# Journal of Peace, Development and Communication

| | |
|---|---|
| **Article:** | **Using Classification Based Approach on Online Social Media as a Marketing Channel for Building and Improving Consumer Perception of Brands: An Empirical Analysis of Facebook Users in Pakistan** |
| **Author(s):** | Hashim Khan<br>Research Scholar, Government College of Technology, TEVTA, Timergara, KP, Pakistan. |
| | Meer Wali Ur Rehman Khan<br>Institute of Computing, Hangu Campus KUST, KP, Pakistan. |
| | Nimra Iqbal<br>Independent Scholar & Credit Risk Analyst (UBL), University of Central Punjab, Punjab, Pakistan. |
| **Published:** | 30th September 2022 |
| **Publisher Information:** | Journal of Peace, Development and Communication (JPDC) |
| **To Cite this Article:** | Khan, H., Khan, M. W. U. R., & Iqbal, N. (2022). Using Classification Based Approach on Online Social Media as a Marketing Channel for Building and Improving Consumer Perception of Brands: An Empirical Analysis of Facebook Users in Pakistan. *Journal of Peace, Development and Communication*, *06*(03), 224–239. https://doi.org/10.36968/JPDC-V06-I03-17 |
| **Author(s) Note:** | Hashim Khan is serving as a Research Scholar at Government College of Technology, TEVTA, Timergara, KP, Pakistan. |
| | Meer Wali Ur Rehman Khan is from Institute of Computing at Hangu Campus KUST, KP, Pakistan.<br>Corresponding Author's Email: meerbangash@gmail.com |
| | Nimra Iqbal is an Independent Scholar & Credit Risk Analyst (UBL) and studied from University of Central Punjab, Punjab, Pakistan. |

## ABSTRACT

Research scholars are continuously trying to comprehend the effects of the use of social media as a marketing channel and tool on consumer perception of brands, however there are still loopholes exist when it comes to the question as how consumer perceive brands?. This research paper stresses on the optimal techniques of using Facebook as a tool of marketing in order to build and improve online brand equity. Online survey through questionnaire was conducted by targeting the active users (urban areas) of Facebook in big cities of Pakistan. The results clarified that there is a strong impact of Facebook on brand awareness and brand image which then lead to brand equity by using the Keller model. Research demonstrates that in order to create customer brand relationships on social networking sites, it is important to comprehend both media system reliance i.e. GOALS and uses and gratifications i.e. NEEDS, that is a classification based approach on social media users, which in turn produced positive results.

**Keywords:** Online Marketing, Facebook, Awareness of Brand Image, Brand Knowledge and Brand Equity.

## Introduction:

Facebook is the most used online social network. The number of active users of Facebook is rapidly increased in this pandemic and reaches approximately 2.93 billion which is about 40% of the world population (Schweidel et al., 2022). The excessive use and global dominance of social media and especially Facebook has drastically changed the global business dimensions and activities of marketing. It catches the marketers to create, advertise (promotion) and build value proposition of brand in the environment where social media rule. The ways and patterns of life and corporate practices are changing due to social networking applications, constantly changing technologies and innovation in everything (Babić Rosario, et al., 2016).

The world is witnessing the digital revolution which has made the places more accessible. Social media channels as a powerful communication and marketing tool are only the part of this digital revolution (Schweidel et al., 2022).

The most pressing problem in the field of marketing in the modern day is how to develop and boost brand equity in today cutthroat global community once brands have been exposed to consumer opinions, comments, and participatory activities. Many users joined social media platforms after the internet came into existence in order to interact and work together with brands on Facebook (Banks et al., 2016).

Knowledge of brands refers to what customers have acquired, heard, felt, seen, and/or experienced as a result of their interactions with the brand. Even with effective marketing initiatives and plans, brand equity is still influenced by the attitudes and perceptions of the customer (Aguirre, Mahr, Grewal, de Ruyter, & Wetzels, 2015). According to prior studies, posting by a brand frequently on Facebook increases brand awareness (Schweidel et al., 2022). Others discovered that brand equity is driven by knowledge of brand (Keller, 1993), and communication of brand via Facebook has a favorable influence on brand equity (Aguirre, Mahr, Grewal, de Ruyter, & Wetzels, 2015). Therefore, it is assumed in this paper that marketing initiatives/activities started on Facebook, have favorable impacts on knowledge of brand.

