons why people use Facebook as a networking community. However, as previously mentioned, many of these users also choose to follow, or Like, brands on Facebook, which one could argue, is another function or factor of SNS use. This study focuses specifically on intentions for that particular use of Facebook, so a review of the development in this area of research follows.

2.6 Intentions to Like a Brand on Facebook

Recent research has focused specifically on the Facebook Fan, or an individual that Likes a brand’s Facebook Page. Poyry, Parvinen, and Malmivaara (2013) noted that Facebook fans have either hedonic (playful, or “for fun”) or utilitarian (for incentives or
information) motivations for using Facebook and examined the relationships between each type of use and participating or browsing on Facebook brand pages. Their findings revealed a strong relationship between hedonic motivations and participation, and a weaker one between those motivations and browsing. However, browsing had a stronger relationship with purchasing intentions than did participation, indicating that hedonic users joined brand pages more for the community aspect and engagement with other fans, with no real attachment or loyalty to the brand itself (Poyry, Parvinen, & Malmivaara, 2013).

Another study interestingly concluded that consumers who Like Facebook brand pages do not necessarily love the brands they follow on Facebook, but rather are, “polygamously loyal to a small group of offerings” in each category of Facebook pages in the study (Nelson-Field & Taylor, 2012, p. 4). This conclusion comes from the authors’ findings that of the responses they received, less that a half percent (0.5%) of fans engaged with the brands they followed in any given week. Furthermore, their findings also showed no significant relationships between category types or brand popularity and degree of engagement among fans.

Similarly, Bushelow (2013) more recently aimed to find out if Liking or interacting with a brand on Facebook acted as a predictor to brand loyalty or purchase intention. Her findings also produced interesting conclusions. When asked if they considered themselves to be brand loyal, connected to the pages they follow, or if being a member of the brand’s online community made them more likely to purchase from the products or services from that brand, the majority of respondents reported that they strongly disagreed with all three statements (Bushelow, 2013). However, when questions
about their motivations to Like the brand to begin with, 56% responded that they were motivated by love for the brand and/or being a brand loyal user. Other factors assessed included whether or not the amount of time spent on the page had any relationship with purchase intention, which also produce no conclusive findings.

While many have attempted to look at the various dimensions of page Likes and what they translate to in terms of value for brands who market themselves on Facebook, there is not enough consistency in the findings of recent research to develop a conclusive answer that can be generalized about online consumers. Thus, it is important to acknowledge that there exist different types of Facebook fans, as the study of Poyry, et.al. did in dividing users into two groups based on their motivations for Facebook use. The following subsection addresses this challenge even more specifically by creating typologies for Facebook fans based on their motivations to follow a brand on Facebook.

2.6.1 Typology of Facebook Fans

The findings of one particular study developed a typology of Facebook Fans, identifying four types of Facebook Fans: “Fan”-atics, Self-Expressive, Utilitarians, and Authentics – each having a defining set of user characteristics (Wallace, Buil, de Chernatony, & Hogan, 2004).

“Fan”-atics, as the first group is labeled by the authors, are classified as being highly engaged with the brand not through Facebook, but offline as well. They also contribute to greater WOM for the brand because they tend to have greater brand loyalty and brand love for the brands they Like when compared to the other three typologies. The defining characteristics for this group, however, are their uses for Facebook, which
include 1) as a source of information, 2) as a means to connect with a specific social group, and 3) as a tool for creating a desired image. Because this group already scores very high in brand loyalty and engagement with brands they like, measures for this type of user were omitted to focus more heavily on types of users who are not as skewed to one end of the brand loyalty spectrum.

Then second typology, Utilitarians, are labeled as such because their reason for Liking a brand is to gain incentives, having no real brand connection, and therefore, lower levels of brand love and brand loyalty compared to others. Their lack of connection with the brand might also explain why those in the Utilitarian typology are the least likely to find the brands they Like to be self-expressive, and also have little interest in offering and/or eliciting opinions of the brand to and from other users. For Utilitarians, there is little value in the brand as a tool to create any identity.

Self-Expressives, the third typology identified in the study, were found to Like a particular brand for the purpose of making an impression on others. In other words, Self-Expressives tend to Like brands that reflect the social self. Self-Expressives also desire to create an image of themselves through Liking a brand. Self-Expressives only claim to have a genuine interest in the brand, when their main motivation for Liking is really to create a desired image of themselves to others.

Authentics, the final typology, are classified as users whose Likes are genuine and are not concerned with image creation. Of the four typologies, Authentics have the highest levels of brand loyalty and love and exhibit a positive relationship with the brands they Like. This group connects with the brands more frequently and with increased levels of intimacy, as they have a genuine liking for the brand both on- and offline. As
the authors note, for Authentics, “Facebook is an online extension of their offline social group, and their Likes on Facebook reflect their brand relationships in an offline environment.”

In sum, “intentions for Liking a Facebook page” refers to the reasons why an individual might consider Liking a Facebook page. These concepts are defined for each the typologies discussed. The researchers identified the specific reasons for each group in respect to why they Like a brand’s Facebook page. Three of these constructs were used to develop the survey item for the current research and are defined in Chapter 4 and in Appendix A.

While this is a great contribution to the field of social media marketing, the authors suggest that using this information on user types and intentions to further understand how marketers should be connecting with their online followers is equally as crucial. They suggest further research in analyzing the timeframe within which Facebook Fans continue to Like a brand in comparison to the motivations associated with their identified user type. Their study has also presented the inquiry as to what motivations or intentions might exist for a specific user type to stop Liking the brand.

2.7 Intentions to Unlike a Brand on Facebook

There has been very little research on intentions to Unlike a brand on Facebook as of yet. This study hopes to begin that necessary discussion. However, there has been research conducted on Unfriending, or removing a contact from your friends list on Facebook, and one could argue that the action of Unfriending is somewhat synonymous with that of Unliking a page, as both signify the termination of an online relationship.
For example, unfriending someone implies the rejection of a connection with another user, no longer giving them access to your profile or updates and vice versa (Peña & Brody, 2014). For that reason, this section of the literature review will look at the available research surrounding the topic of Unfriending as it related to the current study.

