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Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this dissertation was to identify the main motivations that influence students to engage in social co-creation. This dissertation also looked to identify any differences in brand engagement and social media usage between millennial students and the millennial cohort. Gender differences were also tested.

Design/Methodology: A questionnaire was used to generate an overview of student social media usage and the main factors influencing student engagement. The questionnaire was distributed through a snowball sample and a convenience sample. The results were analysed using descriptive statistics including the mean. T-tests were used to identify any significant gender differences.

Findings: The results identified that there are differences between the millennial cohort and millennial students in terms of the type of brand engagement. Furthermore, millennials and millennial students are influenced by similar motivations for engaging in co-creation. These have been represented in an adapted model. The results showed there is limited gender difference in motivations for social co-creation.

Limitations: The quantitative approach failed to get an in depth understanding on why students are influenced by certain motivations. Furthermore, a large part of the sample were from Cardiff.
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An analysis of millennial student engagement in social co-creation. A comparison of the millennial cohort.

1.0 Introduction:

Consumer participation has become hugely influential in developing both products and services (Martinez-Canas et al, 2016) which is why the importance of the consumer to a firm has never been so high (Petri and Jacob, 2016). Research has suggested that marketing approaches have shifted away from one way communication processes to a focus on establishing sustainable relationships with stakeholders where the brand becomes the experience (Kaufmann et al, 2016). Consumers have experienced a transition from being passive to active customers (France et al, 2015), causing a shift from value in use to value in exchange with Vargo and Lusch (2004) stating that through a service-dominant logic approach, the consumer creates value through co-creating rather than the value being solely in the firm’s output and with Kaufmann et al (2016) stating that this process helps establish strong brands, it could be argued that firms understanding the co-creation process is essential to their success.

Co-creation is broadly defined as a collaboration between a firm and their customers with the purpose of generating ideas, products or services and experiences together (Kotler and Keller, 2009). This works by consumers giving their knowledge of a product or service based on personal experiences and the firm providing knowledge on the production and branding of the product or service (Vargo et al, 2008). This shows how value can be created through a joint process between firm and stakeholders by integrating their resources (Jaakkola and Alexander, 2014). With co-creation providing
benefits such as an increase in customer loyalty which can help differentiate and create a competitive advantage for the firm in the market (Cossio-Silva et al, 2016), then understanding what motivates the consumers to co-create could be largely beneficial to the success of the firm.

There is a variety of extant theory on the topic of co-creation, however, as stated by Roberts et al (2014) and Fernandes and Remelhe (2015) the literature focuses on the nature of co-creation rather than the motivation behind consumers engaging in the process. Although academics such as Roberts et al (2014) have tried to address this gap in the literature, they focused on consumers segments that are too broad rather than segment them into generational or lifestyle differences such as, millennials and millennial students. The gap that arises is that the literature is lagging behind the development of concepts such as co-creation and rise of social media. It is therefore important to address this gap or there is potential for organisations being left behind and not understanding how to fully utilise co-creation. Kennedy and Guzmán (2016) conducted research on millennial motivations for engaging in co-creation of brand identity. However the study used millennials aged 18-29 which could be argued to be too broad of a range, suggesting a narrower focus is needed. Tynan (2016) disputes that all millennials are the same as they have different professions and product interests. Therefore, this dissertation will be using millennial students and by using results found in Kennedy and Guzmán’s (2016) study, to identify what millennial students’ main motivations are in co-creating and whether there is a difference within the millennial cohort based on what the literature says about them. Millennial students are being analysed as they are considered digital natives having been brought up in the digital age and are increasingly demanding that companies listen to their
comments (Devaney, 2015). The justification behind using students is because Men and Tsai (2014) state that 18-24 year olds are the most active on social media and are well educated and have an attractive demographic background, so therefore they are often targeted for online communication campaigns. According to Rissanen and Luoma-Aho (2016), social networking sites are a natural environment for millennials with 86% of them using Facebook daily. With millennials wanting to interact with brands they like and with their interactions being seen by many through social tools (Fromm and Garton, 2013) it shows how reaching millennials could be very beneficial to a brand especially as in today’s society it is seen as an expectation to interact both online and offline (Martin, 2010), therefore millennial students are being used in the dissertation with a focus on social co-creation.

The reason for selecting the topic of motivations behind engaging in social co-creation is because of its emergence in the literature and to be able to further understand how to engage millennial students in the co-creation process to generate a competitive advantage. Therefore, this dissertation will be looking to further the results found in Kennedy and Guzmán (2016) study and offer comparison between millennials as a whole cohort and millennial students. This will help identify whether there are similarities in the millennial cohort, or whether as Tynan (2016) argues, there are differences. A detailed literature review will be conducted to assess what has already been researched on the topic of co-creation with reference to social co-creation and the rise in social media. Furthermore, the differences in student brand engagement and the millennial cohort will also be investigated along with differences in gender. This will inform a questionnaire which will be administered to students to identify their motives for engaging with brands over social media which forms the basis of social co-
creation. The questionnaire will incorporate a model from Kennedy and Guzmán’s (2016) framework, forming the basis for comparison.

1.1 Aims and Objectives

This dissertation will be looking to identify the main motivations behind why millennial students co-create, with reference to brand engagement. To achieve this, a number of objectives will be answered.

1. To critically evaluate student millennials’ interactions with brands on social media in relation to the millennial cohort.

2. To investigate the motives and drivers that formulate social co-creation in student millennials.

3. To critically assess gender differences in brand engagement and motivations for social co-creation between student millennials.