Brand recognition and brand recall are the two components that make up brand awareness, according to Keller (2013). Brand recall is the capacity of customers to bring up a certain brand from memory. However, brand awareness may be thought of as the foundational stage of brand communication (Aguirre, Mahr, Grewal, de Ruyter, & Wetzels, 2015). Brand participating in social media in the current technological era exposes brand reputations, and some writers argue that the more engaged a brand's community is with its customers, the more likely it is that people may question the firm's ownership of its identity (Winzar, Baumann, & Chu, 2018). Studies conducted in the past analyzed and discovered favorable marketing communication impacts on awareness of brand on Facebook (Schivinski, Christodoulides, & Dabrowski, 2016).

Brand image, according to Aaker, (1991), is "perceptions about a brand as represented by the brand associations preserved in consumer memory. In order to map a positive image (Kim & Ko, 2012) and valuable information (Schweidel et al., 2022) for involvement &

engagements of consumers,, managers must create high-quality contents. This is necessary to create a positive, powerful, and distinctive involvement in the minds of consumers (Keller's, 1993).

The model of brand equity related to the use of knowledge is applied in this study. Keller (1993) referred to it as consumer equity of brand and defined it as the "degree of difference achieve through the use of knowledge about the brand on end user response to the overall marketing performance of that specific brand," (Kim & Ko, 2012).

**Hypotheses:**

Based on the above discussion the following hypotheses were developed.

H1: "Facebook activities of marketing have a significant and strong relationship with knowledge of brands".

H2: "Facebook activities of marketing have a significant and strong relationship with image of brands".

H3: "Awareness of brand have strong relationship with equity of brands"

**METHODOLOGY**

Uses and Gratifications Theory (Based on Consumer Needs), which examines how community utilize media to pursue their overall needs, serves as the foundation for this study (Blumler, 1979). Mass Media Dependency Theory (Based on Goals) and Uses and Gratifications Theory (Based on Consumer Needs), which are based on Keller's (2013) brand equity model, are the perspectives from which this research investigates and analyses the overall correlation linking Facebook marketing techniques and awareness of brand. The paper used the empirical study of research that seeks to learn things from indirect observations. Through the technique, five-point Likert scale, the questions were designed and delivered through Google forms, Facebook, and Emails. The sample was created through sampling method of non-probability, and the population of the study was drawn from Pakistan's rural cities. The data was then tested, to determine the model's composite reliability, validity, and model fit. For the test of these hypotheses, the model was then shifted to a structural model.

**FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS**

This segment presents the findings of the statistical analyses, by using Descriptive Statistics and compares them to earlier studies. Out of the total 385 Questionnaires, 09 Questionnaires were found as resulting utmost variance errors, Even though the reliability test on the data showed satisfactory results and produced a decent model fit, it was dropped because it was causing issues with the model's discriminant validity. As a result, 298 responders made up the final sample size for testing, yielding a 77.40 % response rate.