Peña and Brody (2014) more recently examined statistics in unfriending, finding that 63% of SNS users have unfriended someone from their contact list, but more importantly, aimed to examine what factors led to the act of unfriending or hiding updates from a particular connection on Facebook (Peña & Brody, 2014). They look particularly at two variables: perceptions of sender attractiveness and status updates, finding that users would rather hide updates from another user rather than unfriend them altogether, as unfriending was considered more extreme. They also found that individuals believed that they would be perceived more favorably by others if they had socially or physically attractive online connections, and were less likely to unfriend or hide updates from “attractive” friends. This study provides a number of significant implications that can be applied to the research structure of the current study. For one, Peña and Brody confirm that there exist various dimensions of online relationship termination – hiding and unfriending, each suggesting different levels of extremity in one’s decision to discontinue an online relationship (unfriending is much less easily undone as both parties must go through the friending process of requesting/accepting the connection again). Secondly, the authors also note that that social capital – in this case, having “attractive” connections – plays an important role in one’s decision to discontinue the relationship. Can the same be said when investigating intentions to unlike a brand? Do these levels of extremity apply to consumers’ decisions or intentions to unlike a brand?
page, and does the “attractiveness” or popularity of a brand affect unliking intentions? Perhaps consumers may not be as hesitant to unlike a page as they are to unfriend a connection since the offline relationship may have lesser or no consequences pertaining to their personal relationship with the brand. Or perhaps the user would continue to like a brand page regardless of any intention to purchase or refer, or lack thereof, if the brand adds to their social capital. In any case, it is important to recognize that decisions and intentions of users to terminate online relationships is anything but simple, as indicated by Peña and Brody’s findings.

Another study outlined the various constructs of online dyads that might affect the probability that the relationship, or tie, will break (Quercia, Bodaghi, & Crowcroft, 2012). Embeddedness, homophily, and personality were examined in aiming to determined what factors of each were most likely to result in a Facebook connection that had less probability to break. Their findings showed that more socially embedded relationships (ones with more common friends between the dyad), greater homophily (or “love of the same”), and personalities with high extraversion and low neuroticism resulted in ties less likely to break. This study also presents interesting constructs that could potentially be applied when studying consumers’ ties with brand they like on Facebook and whether or not these same findings are true when considering Facebook Fans and their relationships with a particular brand.

Similar to the study that defined the typologies of Facebook Fans, Sibona (2014) looked at the types of users that get unfriended, showing that high school friends and work-relate acquaintances were the most common among those unfriended (Sibona, Unfriending on Facebook: Context Collapse and Unfriending Behaviors, 2014). Similar
research would be helpful in finding out what types of brands are more likely to be
unliked, but for now, the development of Facebook Fan typologies will have to suffice.

Prior to that research, Sibona and Walczak (2011) found that the top three reasons
for why users unfriend others for online reasons (i.e. pertaining to the content they post or
their use of social media) included posting too frequently about 1) unimportant, 2)
inappropriate, or 3) frequent content. Other online types of content analyzed included
politics, religion and job-related posts, which were closer to the top of the list than
celebrities and sports score posts. These post types were also categorized into six larger
constructs: 1) everyday life, 2) unimportant/frequent, 3) polarizing, 4) inappropriate, 5)
behavior and 6) change. Those who responded that they unfriended for offline reasons
showed much higher levels of disagreement with the person’s behavior or significant
change to the overall relationship (Sibona & Walczak, Unfriending on Facebook: Friend
Request and Online/Offline Behavior Analysis). Their findings conclude that those who
terminate online relationships for online reasons are willing to terminate relationships
with much lower levels of disagreement. This presents another perspective with which
the current study can be approached. To what extent would the frequency of certain
types of posts affect the intentions of a Facebook fan to unlike a brand page, given that
both the online and offline relationships between the consumer and the brand may differ
in strength when compared to one between two Facebook friends.

Of the limited research related to Unliking, one that attempted to provide
contributions to retaining page Likes noted that, although broad, there exist “tendencies
and patterns of activity that define the phenomena of unliking” (Hackett, Fletcher, &
Heinze, 2013). During the study, the authors noted that the sources of Unlikes that were
counted came from either one of three sources: ‘‘natural’’ erosion of the ‘Page likes at the start of the study,’ are a negative reactions by previous fans to a new campaign or are the immediate counter-response of unliking after being ‘New likes during study’ (Hackett, Fletcher, & Heinze, 2013, p. 5). They do note, however, that studying Unliking behavior on Facebook is difficult without the consent of each user, and the act of Unliking in itself is a rare behavior. Still, their findings contribute greatly in beginning to understand why Facebook users may choose to discontinue their relationship with a brand by clicking “Unlike” on the brand’s page.

Collectively, the research presented in this section all indicate that there are definite indicators for intentions or motivation to terminate online relationships, which essentially, is what a consumer is doing when choosing to unlike a Facebook brand page.

2.8 Dimensions of Brand Loyalty

The focus on online relationships between brands and consumers has also led to extensive research on the effect social media may or may not have on brand loyalty. Brand loyalty has been previously defined as “the strength of the relationship between an individual’s relative attitude and repeat patronage” (Dick & Basu, 1994, p. 99). With social media as a platform developed around establishing and maintaining relationships that has become increasingly used by brands for reaching their audiences, it is obvious why many researchers have chosen to delve deeper into the finding out what effects social media might have on brand loyalty.

Social media marketing is different from traditional marketing and should be treated as such, requiring a different strategy and approach (Erdogmus & Cicek, 2012).
This might explain why many researchers have argued that marketing on social media is heavily tied to relationship marketing, with a greater focus on making connections than on trying to sell a service or product, as Gordhamer noted in 2009 (as noted in Erdogmus & Cicek, 2012). Rather than trying to control a brand image, social media marketing is more genuine in its attempt to relate to their followers by showing consumers what the brand is (Erdogmus & Cicek, 2012). Establishing a brand personality creates a relationship between the consumer and the brand. “When there is a fit between brand personality and a consumer’s self-expression, the consumer may consider the brand as a person, or even a companion… Sometimes, the human characteristics attached to a certain brand are used to express one’s own image or personality” (Kim, Han, & Park, 2001, p. 196). However, it is also important to note that the customer-brand relationship is not the only one that exists. Multiple relationships are developed and maintained that influence the success of the brand. In addition to the customer-brand relationship, one should also consider the customer-product, customer-company, and customer-customer relationships that all remain present when examining relationship marketing on social media.

Laroche, Habibi, & Richard (2012) found that social media-based brand communities positively affect brand loyalty. Furthermore, in a separate study, the researchers also found that these online brand communities also increased brand trust, a dimension of brand loyalty (Laroche, Habibi, Richard, & Sankaranarayanan, 2012).
2.8.1 Brand Trust and Brand Credibility

Brand trust has been defined as “the willingness of the average consumer to rely on the ability of the brand to perform its stated function” (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001, p.82). In other words, brand trust is synonymous with the amount a perceived credibility a brand carries with a customer. Sweeney and Swait (2008) explored this concept in looking at what role brands play in customer retention. In explaining that a brand embodies the credibility, or trustworthiness, of the company it represents, the researchers hypothesized that brand credibility has a positive effect on a customer’s commitment to the brand itself. In proving their hypothesis, they also found that brand credibility impacted customer satisfaction levels and loyalty, therefore proving a positive relationship between brand trust and brand loyalty (Sweeney & Swait, 2008).