4. To identify any overlapping motivations between social co-creation and co-creation of brand identity.
2.0 Literature Review

This chapter will be looking at the current literature around the objectives and will look to identify who the millennial cohort are and how they use social media. This will form the comparison for the millennial students in Chapter 4. The nature and motivations of co-creation will also be analysed.

2.1 Who are Millennials?

The term ‘Millennial’ was coined by Howe and Strauss (2000) but since then there has been little consensus on who the millennial generation are with academics providing different reasons for naming the cohort (Kassaye and Hutto, 2016). For example, they are sometimes referred to as Generation C, referencing their desire to create content (Rissanen and Luoma-Aho, 2016). This has led to millennials being categorised under multiple names: Generation Y (Shamhuyenhanzya et al, 2016), net generation and Generation @ (Tanyel et al, 2013) to name a few. Furthermore, Howe and Strauss (2000) claimed that the millennial generation were those born between 1982 and 2000, however this age range has not been used by all academics. According to Tanyel (2013), Millennials are commonly grouped as being born between 1980 and 2000 however Shamhuyenhanzya (2016) uses the age range of 1975 to 2000, whilst Ozcelic (2015) uses 1981 to 2000. Though these age ranges do not differ by too much, it could be argued that any overlaps in the generational cohorts could cause confusion when talking about characteristics. Tynan (2016) has criticised using age as a way of identification by stating that lifestyles should be segmented instead, with millennial occupations ranging from teachers to lawyers, it suggests that their buying behaviours may differ contributing to different product interests and motivations for engaging.
The characteristics of millennials largely depend on which perspective is taken. Ordun (2015) identifies a pessimistic and optimistic view on the millennial cohort. The pessimistic view perceives Millennials as lazy, irresponsible and impatient, whereas, the optimistic view perceives them as open minded, motivated and social (Ordun, 2015). Paulin et al (2014) claims that the cohort is often described as being homogenous, although, Gurău (2012) argues this as studies are showing that this is not the case as it is too general. Having had a large exposure to technology and the internet from a young age, millennials understand digital language and platforms resulting in them being labelled as ‘digital natives’ and ‘technology savvy’ (Kilian et al, 2012). In contrast, Ogbeide et al (2013) claims that millennials are technology dependent rather than ‘savvy’ as millennials feel that they cannot live without technology but do not understand how it works. Tanyel et al (2013) claims that millennials regard their mobile devices and computers as an essential part of their life contributing to millennials being the first cohort to use digital media more than they use traditional media which has changed the way in which brands advertise.

2.2 Millennial Social Media Usage

According to Bolton et al (2013), academics largely agree on millennials’ social media usage frequency, however, there is little agreement on their activity. Underwood et al (2011) used a cluster analysis to identify undergraduate’s Facebook usage which revealed three usage groups: high broadcaster, high communicators and high interaction group. This shows the multiple ways users can use Facebook. Millennials have become so engaged in social media that they are creating their own digital identity, which is multiple images of the millennial that they share over the digital
world (Dalton and Crosby, 2013), suggesting that social media is a fundamental part of a millennials’ life providing brands an effective platform to engage millennial consumers, especially with Smith and Gallicano (2015) finding that millennials feel the need to engage with brands if the posts are relevant to who they are.

Being technology literate, millennials are relaxed when using the internet (Ozcelik, 2015) which contributes to their desire to be connected through social interactions (Hanson et al, 2010). According to Paulin et al (2014) millennials quickly embrace new online communication tools with social media being a prime way to engage with organisations. According to Muk and Chung (2014), college students have high social media usage rates which is driven by the need to connect with their friends. This links with the Uses and Gratification Theory (UGT) which identifies consumers’ media behaviour by assuming consumers select a type of media to satisfy their psychological needs rather than the media affecting them (Basak and Calisir, 2015). Moore (2012) applied the UGT and found that millennials use interactive technology for entertainment and exploration as well as engage in market research through a variety of platforms, such as blogs. Voorveld and Goot (2013) found that 95% of millennials are online and spend their time multitasking on a variety of social media platforms, which suggests they use multiple platforms to satisfy their psychological needs.

According to Bolton et al (2013), studies have shown that millennials are active content contributors and look towards social media sites as they allow participation, with Rawnet (2015) claiming that 40% of millennials want brands to let them influence product development. Bolton et al (2013) further claims that the millennials feel important when giving feedback about the products they use. Over social media,
millennials want to participate and co-create with brands that they like (Lantos, 2014). Pitta (2012) claims that millennials are independent and therefore decide for themselves how they want to engage on social media, which they see as a platform to establish relationships with their favourite brands. Engagement with brand posts can occur through liking, commenting and sharing, leading to their friends also being able to see that post (Erkan, 2015), showing how brands who generate engagement can achieve high exposure in a short period of time.

2.3 Millennial Brand Engagement

Muk (2013) conducted a study on the factors that influence millennials in liking brand pages by considering two dimensions: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. The results showed that millennials were influenced to join brand pages through both their attitude and social influences with attitudes towards content on social media being enhanced when the content is informative and easy to access, providing brands an effective way to increase millennial engagement. Weyland (2011) claims millennials are attracted to strong brands as they can understand that they are more than just a product or service and appreciate their values, suggesting that the stronger the brand the greater the millennials’ engagement.