**Table 1:** Descriptive Statistics

| Research Variables | Sample | Percentage (100) |
|---|---|---|
| **1. Sex** | | |
| Male Ratio | 177 | 59.39 |
| Female Ratio | 121 | 40.61 |
| Total = | 298 | 100 |
| **2. Age** | | |
| 16-22 | 146 | 48.99 |
| 23-29 | 106 | 35.57 |
| 30-36 | 42 | 14.09 |
| 37-43 | 04 | 1.34 |
| 44 & above | - | - |
| Total | 298 | 100 |
| **3. Education** | | |
| 1-5 Class | - | - |
| 6-10 Class | 5 | 1.67 |
| 11-12 Class | 15 | 5.03 |
| 13-14 Class | 87 | 29.19 |
| 14-16 Class | 123 | 41.27 |
| 16-18 Class | 68 | 22.81 |
| Total | 298 | 100 |
| **4. Work Status** | | |
| Student | 129 | 43.28 |
| Private Employees | 85 | 28.52 |
| Govt. Employees | 25 | 8.38 |
| NGO Employees | 15 | 5.03 |
| Own Business | 43 | 14.42 |
| Jobless/No Job | 11 | 3.69 |
| *Total* | 298 | 100 |
| **5. Province** | | |
| Peshawar | 95 | 31.87 |
| Dara Adam Khel (Merged Districts) | 7 | 2.34 |
| Lahore | 91 | 30.53 |
| Karachi | 81 | 27.18 |
| Quetta | 19 | 6.37 |
| GB | 5 | 1.67 |
| Azad Kashmir | - | - |
| Total | 298 | 100 |

Table 1 reveals the results of descriptive analysis. Peshawar (31.87%) had the highest percentage of responders, followed by Lahore (30.53%) and Karachi (27.18%). The result further shows that male students were the highest respondents.

## Reliability analysis

Reliability was examined in SPSS Version 21 using the Cronbach Alpha test. All of the criteria produced values within the acceptable range, with the exception of "Favorability of association," which is 0.69, and is less than the recommended value of 0.7, but it can still be in use and left in the respective model (Spector et al., 2015).

**Table 2:** Reliability Tests

### *Quality and Performance of E-Service*

| Item/s | Corrected Item/s-Total Coorelation | Item/s if deleted-Cronbach's Alpha | AverageCronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Facebook marketing boosts a brand's popularity. | .586 | .671 | .748 |
| 2. For building brand awareness, I think Facebook is an effective marketing tool. | .642 | .652 | |
| 3. Facebook marketing techniques and activities help to improve businesses' value/brands. | .563 | .660 | |
| 4. Facebook can be a powerful tool to get goals. | .438 | .735 | |

### *Search Information*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Brand Facebook pages provide useful information. | .489 | .783 | .787 |
| 7. I spend most of the time to search for information. | .688 | .684 | |
| 8. Facebook is the best tool to find brands. | .557 | .757 | |

### *Engagement of Brand*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10. I usually utilize Facebook to hunt for products and services. | .457 | .742 | .75 3 |
| 11. I drop comments, sharing it if I like the brand on Facebook. | .569 | .702 | |
| 12. I participate in the discussion about the brand on Facebook. | .576 | .687 | |

### *Recognition of Brand*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I have the information and awareness of the brands on Facebook. | .623 | .721 | .789 |
| 2. I have my view point of the brand on Facebook. | .621 | .722 | |
| 3. I can recognize the brand as other brands on Facebook. | .658 | .701 | |

### Recall of Brand

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7. I may recall the logos and symbols of brands that I look. | .689 | .687 | .768 |
| 8. I know and can spot the quality and uniqueness of brand on Facebook. | .715 | .637 | |
| 9. The brands that I was attached it, I can recall it easily once it appeared on social media. | .453 | .773 | |

### Significance of Associations

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14. Facebook is the best tool to build up image of brand. | .638 | .724 | .78 0 |
| 17. I praise the brand on Facebook sometimes. | .654 | .711 | |
| 23. Facebook Brand appearance looks good. | .597 | .743 | |

### Positivity of Associations

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13. I give a like to a brand on Facebook. | .435 | .632 | .69    0 |
| 19. Brands are quality. | .517 | .581 | |
| 20. Brands are user friendly. | .504 | .587 | |

### Uniqueness of Associations

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Only leading brands appear on Facebook. | .522 | .735 | .783 |
| 16. Brands on Facebook has unique qualities, different than other brands. | .665 | .683 | |
| 18. Brands is a sign of uniqueness for me. | .590 | .710 | |

## Means Computation

Calculating the means for each factor from their corresponding items was crucial to facilitate and assess the fitness of the respective model and to test the hypothesis in statistical software in AMOS. E-Service Quality had five components whereas the other seven factors had four components. The calculation command from SPSS version 22 was used to calculate all of the means.