Laroche, et.al. (2013) focused on the mechanisms of relationship enhancement between customers and various elements and its effects on brand trust. Their findings, as mentioned in relation to brand loyalty, showed that the customer/product, customer/brand, customer/company, and customer/other customer relationships all have direct positive effects on brand trust (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, 2013). Furthermore, the researchers’ findings also supported the hypothesis that brand trust, therefore, has a positive influence on brand loyalty (Laroche, Habibi, Richard, & Sankaranarayanan, 2012). Through their research, they were able to find that the relationship of brand trust and brand loyalty is both positive and significant, whereas brand trust mediates the effect of customer/product, customer/brand, customer/company, and customer/other customer relationships on brand loyalty. In doing so, the researchers also developed a model to help fill the gap between criticisms of brands’ social media use as interrupting an online
space for friends and support for social media as a beneficial platform for businesses in reaching consumers. The constructs used to measure brand trust in the current study was derived from their research model.

**Summary**

In summary, recent research has looked at the various factors involved in the process on online marketing, specifically in hosting a brand page on Facebook. Studies that have attempted to define relationships between user behaviors and purchase intention or brand loyalty have been inconclusive, and there remains a lack of research that provide real implications for helping brand managers understand the dimensions of the Facebook fan and their intentions to follow, or unfollow, their brand. While Wallace, et.al. (2004) provide solid foundations, starting from the core of these dimensions in defining Facebook fan types, this study hopes to begin to fill the gap between their findings and the others reviewed in this chapter. It is first important to understand what users hope to attain by clicking Like, i.e. what purpose should a Facebook page serve for its fans?

Examining the literature presented in this chapter, one could hypothesize that since the various relationships among brand and consumer positively affect brand trust, and therefore, brand loyalty (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, 2013), that a user’s level of brand trust and/or loyalty might also be reflected in one’s intention to maintain the relationship with the brand online by Liking. In other words, those who score high in brand loyalty might be more inclined to Like a page for more reasons than a use that score lower in brand trust and/or loyalty. Keeping in mind the various typologies established by Wallace, et.al. (2004), one might also hypothesize that greater intention to
Like means greater brand loyalty, and therefore, less inclination or motivations to Unlike the brand page. By aiming to identify a fan’s intentions in Liking a brand on Facebook, this study also hopes, then, to what might affect a fan’s intentions to Unlike the brand, and how the dimensions of brand loyalty might affect those intentions, if at all.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In order to address the objectives of this study in determining the relationship between the dimensions of brand loyalty and intentions to Like or Unlike a brand’s Facebook page, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1a: How is brand loyalty associated with a user’s intentions to Like a brand page?

RQ1b. How is brand trust associated with a user’s intentions to Like a brand page?

RQ2a: Alternatively, how is brand loyalty associated with a user’s intentions to Unlike a brand page?

RQ2b. How is brand trust associated with a user’s intentions to Unlike a brand page?
Chapter 4

METHODOLOGY

The method of research used to obtain the data was an online questionnaire. This chapter will discuss the sample of participants in the study, the questionnaire administered, and the method of data analysis and measurement used.

The Sample

The sample was a nonrandom, convenience sample that consisted of adults who were users of the social networking site Facebook. Restrictions of the sample also limited participation to users over the age of 18. The survey was distributed via Facebook in order to target users of the site, and was also offered as extra credit to students at the University of Hawaii at Manoa in the School of Communications at the discretion of teaching assistants and course instructors. In either case, members of the sample were provided a link that directed them to the questionnaire. The online survey host used to administer the survey was Qualtrics.com.

The study collected a sample of 254 respondents. Ages of the respondents ranged between 18 and 67, with a mean age of 29. Respondents ages 39 and above were underrepresented. Of the 254 respondents, 61 did not indicate their age. Of the 254 respondents, 67 (26.4%) identified as male, 130 (51.2%) identified as female, and 57 (22.4%) did not respond, or identify as either male or female. Out of 254 respondents, 87 (34.3%) identified themselves as a student, whereas 109 (42.9%) responded “No” to the survey item asking, “Are you a student?”. 58 respondents (22.8%) did not respond to this
survey item. In the demographic category of race/ethnicity, 36% of the respondents identified as Non-Hispanic White. The remaining 64% identified as Non-White.

*The Questionnaire*

The questionnaire consisted of 60 survey items. Items were organized by page into categories to measure the constructs of brand trust (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, 2013), brand loyalty (Laroche, Habibi, Richard, & Sankaranarayanan, 2012), intentions to Like a Facebook page (Wallace, Buil, de Chernatony, and Hogan, 2004), and intentions to Unlike a Facebook page (Sibona & Walczak, 2011). Demographical questions and items measuring Facebook use and intensity of use (Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2007) were also included in order to provide insight on trends or similarities in Facebook use and intensity among the general sample.

Wallace, Buil, de Chernatony, and Hogan (2004), as previously mentioned in Chapter 2, established a typology of Facebook users, categorizing them into four different categories, each with their own patterns of usage. These typologies were then characterized by their unique motivations for Liking a Facebook page, which was determined using a series of questions. Measures from this survey were used in order to determine the respondents’ Facebook user type to examine relationships between specific user types and intentions to Like brand pages on Facebook and are defined in Appendix A. The aforementioned constructs derived from Sibona and Walczak (2011) were used in this study to measure intentions to Unlike a brand page on Facebook and are further defined in Appendix B.
The questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data, and was administered to the sample within a 2-week period from January 28, 2015 to February 10, 2015. Refer to Appendix C to review the survey items of the administered questionnaire.

Measures

**Brand Loyalty.** Brand loyalty was measured using three items from Laroche, et.al. (2012) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): I consider myself to be loyal to the brands I like; if the brands are not available at the store, I would buy the same brands from some other store; I am willing to pay more for the brands I like. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 3.81$, $SD = .66$, $\alpha = .660$).

**Brand Trust.** Brand loyalty was measured using eight items from Laroche, et.al. (2013) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): the brands I like give me everything I expect out of the brand; I rely on the brands I like; the brands I like never disappoint me; the brands I like deliver what they promise; I believe the claims made by the brands I like regarding their products and/or services; the brands I like have names you can trust; the brand I like don’t pretend to be something they aren’t; the brands I like are at the forefront of using technology to deliver a better service. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 3.60$, $SD = .56$, $\alpha = .825$).