Hanson et al (2010) considers millennials as a social generation as they look to remain connected with friends and family. Further to this, Smith and Gallicano (2015) claim that millennials like to engage with brands in order to stay up to date with their activities and any trends. Shamhuyenhanzya et al (2016) states that a cause of millennials engaging with brands is through peer pressure as they are dependent on friends’ advice, with Muk (2013) also stating that millennials have a psychological need
to be socially accepted, therefore when they receive invitations from their friends to
join a brand page they may perceive it as a conformity pressure to accept. Raacke and
Bonds-Raacke (2015) have linked having less friends on Facebook with low self-esteem
suggesting millennials will actively look to connect with friends allowing an increase in
conformity leading to increased brand engagement.

Further to this Adkins (2016) suggests millennials’ engagement is largely dependent
on technology suggesting that brands should be using the same online platforms as
Millennials to increase the chance of engagement. O’Leary (2015) conducted a survey
on Millennials aged 18-29 and found that there are five traits that millennials look for
in brands: Truthfulness, Authenticity, Sociability, Maturity and Humility to connect.
Rawnet (2015) claims that millennials will be attracted to brands that offers an
experience across all touchpoints, suggesting that if a brand can do this along with
combining the five traits, they can generate brand engagement.

Brands are trying to reach millennials on platforms such as social networks
(Anonymous, 2015b) and according to Mangold and Smith (2012), social media is the
most popular platform for product discussion, with the millennial generation talking
about products and services more than the rest of the population with 56% of them
using online communities on social media as their platform for discussion compared
to 35% of the rest of the population. Felix et al (2017) states that research has shown
that consumers expect brands to engage with them over social media through the use
of hashtags or mentioning the brand in a comment. According to Phua et al, (2016),
consumers are more engaged when the content of the brand page is updated
frequently. However, O’Leary (2015), states that millennials can become tired of
brands that are constantly on their newsfeed, suggesting brands should be careful with the frequency of their advertising. Furthermore, Knittel et al (2016) found that over one third of their millennial respondents would avoid a brand if they deemed the advertising to be distasteful, suggesting brands need to understand millennials preferences. Adkins (2016) argues that Millennials are more likely to be disengaged customers with one in four being fully engaged with brands and that they are more likely to be brand destroyers rather than advocates.

2.4 Co-Creation

Co-creation describes how organisations create value through a participatory process between people and the organisation (Ind and Coates, 2013) with Fernandes and Remelhe (2015) identifying co-creation as a revelation of customer engagement behaviours. Co-creation has been broadly defined as the creation of value from the consumers by Zwass (2010) who categorises co-creation into two activities: sponsored and autonomous. Sponsored co-creation occurs under the supervision and orders of the producers where Autonomous co-creation happens through voluntary participation by the consumer. Co-creation is a result of a shift between a goods-dominated logic to a service-dominated logic approach (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). A goods-dominated logic approach refers to value being created through the consumers purchasing goods that the suppliers produce which is value in exchange, whereas, the service-dominated logic approach refers to the consumers interacting and engaging with the suppliers in the design and production phases of product development which is value in use. (Payne et al, 2009). Through co-creation a consumer can make organisations aware of their preferences and needs creating a situation where the
consumer gets a product or service that is tailored to their preferences and the
organisations gets knowledge which helps them create a competitive advantage,
through customer loyalty and satisfaction (Zhang and Cheng, 2008), showing the
power is now with the consumer (Kotler and Keller, 2009). Vargo et al (2008) furthers
this by claiming that organisations can only offer value as a proposition which is then
turned into value by the consumer, although this means the consumer always has to
be involved in the creation of value (Grönroos, 2011).

The literature reveals many different types and activities of co-creation showing that
this is still an emerging concept. Galvagno and Dalli (2014) conducted a literature
review on the current theory of value co-creation and found that the concept is looked
at from different perspectives with academics wanting clarification of the meaning.
For example, Galvagno and Dalli (2014) found that there have been consumer studies’
cultural perspective, innovation studies and the service science perspective with
Saarijärvi et al (2013) claiming the wide varieties of contributions has led to a plethora
of definitions and perceptions of co-creation causing confusion on how actors create
value. Ind and Coates (2013) argues that the nature of value co-creation depends on
the perspective that is taken, which leads on to the debate of whether the consumer
is leading the organisation in the creation of value or vice versa. Value co-creation has
been defined by Ind et al (2013) as a collaborative process between an organisation
and stakeholders that creates value which benefits those involved. However,
according to Ekman et al (2016), value is subjective, therefore stakeholders may
perceive the outcomes of the collaboration differently, along with value being difficult
to measure and monetise which could make it difficult to measure how successful the
process was. Because of the lack of clarification, there is no agreement on who the
organisation is co-creating value with, as different definitions refer to different actors. Zwass (2010) argues that the participants in co-creation are commonly the consumers, although Kaufmann et al. (2016) argue that the employees can be also co-creators of value and Pera et al. (2016) state that the literature is starting to accept that value is created by multiple stakeholders. This suggests that for organisations to achieve the benefits of co-creation, they need to better understand how value is made and by whom.

2.5 Social Co-creation and the Rise of Social Media

Social co-creation is an emerging concept that is defined as a method of using social media as a platform to allow consumers to engage in co-creation activities and create value which in turn reduces the cost of interaction making the process more efficient (Kang, 2014). Rathore et al. (2016) therefore argues it is essential for organisations to use social co-creation in order to achieve maximum value from customer engagement.