## Multicolinearity Analysis and Outliers

The data was drafted to a multicollinearity test for the purpose to find the acceptable value of variance inflation factor and Value of Tolerance.

**Table 3:** Test of Multicollinearity

| | **Statistics of Collinearity** | |
|---|---|---|
| **Items/Factors** | Values of Tolerance | Valuesof variance inflation factor |
| Quality of E-Service | .239 | 4.071 |
| Searching Information | .263 | 3.675 |
| Engagement of Brand | .268 | 3.567 |
| Brand Recognition | **.329** | **2.943** |
| Brand Recall | .324 | 2.976 |
| Significance of relationship | **.205** | **4.776** |
| Favorable/Positive Relationship | .297 | 3.373 |
| Unique Relationship | .293 | 3.431 |

For the sample data, the multicollinearity test seems great. According to tradition, VIF values for a small sample size should be fewer than 5. According to the most recent statistics, all of the VIF readings are below 5 and fall within the acceptable range. Strength of Association has the highest VIF value of any factor, with a calculated value of 2.9, the Brand Recognition has the highest value of any factor.

Examining tolerance values that shouldn't be lower than the 0.2 threshold is another technique to check for multicollinearity. All of these numbers are more than 0.2 and are thus approved. The greatest value is for brand recognition, which is a sign of reliable data. Overall, the data don't have any concerns with multicollinearity.

**Test of Composite Reliability & Test of Convergent and Test of Discriminant Validity Test**

The CR values produced a range from 0.870 to 0.925, above the previously reported 0.70 threshold value (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988). All of the latent variables in the model have average variance values that above the 0.5 cutoff, indicating accurate Test of convergent validity (Larcker et al., 1981). Based on all of these findings, the researcher was able to establish good Composite Reliability and construct validity. The following tbale shows the reliability test and validity test vales that were obtained as a result.

**Table 4:** Values of the Test of Composite Reliability, Test of Convergent

And Test of Discriminant Validity

| | Value of TCR | Value of TAVE | Value of TMSV | Value of TASV | Activities of Marketing | Awareness of Brand | Image of Brand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Activities of Marketing** | 0.934 | 0.863 | 0.752 | 0.676 | **0.889** | | |
| **Awareness of Brand** | 0.870 | 0.745 | 0.753 | 0.698 | 0.756 | **0.876** | |
| **Image of Brand** | 0.909 | 0.779 | 0.767 | 0.793 | 0.807 | 0.876 | **0.877** |

TCR>0.7, TAVE>0.5,

TAVE>TMSV, TAVE>TASV, TCR>TAVE

**Fitness of Model**

The (Cmin/df) value was calculated to be 2.732, and found that it is less than 5 and within acceptable bounds. The results for the comparative fit index), and goodness of fit index and AGFI adjusted goodness of fit index were recorded as 0.978, 0.943,.876, respectively. TLI, or the Tucker-Lewis Index, came out to be 0.967, RMSEA, or the value of Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, was recorded as 0.092 with 90% confidence interval of 0.05 to 0.133, and SRMR, or Standardized Root Mean Square- Residual value, came out to be 0.0276. Due to their near proximity to the specified threshold, all observed data suggested a good model. Table 6 illustrates the value for model fitness.

**Table 5:** Test of fitness of Model in CFA

| Value to Measure | Value Resulted | Recorded Value of the Threshold |
|---|---|---|
| (Cmin/df) | 2.732 | Range 1-3 is V. Good Fit and <3 & 5< is a Good Fit. |
| TCFI | 0.978 | 1 is equal to Perfect Fit and <.95 is a Great Fit. |
| TGFI | 0.943 | 1 is equal to perfect fit and higher than 0.91 is good fit. |
| TAGF | 0.876 | Higher than 0.85 is Good Fit. |
| TTLI | 0.967 | Value of TLI is close to 1 and is Good Fit. |
| TRMSEA | 0.092 | Value close to 0.5 or less is Good Fit and the value is near to 0.10 is a fine value. |
| TSRMR | 0.0276 | Value close to 0 and is Good Fit. |

**Latent Variables and their Correlation**

In the CFA, the predictable correlations between activities of marketing and awareness of brands and image of brands were 0.786 (78%) and 0.875 (84%) respectively, while the predictable correlation between awareness of brands and image of brands was 0.859 (85%). The values of correlation between the mentioned variables are shown in table 7 together with their respective coefficients of correlation, which show how closely these latent variables are connected to one another.