**Liking for Authentic Reasons.** Liking for authentic reasons was measured using three items from Wallace, et.al. (2004) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): I really want to know more about the brands I like; having updates from the brands I like on my news feed keeps me up to date; the news feeds from the brands I like are useful to
me in the short term. These items were combined to form a single measure (\(M = 10.04, SD = 2.60, \alpha = .808\)).

**Liking for Self-Expressive Reasons.** Liking for self-expressive reasons was measured using three items from Wallace, et.al. (2004) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): my friends likes the brand; liking the brands showed off my taste to other people; having updates from the brands I like on my news feed made my Facebook page look good. These items were combined to form a single measure (\(M = 8.91, SD = 2.10, \alpha = .583\)).

**Liking for Incentive Reasons.** Liking for incentive reasons was measured using four items from Wallace, et.al. (2004) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): I received a discount for clicking “Like”; my friend asked me to like the brands; I entered a competition by clicking “Like”; there was a campaign to reach a target number of “Likes.” These items were combined to form a single measure (\(M = 9.89, SD = 2.97, \alpha = .598\)).

**Everyday Life.** Everyday life was measured using eight items from Sibona and Walczak (2011) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Exercise too frequently; I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Purchases too frequently; I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Eating too frequently; I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Money too frequently; I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Celebrities too frequently; I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Sports scores too frequently; I would Unlike a brand if they posted more often than I’d like (too
frequently); I would Unlike a brand if they posted Unimportant content too frequently. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 26.72$, $SD = 6.24$, $\alpha = .868$).

**Inappropriate.** Inappropriate was measured using six items from Sibona and Walczak (2011) ($1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree$): I would unlike this brand if they posted sexist content too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they posted inappropriate content too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they posted content about sex too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they use swear words too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they posted racist content too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they posted unflattering content too frequently. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 23.63$, $SD = 4.564$, $\alpha = .859$).

**Displeasure.** Displeasure was measured using four items from Sibona and Walczak (2011) ($1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree$): I would unlike this brand if they betrayed me; I would unlike this brand if I did not trust them; I would unlike this brand if they were incompatible with my interests; I would unlike this brand if I developed dislike for the brand. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 16.99$, $SD = 2.33$, $\alpha = .749$).

**Inappropriate.** Inappropriate was measured using six items from Sibona and Walczak (2011) ($1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree$): I would unlike this brand if they posted sexist content too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they posted inappropriate content too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they posted content about sex too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they used swear words too frequently; I would unlike this brand if they posted racist content too frequently; I would unlike this
brand if they posted unflattering content too frequently. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 23.63, SD = 4.56, \alpha = .859$).

**Change.** Change was measured using two items from Sibona and Walczak (2011) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): I would unlike this brand if they started posting new information from what they usually post about; I would unlike this brand if they changed geographic distance or location. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 5.43, SD = 1.55, \alpha = .631$).

**Behavior.** Behavior was measured using two items from Sibona and Walczak (2011) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): I would unlike this brand if they had a change in behavior; I would unlike this brand if I disagreed with their personality. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 7.48, SD = 1.50, \alpha = .648$).

**Polarizing.** Polarizing was measured using two items from Sibona and Walczak (2011) (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*): I would unlike this brand if they posted content that did not match my political views; I would unlike this brand if they posted content about religion too frequently. These items were combined to form a single measure ($M = 7.03, SD = 1.86, \alpha = .697$).

**Data Analysis**

Most questionnaire items were measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale and were coded numerically from 1 to 5, with 1 coded as “Strongly Disagree,” 2 being “Disagree,” 3 being “Neutral,” 4 being “Agree,” and 5 being “Strongly Agree,” unless otherwise specified. For example, demographic information such as “Age” required open-ended responses for users to enter their age as a numerical value, “What is your
sex?” was coded with 1 as “Male” and 2 as “Female,” and items measuring time spent on Facebook and annual income provided multiple choice responses in minutes and dollar amounts, respectively.

As previously mentioned, indexes were created using the relevant measures for each construct and reliability analyses were run to determine Cronbach’s alpha for each index. Then, the research questions of the study were analyzed using the indexes for each construct and bivariate correlation analyses to calculate Pearson’s r while simultaneously testing for one-tailed significance.
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RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings of the study. First, the respondents’ characteristics and overall findings about the group of participants are described, followed by an analysis of the research questions of the study.

Sample

In general, the group consisted of heavy users of Facebook. Of the valid responses, 81 (41.1%) of the respondents reported having more than 400 Facebook Friends. The next highest percentiles were significantly lower, with 30 (15.2%) respondents reporting 251-300 Friends in their networks, followed closely by 22 (11.2%) reporting to have between 301 and 400 Facebook Friends. Nearly 25% of respondents reported having spent an average of 10-30 minutes on Facebook each day in the past week, with 22.8% reporting an average of half an hour to one hour. Table 5 shows how the remainder of the sample responded to this item and Figure 3 represents these percentages in a bar chart format, showing little variance between the range of 10-30 minutes and 1-2 hours spent on Facebook daily. Majority of the respondents also Agreed or Strongly Agreed to the statement that Facebook is part of their everyday activity (34% and 30%, respectively).

Reliability Analysis

A reliability analysis was run, creating two indexes: one for Brand Loyalty and one for Brand Trust. The reliability analysis for Brand Loyalty returned a Cronbach’s
alpha for 3 items ($\alpha = .66$). Deleting any of the three items measured in the index would have reduced Cronbach’s alpha.

The reliability test for Brand Trust returned a Cronbach’s alpha for 8 items ($\alpha = .825$). Removing the eighth item (“The brands I like are at the forefront of using technology to deliver a better service”) would have increased the Cronbach’s alpha for the index to .827. However, with that small a variance, the item was left in since it was only one of two items that contributed to measuring credibility as a dimension of Brand Trust.

**Factor Analysis**

A Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was run to categorize each variable into combined indexes for data reduction. Two variables from the questionnaire were dropped from the analysis and not included since the PCA showed that these two items did not show significance with any of the indexes. These two variables were “I would Unlike a brand if they Did a Misdeed” and “I would Unlike a brand if they Broke a Rule.” The remaining variables showed significant correlation with other variables of the same index and therefore remained in the study’s data analysis. Table 1 shows the PCA for variables contributing to the indexes pertaining to intentions to Like a brand and Table 2 shows the PCA for variables contributing to the indexes defined for intentions to Unlike a brand.