Social co-creation is emerging due to the rise in social media. Over the past twenty years, technology has been changing at an unprecedented rate (Moore, 2012). This can be seen in the early 2000’s when the ‘hype’ around social media started with the likes of Facebook dominating the social media scene and then the introduction of Twitter and Instagram from 2010 furthering its popularity (Lomborg, 2017). Social media is a set of online tools that through collaboration and interaction with users, idea sharing, content editing and relationship building is supported (Mount and Matinez, 2014). Through the ability to express yourself and allowing two way communication leading to user generated content and social co-creation, social media has become increasingly important to brands as it empowers the consumers through
online word of mouth (Erkan, 2015) which has led to 96% of businesses having an account on at least one SNS platform in an attempt to increase their exposure and attract traffic to their brand pages (Phua et al, 2016), which many brands are creating allowing them to update their consumers and generate more intimate relationships (Gao and Feng, 2016). More advertisers are looking toward social media to promote their brands to reach the millennial audience in attempts to engage them through recommendations and comments (Logan, 2014). According to Prescott (2016), 63% of people use social networking and with three in four people having used Facebook in the last three months, it is the largest social media platform with 1.59 billion users with a daily usage rate of over one billion people (Mintel, 2016a).

In addition, Web 2.0 has contributed to the rise in social media. Web 2.0 is the range of web based technologies that allow engagement among users and alongside social media it allows those users to share digital content with people all over the world (Ballew et al, 2016). According to O’Reilly (2005) Web 2.0 followed Web 1.0 after the dotcom bubble burst in 2001 and this has led to static read only applications to ones allowing participation in content editing which is generating new ways for users to interact and share knowledge (Cheong and Lundry, 2012). This is allowing users to navigate through virtual content with limited restrictions which influences co-creation rather than observational behaviours (Ballew et al, 2015).

2.6 Motivations to Co-create

The literature revealed that motivation behind engagement in the co-creation process is a fairly new research area. Academics have started to look into what motivates
consumer to co-create, although use a variety of psychological theories. This suggests that further research is needed to narrow down what the main motivations behind engaging in co-creation are. Marketers spend a lot of time and money motivating consumers into buying their products, and consider connecting with their customers as a main concern (Sobh and Martin, 2011). Motivation looks at why people do what they do (Martinez-Canas et al, 2016) and is defined as a force that stimulates an action and the amount of effort they assign to that action (Nwankwo et al, 2014). By understanding what motivates consumers, a brand can increase the amount of consumers to participate in the co-creation process which could help reduce their costs.

Martinez-Canas et al (2016) state that when looking at motivation from a psychological perspective, it falls into either intrinsic or extrinsic motivations, which was a common theme found in the literature. Intrinsic motivation refers to completing a task in order to gain personal satisfaction, such as fun and enjoyment, whereas, extrinsic motivation refers to completing a task for the expected outcomes, such as rewards (Bittner and Schipper, 2014). Fernandes and Remelhe (2015) identified that intrinsic motivations were more important than extrinsic motivations when participating in co-creation. Zwass (2010) found that extrinsic motivations only contribute to goal commitment, suggesting that their motivation could be limited. Therefore Fernandes and Remelhe, (2015) state that a combination of both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations will be the most effective approach. Reiss (2012) criticises the use of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation altogether by claiming that humans are too complex and therefore categorising motivations into two categories is too broad. This could be a contribution to the many theories being used to describe motivations.
behind co-creation. For example, Tang et al (2016) have linked the self-determination theory with intrinsic motivation as humans are intrinsically motivated to challenge themselves and engage in activities that are interesting. Tang et al (2016) also link the social exchange theory with extrinsic motivation by stating interactions are based on the exchange of tangible or intangible resources.

Trying to avoid negative end states and trying to achieve positive end states is how humans behave according to goal literature (Sobh and Martin, 2011). Roberts et al (2014) states that one motivation for engaging in co-creation is the desire for new or better products. This suggests that consumers will co-create in order to produce a product that helps them satisfy their needs and achieve a positive end state. Further to this Petri and Jacob (2016) states that consumers will co-create if they identify a problem in which they do not have the required resources for the solution and will see the brand as a means to solve their problem.

It is difficult to pinpoint the main motivations for participating in co-creation, mainly because (Roberts et al, 2014) found that motivations differ across the varying types of co-creation, although they also found that there are overlapping motives for engagement regardless of the co-creation activity. For example, co-creating on an individual level was largely through egocentric motives such as, developing personal skills, whilst co-creating on a community level was driven by altruistic motives, such as, achieving intrinsic needs (Roberts et al, 2014). This suggests that if a brand can identify overlapping motivations, they can successfully encourage consumers to partake in multiple co-creation activities. According to Fernandes and Remelhe (2015), there is an increased desire for consumers to engage in co-creation but before they
engage, they will compare the costs to the benefits, for example, the time they give up in return for financial rewards. Organisations should therefore try to reduce the perceived costs of co-creating and increase the perceived benefits. If a brand can understand common motivations in why consumers engage with them, it could help motivate more consumers to co-create and help the organisation create value and a competitive advantage. However, Fuller (2010) argues that a consumer’s personality can affect what motivates individuals in engaging. This along with differing motivations can make it difficult to identify the main motivations, showing the importance of finding any overlaps in motivations.

2.7 Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) Model

Kennedy and Guzman (2016) used word association to identify what came to the mind of millennials when thinking about why they co-create. This generated a variety of motivations in which the most frequent were placed in a further survey where a different set of millennials rated each motivation on a Likert scale. This generated a model containing 12 motivations which proved to have significance as a motivating factor. The reason for this being tested is that Roberts et al (2014) has indicated motivations differ depending on the type of co-creation alongside Tynan (2016) arguing millennials are not the same. This will allow the researcher to identify any differences inside the millennial cohort in conjunction with any overlapping motivations. The five components being tested are: Social, Fun, Brand Identification, Communication Appeal and Brand Communication (Appendix 1).
2.8 Gender Differences in Engagement and Consumption

A common way to analyse consumer differences is through gender with research finding differences in the behaviour of males and females in their consumption behaviours (Kolyesnikovo et al, 2009). For example, Tifferet and Herstein (2012) used the Impulsive trait scale and identified that women were more impulsive buyers than men.