**Table 6:** Analyzing the Correlations among Latent Variables

| Variables/Factors | | | Predicted Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Activities of Marketing | <--> | Awareness of Brands | .786 |
| Awareness of Brands | <--> | Image of Brands | .875 |
| Activities of Marketing | <--> | Image of Brand | .859 |

**Path Analysis or Structure Equation Modeling-SEM Fitness of the Model through SEM**

The calculated df value was recorded as 2.84, and the value is lesser than value 5 and within the allowed range. Comparative Fit Index, Goodness of Fit Index and Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index, values were recorded as 0.968, 0.931, and 0.852. The Tucker-Lewis Index, noted as 0.963, Root Mean Square -Error of Approximation, was recorded as 0.081 with a 90% confidence interval of 0.036 to 0.123, and Standardized Root Mean Square-Residual value, was 0.0289. When brand knowledge was considered a second order component, all model fitness values remained constant. Because all of the observed values were so near to the specified threshold, they all showed a strong model fit. Table 8 has the recorded values.

**Table 7:** Path Analysis or SEM

| Measure | Recorded Value | Threshold |
|---|---|---|
| , (Cmin/df) | **2.84** | Range 1-3 is V. Good Fit and <3 & 5< is a Good Fit. |
| TCFI | **0.968** | 1 is equal to Perfect Fit and <.95 is a Great Fit. |
| TGFI | **0.931** | 1 is equal to perfect fit and higher than 0.910 is good fit. |
| TAGFI | **0.852** | Higher than 0.85 is Good Fit. |
| TLI | **0.963** | The Vale of TLI is close to 1 and is Good Fit. |
| TRMSEA | **0.081** | Value close to 0.5 or less is Good Fit and Value is near to 0.10 is a fine value. |
| TSRMR | **0.0289** | Value near to 0.0and is Good Fit. |

**Beta coefficients or Beta Weights or Standardize Coefficients Standardize Coefficients**

The activity of marketing on Facebook grows 1 standard deviation, the knowledge of brand improves by 0.874. Likewise, the activity of marketing grows by 1 standard deviation, awareness of brand rises by 0.75. In the same way, awareness of brand rises by 1 standard deviation, the image of brand deviates or improves by 0.478. And if activities ofmarketing grows by standard deviation 1, image of brand rises by 0.509.

**Total effects in the Model**

Marketing effort has a 0.824 influence on brand knowledge overall (direct and indirect). This suggests that combined direct (unmediated) and also indirect (mediated) impacts on knowledge of brand result in a brand knowledge gain of 0.824 for every increase in marketing activity of 1. Marketing activities affect brand awareness by a total of 1,711 units (direct and indirect). Accordingly, brand awareness grows by 0.711 units when marketing activities rise by one unit that maybe direct effects (unmediated ones) and indirect effects (mediated ones) on awareness of brands. The total overall effect of the activities of marketing on image of the brands (direct and indirect) is 0.821 units. As a result of combined direct impacts (unmediated ones) and indirect impacts (mediated ones) on image of the brands, brand image grows by 0.821 units for every unit increase in marketing activity. Brand awareness has a 0.491 unit total (direct and indirect) influence on brand image. As a result of both the direct effects (unmediated ones) and indirect effects (mediated ones) of awareness of brands on the image of the brands, when awareness of the brand grows by unit one, image of the brand increases by 0.491 unit.