As anticipated, the PCA resulted in the emergence of three factors for intentions to Like a brand page and six factors for intentions to Unlike a brand page. As such, the items loading on the three factors for intentions to Like a brand page were combined to
form three indexes (i.e. Intentions to Like a brand for Authentic Reasons, Intentions to Like a brand for Self-Expressive Reasons, and Intentions to Like a brand for Incentive Reasons) and the items loading on the six factors for intentions to Unlike a brand page were combined to form six indexes (i.e. Everyday Life, Inappropriate, Displeasure, Change, Behavior, and Polarizing). The items loading on their respective factors are indicated in bold font on Table 1.
Table 1. PCA for Intentions to Like a Brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intentions to Like a brand for</th>
<th>Indexes</th>
<th>Intentions to Like a brand for</th>
<th>Indexes</th>
<th>Intentions to Like a brand for</th>
<th>Indexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authentic Reasons</td>
<td>Incentive Reasons</td>
<td>Self-Expressive Reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having updates from the brands I like on my news feed keep me up to date.</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The news feeds from the brands I like are useful to me.</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really want to know more about the brands I like.</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a campaign to reach a target number of &quot;Likes.&quot;</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I entered a competition by Liking the brand(s).</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>-.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friend asked me to like the brands.</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received a discount for Liking the brand(s).</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking the brands showed off my taste to other people.</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friends liked the brands.</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having updates from the brands I like on my news feed made my Facebook page look good.</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. PCA for Intentions to Unlike a Brand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Everyday Life</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Displeasure</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Polarizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Eating too frequently.</td>
<td><strong>.835</strong></td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Money too frequently.</td>
<td><strong>.826</strong></td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Purchases too frequently.</td>
<td><strong>.811</strong></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Celebrities too frequently.</td>
<td><strong>.791</strong></td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted more often than I'd like (too Frequently).</td>
<td><strong>.632</strong></td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Sports scores too frequently.</td>
<td><strong>.620</strong></td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Exercise too frequently.</td>
<td><strong>.619</strong></td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted Unimportant content too frequently.</td>
<td><strong>.558</strong></td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted Sextist content too frequently.</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td><strong>.795</strong></td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted Inappropriate content too frequently.</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td><strong>.748</strong></td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Sex too frequently.</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td><strong>.743</strong></td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they used Swear words too frequently.</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td><strong>.719</strong></td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted Racist content too frequently.</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td><strong>.711</strong></td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they posted Unflattering content too frequently.</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td><strong>.673</strong></td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would Unlike a brand if they Did misdeed.*</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As depicted in Table 2, six indexes were derived, as expected. However, unexpectedley, the construct for Unimportant/Frequent was not isolated as one of the six identified indexes. The two items originally intended to measure motivations pertaining to Unimportant/Frequent content computed more significantly with factors in the construct for Everyday Life and are, therefore, apart of the index of Everyday Life. Additionally, a new construct, labeled as Displeasure, isolated four factors that were previously under the construct for Behavior. These four factors (Betrayed, Trust,
Incompatible, and Dislike) more closely identified with one another in terms of a brand creating feelings of displeasure among the user and were therefore isolated under a new construct, labeled appropriately as Displeasure.

Correlations

Bivariate correlation analyses were run to examine any existing relationships between Brand Loyalty and the three identified indexes for intentions to Like a brand page on Facebook (Table 3) and Brand Trust and the indexes for intentions to Like a brand page on Facebook (Table 4). Then, bivariate correlation analyses were run to test the relationship between Brand Loyalty and the indexes for intentions to Unlike a brand page on Facebook (Table 5), and between Brand Trust and the identified indexes for intentions to Unlike a brand page on Facebook (Table 6). The results of the bivariate correlation analysis show a positive and significant relationship between brand loyalty and intentions to Like a brand’s Facebook Page for authentic reasons, $r(206) = .231, p < .01$, which included the following items:

- “I really want to know more about the brands I like.”
- “Having updates from the brands I like on my news feed keep me up to date.”
- “The news feeds from the brands I like are useful to me.”

A statistically significant positive relationship was similarly found between brand trust and the same intentions of liking for Authentic and Self-Expressive reasons, $r(206) = .751, p < .01$. 
In examining the correlation between brand loyalty and intentions to unlike, a negative significant relationship between brand loyalty and intentions to unlike a brand for posting Polarizing content more often than preferred was found in the bivariate correlation analysis of these factors, where \( r(200) = -.119, p < .05 \) for the construct of Unliking for Polarizing content. Similarly, a correlation output of \( r(200) = -.147, p < .05 \) was also found to be significant at the 0.05 level in the analysis between brand trust and Unliking for Polarizing content. These results are shown below in Tables 3 through 6.

Table 3. Relationship between Brand Loyalty and Intentions to Like a Brand Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intentions to Like for Authentic Reasons</th>
<th>Intentions to Like for Incentives</th>
<th>Intentions to Like for Self-Expressive Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Pearson’s r</td>
<td>( .231^{**} )</td>
<td>( .017 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>( .000 )</td>
<td>( .405 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).  
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Table 4. Relationship between Brand Trust and Intentions to Like a Brand Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intentions to Like for Authentic Reasons</th>
<th>Intentions to Like for Incentives</th>
<th>Intentions to Like for Self-Expressive Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust</td>
<td>Pearson’s r</td>
<td>( .310^{**} )</td>
<td>( .049 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>( .000 )</td>
<td>( .242 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
Table 5. Relationship between Brand Loyalty and Intentions to Unlike a Brand Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Everyday Life</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Displeasure</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Polarizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Loyalty Pearson’s r</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.119*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Table 6. Relationship between Brand Trust and Intentions to Unlike a Brand Page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Everyday Life</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Displeasure</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Polarizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand Trust Pearson’s r</td>
<td>-.147*</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.152*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).
RQ1a: How is brand loyalty associated with a user’s intentions to Like a brand page?

The results for the bivariate correlation analysis between brand loyalty are shown in Table 3 above, showing a significant correlation between brand loyalty and liking for Authentic reasons.

“Authentics” as described in a study on Facebook typologies (Wallace, Buil, de Chernatony, & Hogan, 2004) were also found to be a user group with higher levels of brand loyalty, so this outcome supports this theory in finding the reverse effect - that users with a higher level of brand loyalty would be more inclined to follow a brand on Facebook for genuine reasons of interest in the brand.