It is understood that the usage of social media is similar between males and females (Muk, 2013), however, the way in which they use social media and their motivations to use social media is different (Kimbrough et al, 2013). Hupfer and Deltor (2007), claims that male and females react differently to marketing communications, for example, agentic messages that express self-interest are more persuasive for males, whereas females are more persuaded by communications that are about helping others. This is backed up by the social role theory. The social role theory states that social actors are expected to behave in certain ways based on the norms, duties and expectations of a certain social role (Zhao et al, 2013). The social role theory expects Men to be more agentic as they are more task focused and try to gain independence, whereas women are considered as being communal because they look to be more interactive and create social bonds (Kimbrough et al, 2013). Porter et al (2012), identified men like the opportunity to influence organisations which suggests they are more engaged in co-creation. According to Mintel (2015), male and female brand engagement differs between product industries. For example, in food and drink industries, 66% of males engage in comparison to 71% of females and in the fashion industry, 63% of males compared to 71% from females. This also suggests that females
are more engaged with brands on social media as well as suggesting that brands need to tailor their communication efforts depending on whether they are targeting males or females. Vieceli and Shaw (2010) found a relationship between brand knowledge and brand salience with shampoo products in the FMCG industry, suggesting awareness plays a role in engagement levels.

Fugate and Phillips (2010) state that research shows that male and female consumption behaviour leaves them purchasing products related to their gender identity and feel uncomfortable buying products that are perceived to be made for the other sex. This suggests that their consumption behaviour is predictable. However, it could be argued that certain distinctions in gender differences are becoming blurred. Zayer and Neier (2011) mentions how men are now buying grooming products for themselves which was known to be an industry dominated by women, with brands such as Proctor and Gamble becoming more aware of the potential of the men’s grooming industry. Porter et al (2012) looked at the difference in trust levels between males and females in virtual communities as trust is seen as an essential part of online strategies. Porter et al (2012) found that despite similar internet usage, women have less trust online in comparison to men, however, when women exhibit trust it is a lot stronger which is likely to lead to higher sales and profits for the brands. This could contribute to why males prefer online shopping to women as women do not trust it and find it less satisfying (Meyers-Levy and Loken, 2015). Furthermore, Barber et al (2009) found that when looking for sources of information to gain product knowledge, males tend to look for published material whereas females look to their close friends for advice. This suggests that males are more online orientated and could therefore have higher intentions to engage in social co-creation.
2.9 Conclusion:

This literature review has underlined some of the main themes in the literature surrounding co-creation, millennials and gender differences. Co-creation is identified as an emerging concept with a lack of consensus around the definition and what the motivations are, showing the importance of identifying overlapping motivations to provide clarity. Furthermore, millennials are identified as being an actively engaging cohort although the cohort as a whole lacks consensus on who they are. Furthermore, the literature suggests that male and females are different in terms of how they use social media, suggesting there will be difference in the levels of engagement.
3.0 Methodology

The following chapter will give an overview on the methods used to conduct both primary and secondary research. This section will also give an overview on the data analysis and sampling techniques used to help answer the objectives.

3.1 Research Philosophy

Research philosophy is essentially the development of knowledge (Saunders et al, 2009) with a common problem in student dissertation research being the selection of the correct philosophy effecting the direction of the research (Mkansi and Acheampong, 2012). Research incorporates both reasoning and observation and it is important to consider the underlying philosophical nature of the research as it can help clarify the research design (Cooper and Schindler, 2011). This will allow the researcher to critically evaluate different approaches, allowing the discovery of the most appropriate and most effective method (Frank, 2003).

3.2 Epistemology and Ontology

As identified in the literature, motivation is a force depicting why people act in certain ways (Martinez-Canas et al, 2016), with (Fuller, 2010) stating that personality results in differing motivations in co-creation, suggesting there are differences in the reasons behind why people do things. Therefore the research philosophy will need to take an epistemological approach. Epistemology is concerned with what the acceptable knowledge is in a particular area of study (Saunders et al, 2009) and considering it can be about knowledge and justification, Audi (2005) states that perception is a key as
everything that is seen is seen with a certain perception that forms the basis of knowledge.

The epistemological view of the researcher must be in line with their own ontological view (Klenke, 2016). Ontological beliefs can have an effect on how objective the relationship is between the researcher and what can be known (Killam, 2013). Ontology refers to the way in which we view the world (Garner et al, 2009) and what the nature of reality is, affecting how research is conducted (Klenke, 2016). The researcher perceives that motivational differences between the millennial cohort exist based on what was found in the literature, which can be measured through quantitative methods.

3.3 Positivism

This dissertation used the quantitative research paradigm which can be known as positivism by having a large emphasis on numerical data (White and Rayner, 2014). Positivism emphasises that knowledge is created through observing objective facts (Cooper and Schindler, 2011) and that the only acceptable knowledge is knowledge which comes from experience (Blaikie, 2009). This approach allows the researcher to view the world objectively and through the use of quantitative methods, knowledge can be created and generalised (Belk, 2007). Frank (2003) states that the positivist approach is criticised by not allowing any in-depth knowledge on human behaviours.