**Table 8:** Standardize Coefficients and total effects during SEM Analysis

| Factors | | | Predicted Value | Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Activities of Marketing | → | Knowledge of Brands | 0.874 | 0.824 |
| Activities of Marketing | → | Awareness of Brand | 0.75 | 0.711 |
| Awareness of Brand | → | Image of Brand | 0.478 | 0.491 |
| Activities of Marketing | → | Image of Brand | 0.509 | 0.821 |

## Index Score from a Factor Analysis with Latent Variables

When an indicator's value increases by one unit in a structural model, factor scores or loading are the values that result, reflecting a change in that component and other connected components. This specified that the value which is estimated for the hidden variable activity of marketing grows by 0.221, 0.357, and 0.261 units, each, when the calculated variables Searching Information, engagement of brands, and Quality and Performance of e-service increase by 1 unit each. When the assessed variables recognition of brand and recall of brand rise by unit 1, awareness of brand is projected to increase by 0.397 and 0.311 units.. The calculated variable strerelationship or association grows by unit 1, the projected worth of the latent variable of image of brand increases by units of 0.379 units. All values have to be taken the same mode it is realized for the aforementioned factors/variables. For each element, associated indicators are displayed in the darkened cells.

**Table 9:** Index Score from a Factor Analysis with Latent Variables

| Indicators | Marketing Activities | Brand Awareness | Image of brand Factors |
|---|---|---|---|
| Searching Information | 0.221 | 0.016 | 0.041 |
| Engagement of Brand | 0.357 | 0.029 | 0.058 |
| Quality of E-Service | 0.261 | 0.022 | 0.047 |
| Recognition of Brand | 0.031 | 0.397 | 0.069 |
| Recall of Brand | 0.015 | 0.311 | 0.059 |
| | | | |
| Significance of Relationshp | 0.069 | 0.119 | 0.379 |
| Favorable/Positive Relationship | 0.020 | 0.061 | 0.198 |
| Unique Relationship | 0.040 | 0.049 | 0.198 |

## DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

The resulted value of T-Test noted was recorded as 14.5, β =0.874, p-value is equal to 0.001 supported the rejection of the null hypothesis and so led to a constructive and positive link between activities related to marketing and knowledge of brand. Previous research showed that posting by a brand frequently on Facebook increases awareness of brand (Winzar, Baumann, & Chu, 2018). Others discovered that brand equity is driven by knowledge of brand (Keller, 1993), and brand communication via Facebook has a favorable influence on brand equity (Schweidel et al., 2022).

According to the results of the T-statistic, that are recorded as 11.011 greater than the threshold of the value 2 with a 99% confidence interval and the recorded value of 0.75, activities of marketing or actions on Facebook demonstrated a positive link with awareness of brand. As a result, we accepted Hypothesis 1. (H1). The findings are consistent with earlier research that discovered that the more engaged a brand's community is with its customers; the more likely it is that people will dispute its ownership (McCarthy et al., 2013). The findings confirm a prior study's finding that effective marketing communication increases Facebook recognition of brand (Schweidel et al., 2022).

The second hypothesis, H2, was supported by activities of marketing on Facebook, which likewise demonstrated a favorable relationship with image of brand (β=0.47; t-value 5.2; p-value 0.001). Likewise findings were made in a study carried out by (Schivinski, Christodoulides, 2022 & Dabrowski, 2016), which discovered that brand managers needed to provide high-quality materials to map image of brand. The findings are also consistent with a different research by Schivinski, Christodoulides, (2022) that emphasized the importance of information for customer involvement & engagement, which is essential to forging positive, powerful relationship in consumers' minds.

The third hypothesis was supported by the finding that there is a strong and positive connection between awareness of brand and image of brand. The T-statistic was recorded as 6.2, β =0.509, and p-value recorded as 0.001 validating H3. Image of brand depends on awareness of brand, according to previous research that revealed efforts to enhance perception of brand would also need to increase recognition of brand (Back et al., 2010). Additionally, the study supports (Holliman & Rowley, 2014) claim that successful businesses would need to have a greater degree of image of brand. Awareness of brand and image of brand are closely intertwined, and changes in awareness of brand results in a change in image of brand (Keller, 1993).