Additionally, the results revealed a positive and significant relationship between brand loyalty and user intentions to like for self-expressive motivations, $r(206) = .130, p < .05$. It could be that higher levels of brand loyalty also imply a positive level of self-identification with the brand among brand loyal users. However, the lesser significance might also imply that “brand loyalty” may be translating more directly into having a genuine interest in the brands’ products or services rather than feelings of identification with the brand itself.

On the other hand, no relationship was identified between brand loyalty and user intentions to like a brand’s page for incentives. This also supports previous research that Facebook Fans who follow a brand for incentives or discounts reflect low levels of brand loyalty (Wallace, Buil, de Chernatony, & Hogan, 2004).
RQ1b: How is brand trust associated with a user’s intentions to Like a brand page?

In examining brand trust as a dimension of brand loyalty, the results of this correlation analysis were similar to that of brand loyalty, whereas significant, positive relationships were found between brand trust and liking intentions for authentic self-expressive reasons, with no relationship found between brand trust and liking intentions for incentive reasons.

In addition, a statistically significant positive relationship was found between brand trust and the same intentions of liking for Authentic and Self-Expressive reasons. As discussed in Chapter 2, brand trust encompasses consumer feelings of credibility and reliability, which can be perceived to be more humanizing qualities of the brand, whereas brand loyalty captures the consumer’s allegiance to purchasing the products or services offered by the brand.

RQ2a: Alternatively, how is brand loyalty associated with a user’s intentions to Unlike a brand page?

In analyzing the relationship between brand loyalty and the various indexes pertaining to intentions to unlike a brand page, only one relationship showed significance. The results showed that as the level of brand loyalty increases, the degree to which a user might be motivated to unlike the brand page for posting polarizing content decreases.

This relationship might imply that the higher the level of loyalty a consumer has for the products and services the brand provides, the least likely they are to be affected by content posted by the brand unrelated to its products or services. Adversely, this would
also imply that lower levels of brand loyalty reflect a negative impact of polarizing content on maintaining online relationships between a brand and its less loyal consumers, who would be more easily persuaded to Unlike a brand.

RQ2b: How is brand trust associated with a user’s intentions to Unlike a brand page?

The relationship between the dimension of brand trust and user intentions to Unlike a brand on Facebook was also examined and two significant correlations were found (as opposed to one significant correlation found in the primary analysis of brand loyalty. In addition to the similar finding that a negative significant relationship exists between brand trust and a user’s intent to unfollow a brand for posting polarizing content too often, the same relationship was found between brand trust and content that categorizes as Everyday Life. In addition to decreased levels of intent to unlike a brand page for posting Polarizing content more than preferred by the consumer, intentions to unlike for frequent content pertaining to Everyday Life (and Unimportant/Frequent content as defined in Chapter 2) also decrease as the amount of brand trust increases. With particular reference to the items of Everyday Life and Polarizing content, it could be implied that content on both ends of the spectrum of sensitivity, i.e. non-polarizing versus polarizing, have the same effect on the user, where non-polarizing content creates disinterest based on lack of sensitivity toward a topic or post, and polarizing content may also result in disinterest as a result of posting content that exhibits a strong bias on a sensitive subject.
Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings of this study are highly indicative of patterns in consumers’ intentions to Like and Unlike brand pages on the social networking site Facebook when attributing them to the users’ level of brand loyalty and brand trust. The findings show significant correlations between the indexes of brand loyalty and brand trust with various factors of liking and unliking that might help brands better their marketing strategies in utilizing Facebook as a platform to develop and/or maintain relationships with consumers, as well as provide preliminary groundwork for future studies of interest in the field of relationship and online marketing.

Contributions and Practical Implications

Respondents for this sample showed high levels of Facebook intensity and use, so the findings for this study are highly relevant for market researchers interested in trends or patterns among Facebook users, especially as Facebook becomes an increasingly popular platform for both consumers and brands to establish relationship among themselves (e.g. consumer-other consumer) and with each other (brand-consumer).

Additionally, the group generally remained neutral on the scale of brand loyalty and brand trust, depicting a sample that could be generalized among the average consumer, not gravitating to one end of the spectrum. Therefore, marketers utilizing Facebook to develop and maintain relationships with online consumers should cater to this group, whereas the findings show that this group is more greatly affected by the type of content posted by the brand on their Facebook page. For example, there is much less
risk in losing followers who score high in brand loyalty when posting Polarizing content. However, the findings also show that there is a significant correlation between this type of content and increased levels of intention to unlike the brand page among decreasing levels of brand loyalty. Therefore, marketers should cater to the followers that are more sensitive to Polarizing content (those with lesser levels of brand loyalty) since brand loyal followers are more likely to remain followers regardless of the content on the brand page.

Furthermore, the findings also show that brand trust plays a more distinct role in user intentions to like or unlike a brand page on Facebook based on the content posted by the brand. Content considered to be topics of “everyday life” or “unimportant/frequent” were found to influence consumers with lesser brand trust levels negatively, where they would be more likely to unfollow the brand if they posted this type of content more often than preferred by the consumer. Marketers should use this information to reconsider posting content that might fall under this category, as it suggests an impact on the perceived credibility or reliability of their brand.

In general, content posted by the brand on their Facebook page should remain relevant to their products and services in order to maintain brand-consumer relationships with consumers who might be able to be considered “on the fence” in terms of levels of brand loyalty and brand trust. However, social media marketing practitioners must understand that consumers come in various types of “Fans” as depicted by the typologies identified and studied in this research.
Limitations

Limitations to the findings of this study more generally pertain to the demographic of the sample. One limitation concerns the wording of the survey item interested in the income levels of the respondents. The question was misworded as “What was your annual household income in 2012?” and should have read, “What was your annual household income in 2014?” Typically, census questionnaires are interested in income of the calendar year prior, which would be 2014 as the study took place in 2015, so it is uncertain as to whether or not respondents answered the question with their stated incomes for 2012 or 2014. This would only limit demographical information, however, income can reflect social status and trends in technology use or affluence.

Another limitation might be the lack of data on residential location of the respondents. The survey was distributed by the researcher, who resides in Honolulu, Hawaii, through their personal Facebook network, as well as to student of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, also located in Honolulu. This could limit the generalizability of the findings in the sense that it could be assumed that most of the respondents are also Hawaii residents. Hawaii is made up largely of small businesses that rely on word-of-mouth marketing via online platforms such as Facebook, which might significantly differ from other geographical locations. Collecting data on geographical residence of the respondents would have eliminated this limitation and could be utilized in future research to generate more generalizable data.