3.4 Deductive

Being a method of logical argument leading to conclusions, the deductive approach tests theories (Coolican, 2013). These theories can be generated from a collection of
literature and then through empirical observations, they can be tested (Lancaster, 2004). Data that is collected will lead to the researcher either accepting or rejecting the theory (White and Rayner, 2014). Both primary and secondary data was used in order to try and answer the three objectives of this dissertation. The secondary data was collected from a range of sources including academic journals and text books. This data was used to form the literature review and influenced the questions in the questionnaire, forming theories in which the researcher tested.

3.5 Quantitative data

Quantitative data focuses on data collection in order to generate discussions on certain concepts (Goertz and Mahoney, 2012). The data collected can be interpreted through the use of statistics (Lancaster, 2004). One of the main ways to evaluate the success of quantitative data is the ability to generalise the results to the rest of the population (Polit and Beck, 2010). Considering the nature of quantitative research, collection and the results of the study are easier to replicate than quantitative allowing greater generalisability (Lyons and Doueck, 2010), which is why quantitative was selected over the qualitative approach.

3.6 Research Strategy

The collection of primary data was completed through an online survey on Qualtrics. Qualtrics allowed the online survey to be distributed over social media as a status posted by the researcher on social media allowing participants to share the post with those in the target sample. According to Denscomb (2007) an advantage of using an internet-based questionnaire is that the results automatically get analysed which increases the accuracy of the analysis and therefore reducing the chance of human
errors and increasing validity. As students are ‘technology savvy’ (Denscomb, 2007) any limitations arising from the reliance of technology are eliminated. Further to the internet questionnaire, a printed version was distributed which is discussed in the sampling techniques section below. The results from the printed questionnaire were uploaded to Qualtrics so they could be analysed. The reason a questionnaire was used to collect data was because it can generate a lot of responses over a short time period (Saunders et al, 2009). If an interview was used, more in-depth data could be generated, however they are time-consuming and with the vast amount of millennial students, it would be too time-consuming generating a sufficient sample (Brace, 2013).

3.7 Pilot Questionnaire

A pilot questionnaire was administered to 10 individual in a non-marketing related degree which helped eliminate uncertainties in the questions (Saunders et al, 2009). Kennedy and Guzman (2016) found that using the term ‘co-creation’ would not be appropriate as it is jargon so not common to most millennial students. Further to this, the participants did not understand what brand engagement was, therefore, interacting and communicating on social media was used and the components of brand engagement were explicitly stated.

3.8 Sampling Methods

The online questionnaire was administered to a sample of the millennial student population by using two non-random sampling methods: snowball and convenience (Bajpai, 2011). This allows results to be generated quickly and at a lower cost compared to a using a census of the whole population (Lim and Ting, 2013).
The main sampling technique used was virtual snowball sampling over social media, which is using respondents to refer the questionnaire to others in the target population until the required sample is collected (Hair, 2016). Baltar and Brunet (2012) found that virtual snowball sampling response rate are higher compared to the traditional snowball method, hence why it was selected. An issue that arises is that snowball samples often produce homogenous samples Saunders et al (2008), although there is not too much disparity in millennial students, reducing the effects of this problem.

In order to reach the desired response rate of 80 students, a convenience sampling method was also used, which is selecting participants to participate based on being conveniently placed to provide information and is a good way of getting results quickly (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). The convenience sample was generated from individuals in Cardiff Metropolitan’s library. Studies using convenience sampling sometimes suffer from lack of generalisability (Greener, 2008), however, as stated, there is not too much variation within the millennial student populations, reducing the effect of this.

3.9 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire incorporated four sections in order to answer the objectives, however only three were analysed. This dissertation was passed by the ethics committee and to comply with ethical procedures, the first question on the questionnaire required the participant to read the participant information sheet to make sure they have understood what is required of them. This also made sure that
the participant was a millennial student. A number of questions throughout the questionnaire were inspired from Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model on co-creation motivations and Fraday (2015) who conducted research on brand engagement. As stated, the questions were influenced by the literature review, in particular Brodie et al (2011) who stated that customer engagement can vary from non-engaged, marginally engaged, engaged and highly engaged and Erkan (2015) who stated that engagement can be done through liking, sharing, commenting and inviting friends to join brand posts and pages. The questions were mainly closed questions, however a small number of open questions were included to allow extra information. The final section incorporated a Likert Scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. This was used to test Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model (Appendix 1) on millennial students. A more detailed justification on the questionnaire design is included in appendix 5.

3.10 Methods of Analysis

The research focused on collecting data for analysis. Through the completion of the questionnaire, a range of numbers were generated. These numbers on their own meant very little as they could be interpreted in many ways, therefore, it was important for the researcher to select the appropriate method of analysis in order to make sense of the numbers collected and generate meanings (White and Rayner, 2014). The results were analysed using a range of descriptive statistics, such as the mean, mode and standard deviation and a T-Test to test the significance of gender differences. If the P value was less than 0.05, then a significant difference was determined. Section 1 which consists of questions 1–3, were analysed through the use
of Pie Charts. A pie chart is a simple way of displaying information from a range of subgroups and is most effective when there are a small number of subgroups (Morris and Thanassulis, 2007).

3.11 Limitations

Due to the nature of research, a number of limitations arise. Firstly, the use of a questionnaire can lead to biases such as social desirability bias (Brace, 2013) but ultimately there will be a lack of in depth data compared to other methods. Furthermore, although the virtual snowball sampling method reached respondents in a variety of places around the country, the majority of responses originated from Cardiff, which could cause homogeneity within the sample. One major limitation was that the main platform for the virtual snowball sample was Facebook. This could result in Facebook being the most selected option for social media use. However, the use of a convenience sample will help reduce this effect. This dissertation initially had an additional objective about frequency of engagement across the Fast Moving Consumer Goods Industry. Due to the restrictions of the word limit, the objective has been moved to Appendix 2 for further research.