## CONCLUSION

The confirmatory factor analysis revealed that the conceptual model and structural model fit together well, supporting the hypothesis and achieving the study's goals. We can also draw the conclusion from the study that when marketers employ their efforts on Facebook, such as creating and disseminating high-quality material and information for the aim of

encouraging customer interaction with their brand, there is an actual, measurable gain in brand knowledge.

Using the uses and satisfaction theory as a guide, this study demonstrates that customers visit brand communities, brand sites, and look at brand posts to satisfy their informational demands. Facebook users utilize it to find information and brand messages to accomplish their goals, which lend credence to the thesis of mass media dependence. This study also looked at secondary data from the literature on the status of Facebook marketing initiatives, social media marketing, branding, brand awareness, brand perception, quality and performance of e-service, searching information, engagement of brand, and overall brand equity. This work helped the researcher develop the conceptual framework for the current study and identify the evidence for how brand equity can be raised. The overall goals and objective of the research were satisfactorily achieved.

## REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A. (1991). Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name. *Journal of Marketing*, *56*(2), 125. https://doi.org/10.2307/1252048

Aguirre, E., Mahr, D., Grewal, D., de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (2015). Unraveling the Personalization Paradox: The Effect of Information Collection and Trust-Building Strategies on Online Advertisement Effectiveness. *Journal of Retailing*, *91*(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2014.09.005

Babić Rosario, A., Sotgiu, F., De Valck, K., & Bijmolt, T. H. A. (2016). The Effect of Electronic Word of Mouth on Sales: A Meta-Analytic Review of Platform, Product, and Metric

Factors. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *53*(3), 297–318.

https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.14.0380

Back, M., Stopfer, J., Vazire, S., Gaddis, S., Schmukle, S., Egloff, B., … Bochantin, J. (2010). Marketing meets Web 2.0, social media, and creative consumers: Implications for international marketing strategy. Blumler. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *91*(1), 89–104.

https://doi.org/10.1177/009365027900600102

Bail, C. A., Argyle, L. P., Brown, T. W., Bumpus, J. P., Chen, H., Hunzaker, M. B. F., … Volfovsky, A. (2018). Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *115*(37), 9216–9221. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1804840115

Baker, D. A., & Algorta, G. P. (2016). The Relationship Between Online Social Networking and Depression: A Systematic Review of Quantitative Studies. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *19*(11), 638–648. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2016.0206

Banks, G. C., Pollack, J. M., Bochantin, J. E., Kirkman, B. L., Whelpley, C. E., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2016). Management's Science–Practice Gap: A Grand Challenge for All Stakeholders. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*(6), 2205–2231. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0728

Blumler, J. G. (1979). The Role of Theory in Uses and Gratifications Studies. *Communication Research*, *6*(1), 9–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365027900600102

Holliman, G., & Rowley, J. (2014). Business to business digital content marketing: marketers' perceptions of best practice. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, *8*(4), 269–293. https://doi.org/10.1108/jrim-02-2014-0013

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity.

*Journal of Marketing*, *57*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299305700101

Keller, K. L. (2009). Building strong brands in a modern marketing communications environment. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, *15*(2-3), 139–155.

Keller, K. L. (2014). Consumer brand relationships. *Journal of Brand Management*, *21*(5), 365–

365. https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2014.21

Kim, A. J., & Ko, E. (2012). Do Social Media Marketing Activities Enhance Customer equity?

an Empirical Study of Luxury Fashion Brand. *Journal of Business Research*, *65*(10), 1480–1486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.014

Schivinski, B., Christodoulides, G., & Dabrowski, D. (2016). Measuring Consumers' Engagement With Brand-Related Social-Media Content. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *56*(1), 64–80. https://doi.org/10.2501/jar-2016-004

Schweidel, D. A., Bart, Y., Inman, J. J., Stephen, A. T., Libai, B., Andrews, M., … Thomaz, F.

(2022). How consumer digital signals are reshaping the customer journey. *Journal of the*

*Academy of Marketing Science*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-022-00839-w

Winzar, H., Baumann, C., & Chu, W. (2018). Brand competitiveness. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *30*(1), 637–660. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm11-2016-0619