Lastly, the constructs used to measure Unliking motivations were taken from a study that measured Unfriending. While both are similar in the sense that they represent the termination of an online connection, it is also important to recognize the differences
between the two processes. Therefore, another limitation might be that the measures used do not accurately measure one’s intention to terminate a relationship with an entity, but rather, another person, resulting in little to no correlation between the variables.

Suggestions for Future Research

To elaborate on avoiding the limitation of geographical location in future research, the relationship of geographical location and the current findings might also be of interest. Location-based capabilities now available on Facebook and similar platforms available to marketers may show interesting relationships between user intentions to like and unlike brand pages or trends among online consumers based on geographic location.

Other future research might delve into identifying and understanding patterns in Facebook use and their effects on brand loyalty or consumer motivations to follow brand pages on Facebook. For example, the sample for this study scored high in levels of Facebook use, so one might analyze the relationship, if any, between levels of Facebook use, rather than levels of brand loyalty, and the same indexes for intentions to like and unlike brand pages. Looking further into the typologies of Facebook fans and patterns of Unliking a brand or a similar study to current research that includes an analysis of all four typologies might also of interest.

Moving beyond SNS and into the realm of social media, researchers may also want to look at how these findings compare to other social media platforms that are heavily used for marketing, such as Instagram or Twitter. Topics of research might include typologies of users for each specific platform, and beyond that, how they differ in
brand loyalty levels and intentions to follow or engage with brands on these various platforms.

One obvious step forward in contributing to research in this field would be to compare these findings with purchasing intentions. What relationship might exist between user intentions to follow or unfollow a brand on Facebook and purchasing intentions? Do the influences of content posted by the brand have the same impact on purchasing intentions as they do on Liking/Unliking intentions? These are important research questions that marketers could build off the current study to answer.
APPENDIX A: Constructs for Liking

Genuine Interest

Genuine interest refers to a Facebook user’s authentic interest in the brand, company, products or services as being the reason why they like a brand’s Facebook page. The following survey items are used to measure a user’s genuine interest in the brand as a reason for liking:

I really want to know more about the brands I like.

Having updates from the brands I like on my news feed keep me up to date.

The news feeds from the brands I like are useful to me in the short term.

Image Creation

Image creation refers to a Facebook user’s desire to develop a desired image or perception of themselves to others as a reason for liking a brand’s Facebook page. In other words, the user hopes that if others see that they have followed a particular brand on their News Feed, it will contribute to the desired image they wish to portray online. Four survey items were used to measure image creation as a reason for liking and are as follows:

My friends liked the brands.

Liking the brands showed off my taste to other people.

Having updates from the brands I like on my news feed made my Facebook page look good.
Incentive

Incentive refers to a user being offered or provided a reward, discount, or other return that would directly benefit the user, e.g. social capital, for liking a brand’s Facebook page. The following four items were adapted from the study and used in the survey for this research to measure incentive as a user’s reason for liking. These measures are as follows:

I received a discount for clicking “Like.”

My friend asked me to like the brands.

I entered a competition by clicking “Like.”

There was a campaign to reach a target number of “Likes.”
APPENDIX B: Constructs for Unliking

Everyday Life

Everyday life refers to content that can be categorized under common, non-emotionally charged topics as a reason why a Facebook user might unlike a brand’s Facebook page. Wallace, et.al. listed exercise, purchases, eating, money, celebrities, and sports as topics that can be categorized as such. Therefore, the following survey items have been adapted from their study to measure the extent to which content about everyday life can be a reason for unhliking.

- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Exercise too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Purchases too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Eating too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Money too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Celebrities too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Sports scores too frequently.

Unimportant/Frequent

Unimportant refers to content deemed of little to no importance to the user, whereas Frequent refers to a brand posting content more often than preferred by the user. The following items measure unimportant/frequent content as reasons why a user might unlike a brand’s Facebook page.

- I would Unlike this brand if they posted Unimportant content too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted more often than I’d like (too Frequently).


Polarizing

Polarizing refers to content a brand posts that may be emotionally charged or depict a brand’s particular stance on a topic. Religion and politics are two such topics that fall under the Polarizing category. Therefore, the following survey items measure Polarizing as a user’s reason for unliking.

- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Politics too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Religion too frequently.

Inappropriate

Inappropriate refers to content regarding topics that a user deems inappropriate or uncomfortable. The following survey items will measure inappropriate content as a reason for unliking.

- I would Unlike this brand if they posted Inappropriate too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted content about Sex too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they used Swear words too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted Sexist too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted Racist too frequently.
- I would Unlike this brand if they posted Unflattering too frequently.

Behavior

Behavior is an offline factor measured by the authors. It refers to an offline action performed or persona exhibited by the brand that user might disagree with or find
unfavorable. The following survey items measure a brand’s behavior as a reason for unliking.

I would Unlike this brand if they Did misdeed.
I would Unlike this brand if I developed Dislike for the brand.
I would Unlike this brand if they had a change in Behavior.
I would Unlike this brand if I disagreed with their Personality.
I would Unlike this brand if I did not Trust them.
I would Unlike this brand if they Betrayed me.
I would Unlike this brand if they Broke a rule.

Change

Change is also regarded as an offline factor that might contribute to a user’s reason for unliking a brand’s Facebook page, referring to differences made by the brand that might affect a customer’s interest. The following items are used to measure change as a reason for a user’s reason to unlike a brand’s page on Facebook:

I would Unlike this brand if they were Incompatible with my interests.
I would Unlike this brand if they Changed geographic distance or location.
I would Unlike this brand if they started posting New information from what they usually post about.
APPENDIX C: Questionnaire

Intentions to Like and Dislike Brand Pages

Aloha! My name is Felicia Durant. I am a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Manoa in the School of Communications. As part of the requirements for earning my graduate degree, I am doing a research project, in which I intend to identify Facebook users intentions to Like and Dislike brands on Facebook. I am asking you to participate because you are a Facebook user.

Activities and Time Commitment: By participating in this survey, you will be asked to complete the following survey. Completing the survey will take 5-10 minutes. Survey questions will include items asking you how you feel about the brands you “Like” on Facebook, what made you Like them and what might make you want to Dislike them, as well as some demographical questions about yourself. No identifiable information will be collected.

Benefits and Risks: There will be no direct benefit to you for participating in this interview. The results of this project may contribute to the field of social media marketing for businesses in understanding the intentions of consumers on Facebook. I believe there is little risk to you in participating in this research project. However, should you feel uncomfortable answering any of the survey items, you can withdraw from the project altogether simply by closing the survey window. Your incomplete survey will not be used in the project.

*UH Manoa students: Participation in this study will not jeopardize your status or enrollment with the University of Hawaii.