3.12 Conclusion

This chapter discussed that the main data collection was through a questionnaire which was completed through using a convenience and virtual snowball sample. This generated data that had been for analysis in the next chapter.
4.0 Results, Analysis and Discussion

This chapter will be analysing the data collected from the online questionnaire. The data has been presented in a pie chart and bar graphs alongside using a range of statistics which include the mode, mean, standard deviation and T-tests to identify if there are significant gender differences.

4.1 Section 1: Suitability of Respondents

This section looked at the suitability of the respondents to make sure they were students. Out of the 85 responses, five respondents did not match the criteria so their results were not analysed which left the study with 80. Questions 1 and 3 have been placed in appendix 6 as they do not help answer the objectives.

4.1.1 Gender

The literature suggests that there are similarities in the usage of social media between male and females (Muk, 2013), but differences in other consumption behaviours (Fugate and Phillips, 2010). Figure 1 illustrates the gender split of the questionnaire respondents.
Both males and females have been equally represented in the study with 52.50% for males and 47.50% for females. This allows a valid comparison of gender differences in both brand and social media engagement and motivations for social co-creation.

4.2 Section 2: Student Brand Engagement and Social Media Usage

Section 2 aimed to identify social media usage and engagement levels amongst students and compare the results to the literature to identify any differences or similarities in the millennial cohort. The mode was used to identify the most frequent answer. The ‘Other’ option for questions 4 and 5 were placed in appendix 7 due to the low response rate allowing no identifiable themes.
4.2.1 Frequency of social media usage on different platforms

The literature suggests that millennials are avid users of social media (Muk and Chung, 2014) through quickly adapting to new communication methods (Paulin et al, 2014). Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the platforms most adopted and used by students.

![Figure 2: Q4 - Which of the following social media platforms do you use?](image)

The results in Figure 2 show that Facebook is the most used social network platform with a modal value of 96.25%. This result coincides with Mintel (2016a) and Prescott (2016) who identify Facebook as the most popular social media platform which is furthered by Figure 3 which shows students use Facebook the most in a week with a modal value of 63.75%. With multiple selections being allowed, respondents further identified Snapchat (80%) and Instagram (70%) to be popular platforms. This shows that students are using multiple social media platforms agreeing with Voorveld and Goot’s, (2013) study which claimed millennials multitask through multiple social media accounts. This suggests brands should be using Facebook as their main method
of engaging students. Furthermore, interactions can be made on Instagram and Snapchat but should not be the sole method of communication with students.

Figures 2 and 3 further identify that LinkedIn had a low choice count in terms of usage (22.50%) and frequency (0%) agreeing with Muk and Chung’s (2014) research who identified that millennials like to use social media to connect with friends. With LinkedIn being a networking site, it provides a poor platform for peer engagement explaining the low choice count. Therefore, brands should look to platforms that put emphasis on peer engagement.

Figures 4 and 5 offer a comparison between male and female usage and frequency.
Figures 4 provides no significant gender difference (P=0.84). This agrees with the extant literature with Muk (2013) identifying similar social media usage levels between male and females. This is furthered as Figure 5 also shows no significant gender difference (P=0.64). This means that both male and female students are utilising social media in similar ways making it easier for brands to connect with them.

4.2.2 Engagement with Social Media and Brand Pages

Brands are trying to contact millennials through social media, suggesting engagement levels are high (Anonymous, 2015b). Figures 6 and 7 illustrate the students’ frequency of engagement with social media and brand pages. The figures were influenced by Brodie et al (2011), who stated that there were four levels of engagement: non-engaged, marginally engaged, engaged and highly engaged.

4.2.3 Social Media Engagement

The literature suggests that student social media engagement should be high. Figure 6 illustrates the amount of time students spend on social media.
Figure 6 shows that students are engaged with social media with 5-25 hours being the mode with 66.25% of the respondents. This agrees with the extant literature. Hanson et al (2010) states millennials are a social generation and Muk and Chung (2014) found high usage rates from college students. This could mean millennials are using social media as part of their daily lives, providing brands an effective tool to engage students, especially with Facebook being identified as the most used platform.

4.2.4 Brand Page Engagement

The literature suggests that students should be following multiple brands on social media. Figure 7 illustrates how engaged students are with brand pages.
Figure 7: Q7 - How many organisation/brand pages do you like or follow on Social Media?

Figure 7 indicates that students are engaging with brand posts with the modal value being 5-15 pages with 27.50% of the respondents. This agrees with the standing literature as Paulin et al (2014) claim millennials perceive social media as a prime way to engage with brands. This suggests brands are appealing to the majority of students encouraging them to engage through liking their page. With brand pages allowing easy communication with the followers, it is important to keep their content contemporary to maintain high engagement.

Figure 8: Gender Analysis for Hours Spent Per Week on Social Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0 hours</th>
<th>Less than 5 hours</th>
<th>5-20 hours</th>
<th>More than 26 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8 shows no significant gender difference in hours spent on social media (P=0.32). This disagrees with the extant literature as Kimbrough et al (2013) claims male and female social media usage is different. Figure 9 further disagrees by showing no significant gender difference for brand pages liked. As the majority of males and females have identified similar levels of engagement, it suggests they use social media in the same way. This means brands do not need to adapt the frequency of their communication or the social media platform used in order to target male or female students.