Privacy and Confidentiality: No identifiable information will be collected for the project. Survey answers are completely anonymous.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. You may stop participating at any time. If you stop being in the study, there will be no penalty or loss to you.

*UH Manoa students who were provided this link as an option to earn extra credit will receive extra credit for the course as determined by that course’s professor, lecturer, or section leader.

Questions: If you have any questions about this study, please email me at feliciaaa@hawaii.edu. You may also contact my advisor, Dr. Francis Dalisay, at fdalisay@hawaii.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the UH Human Studies Program at 808.956.5007 or uhirb@hawaii.edu.
If you agree to participate in this project, please proceed to begin the survey by clicking “Next.” By clicking “Next” and beginning the survey, you also acknowledge that you are 18 years of age or older at the time you begin the survey.

Mahalo for participating in this project! You may print this page for your records.

Please recall the brand pages you “Like” on Facebook. Answer each item in regards to those brands. A “brand” is defined by Merriam-Webster as “a class of goods identified by name as the product of a single firm or manufacturer.”

We first would like to ask you some questions regarding your feelings of loyalty and trust toward the brands you like. Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning “strongly disagree” and 5 meaning “strongly agree” for the following items regarding Brand Loyalty and Brand Trust.

I consider myself to be loyal to the brands I like.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree  
☐ 2 - Disagree  
☐ 3 - Neutral  
☐ 4 - Agree  
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

If the brands I like are not available at the store, I would buy the same brands from some other store.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree  
☐ 2 - Disagree  
☐ 3 - Neutral  
☐ 4 - Agree  
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I am willing to pay more for my brands I like.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree  
☐ 2 - Disagree  
☐ 3 - Neutral  
☐ 4 - Agree  
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree
The brands I like gives me everything that I expect out of the product.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I rely on the brands I like.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

The brands I like never disappoint me.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

The brands I like deliver what they promise.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I believe the claims made by the brands I like regarding their products and/or services.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

The brands I like have names you can trust.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree
The brands I like don’t pretend to be something they aren’t.
○ 1 - Strongly Disagree
○ 2 - Disagree
○ 3 - Neutral
○ 4 - Agree
○ 5 - Strongly Agree

The brands I like are at the forefront of using technology to deliver a better service.
○ 1 - Strongly Disagree
○ 2 - Disagree
○ 3 - Neutral
○ 4 - Agree
○ 5 - Strongly Agree

Next, we would like to ask you some questions about factors that might affect your intentions to Like or Unlike the brands’ Facebook pages. Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning “strongly disagree” and 5 meaning “strongly agree” for the following items regarding Intentions to Like and for Unlike brands’ Facebook pages. Please answer the following questions in regards to why you Like the brand page(s) on Facebook.

I really want to know more about the brands I like.
○ 1 - Strongly Disagree
○ 2 - Disagree
○ 3 - Neutral
○ 4 - Agree
○ 5 - Strongly Agree

Having updates from the brands I like on my news feed keep me up to date.
○ 1 - Strongly Disagree
○ 2 - Disagree
○ 3 - Neutral
○ 4 - Agree
○ 5 - Strongly Agree

The news feeds from the brands I like are useful to me.
○ 1 - Strongly Disagree
○ 2 - Disagree
○ 3 - Neutral
○ 4 - Agree
○ 5 - Strongly Agree
My friends liked the brands.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

Liking the brands showed off my taste to other people.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

Having updates from the brands I like on my news feed made my Facebook page look good.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I received a discount for Liking the brand(s).
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree
My friend asked me to like the brands.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I entered a competition by Liking the brand(s).
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

There was a campaign to reach a target number of “Likes.”
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

Please answer the following statements regarding reasons why you might Unlike the brands you already follow on Facebook.

I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Exercise too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Purchases too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree
I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Eating too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Money too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Celebrities too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Sports scores too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted Unimportant content too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted more often than I’d like (too Frequently).
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree
I would Unlike a brand if they posted content that did not match my political views.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Religion too frequently.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neither Disagree nor Agree
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted Inappropriate content too frequently.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted content about Sex too frequently.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neither Disagree nor Agree
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they used Swear words too frequently.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted Sexist content too frequently.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree
I would Unlike a brand if they posted Racist content too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they posted Unflattering content too frequently.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they Did misdeed.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if I developed Dislike for the brand.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they had a change in Behavior.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if I disagreed with their Personality.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree
I would Unlike a brand if I did not Trust them.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they Betrayed me.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they Broke a rule.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2 - Disagree
☐ 3 - Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree
I would Unlike a brand if they were Incompatible with my interests.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they Changed geographic distance or location.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

I would Unlike a brand if they started posting New information from what they usually post about.
☐ 1 - Strongly Disagree
☐ 2- Disagree
☐ 3- Neutral
☐ 4 - Agree
☐ 5 - Strongly Agree

Facebook Use
We would now like you to answer some questions regarding your Facebook use. Unless answers are provided, please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning “strongly disagree” and 5 meaning “strongly agree” for the following items regarding Intensity of Facebook Use.

About how many Facebook friends do you have?
☐ 10 or less
☐ 11-50
☐ 51-100
☐ 101-150
☐ 151-200
☐ 201-250
☐ 251-300
☐ 301-400
☐ more than 400
In the past week, on average, approximately how many minutes per day have you spent on Facebook?
- less than 10
- 10-30
- 31-60
- 1-2 hours
- 2-3 hours
- more than 3 hours

Facebook is part of my everyday activity.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I am proud to tell people I’m on Facebook.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

Facebook has become part of my daily routine.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree
I feel out of touch when I haven’t logged onto Facebook for a while.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I feel I am part of the Facebook community.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

I would be sorry if Facebook shut down.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree
- 2 - Disagree
- 3 - Neutral
- 4 - Agree
- 5 - Strongly Agree

Demographics
Finally, we would like to ask you some question about yourself. Please select or fill in the most appropriate answer to the following items regarding Demographics.

What is your sex:
- Male
- Female

Age:

Are you a student?
- Yes
- No
What was your household’s income in 2012? (Check ONE of the following)

- $19,999 or less
- $20,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$99,999
- $100,000-$119,999
- $120,000-$139,999
- $140,000-$159,999
- $160,000-$169,999
- $170,000-$189,999
- $190,000 or above

Do you consider yourself…? (Check all that apply)

- Non-Hispanic White
- Japanese
- Filipino
- Native Hawaiian
- Hispanic
- Chinese
- Okinawan
- Korean
- Samoan
- Tongan
- Chamorro
- Other
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