4.2.5 Types of Brand Engagement

With Figures 6 and 7 identifying students are engaging with brands through liking brand pages, it suggests students are highly engaging. Figures 10, 11, 12 and 13 illustrate student engagement based on the four types of engagement: Reading, Sharing, Commenting and Inviting friends (Erkan, 2015). Figures 12, 14 and 16 will be discussed together due to the similarity in results.
4.2.6 Reading

Figure 10 portrays the frequency of students reading brand posts.

![Bar chart showing frequency of reading brand posts]

Figure 10: Q8 - How often do you read messages posted by the brands you follow on Social Media?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Gender Analysis for Reading Brand Messages

Figure 10 portrays that the majority of students are engaging with brands on a daily or weekly basis in terms of reading brand posts with 38.75% and 31.25% of the respondents retrospectively. This agrees with the extant literature with Smith and Gallicano (2015) finding that millennials like staying up to date with brands and therefore follow them on social media, showing students are perceiving the information on the brand pages useful (Muk, 2013) and are engaging to keep up to
date with the latest affairs. Brands will need to keep up to date with the students’ interests in order to make their content useful to students and maintain that engagement. Figure 11 reveals no gender difference for reading brand pages (P=0.29).

4.2.7 Share/Retweet

Figure 12 illustrates how often students share brand messages.

Figure 12: Q9 - How often do you Share/Retweet messages posted by brands that you follow with others on Social media?

Figure 13: Gender Analysis for Share/Retweet
Figure 12 indicates that the majority of millennials never share or retweet messages posted by brands with the modal score being 76% for ‘Never’. Figure 13 further provides no significant gender difference (P=0.47).

4.2.8 Commenting

Figure 14 portrays the frequency in which students comment on brand posts.

![Figure 14: Q10 - How often do you comment on messages posted by brands that you follow on social media?](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Gender Analysis of Commenting on Brand Posts

Figure 14 indicates that the majority of students are not engaging by commenting on brand pages with the modal score being ‘Never’ with 67.5% of respondents. Figure 15 also provides no significant gender differences (P=0.60).
4.2.9 Inviting Friends

Figure 16 illustrates how often students invite their peers to join brand pages.

Figure 16: Q11 - Do you invite friends to join organisation/brand pages on social media?

Figure 16 indicates that the majority of students do not invite their friends to join brand pages with ‘No’ being the mode with 83.75% of the respondents. Figure 17 further provides no gender difference in terms of peer pressure (P=0.63).

Figures 12 and 14 and 16 contradict the extant literature. Firstly, the literature emphasises the role of peer pressure within the millennial cohort with Muk (2013) describing it as a type of conformity. However, the results suggest peer pressure is low with students as a limited number of students are initiating the pressure due to the low levels of engagement. This means students are not feeling pressured to engage with brands. Furthermore, Bolton et al (2013) stated millennials look to actively
contribute with brands on social media. With engagement through commenting being low, the results contradict this. This could be because Felix et al (2017) found that millennials expect brands to contact them over social media, suggesting brands are expecting students to have the willingness to engage with them and therefore wait for the student. In reality, the brand needs to make the first move in engaging students.

### 4.2.10 Section 2 Summary

After analysing the findings in section 2, the results identified similarities and differences between the millennial cohort and millennial students. Firstly, questions 4-8 largely agree with the literature by showing similarities with students’ high usage rates on social media across a number of platforms and high engagement with brand pages. However, questions 9-11, largely disagree with the literature by identifying a lack of engagement beyond reading brand posts from the students. This means that students are passively engaging with brands rather than active engagement as the literature identifies, implying that students are seeing brand posts but do not feel the need to actively engage with brands, giving the impression the millennial cohort cannot be treated the same.

Section 2 revealed no significant gender differences with $P$ having a value less than 0.05. This agrees with the extant literature as Muk (2013) identifies similar usage rates between male and females. This shows that both males and females are engaging at similar levels, possibly because they have had similar experiences with new social platforms.
4.3 Section 4 – Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model

Section 3 was removed and placed in appendix 2. This section examines the components of Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) Co-creation of Brand Identity Model. Each component will be addressed in order starting with Social. This allows comparison with Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model to see if the motivations are applicable to both social co-creation and co-creation of brand identity and if there are any differences between millennials and millennial students. Each graph has been colour coded to show positive (green), negative (red) and neutral (yellow) opinions. The mean score calculated was analysed at the end of each component to identify whether there is an overlapping motivation. If the mean score is under 3 and therefore the red line on the graph, it shows disagreement with the statement and cannot be considered an overlapping motivation.

4.3.1 Social

The social component of the model contains four elements: Peer Pressure, Popularity, Trend and Social Status. This component evolves around influences in the external environment that will affect engagement level, such as the effect of peers and how contemporary the brand’s image is. (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016).

4.3.2 Peer Pressure

The literature identifies Peer Pressure being a large influence on millennials’ engagement (Shamhuyenhanzya et al, 2016) with it being seen as a means for social
acceptability (Muk, 2013). Figure 18 tests this theory by looking at the influence peer pressure has on students.

Figure 18: Q20 - Peer pressure would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

Figure 19: Gender Analysis of Peer Pressure

Figure 18 indicated that peer pressure was not a contributing factor in engaging in social co-creation with the mean score being 2.79 (±1.19) and 43.75% of respondent indicating a negative opinion. The results contradict the extant literature with Muk (2013) claiming that conformity pressure influences millennials into engaging with brands. This could be because University promotes independence which could be
influencing students in their daily lives and therefore their engagement choices, agreeing with Pitta’s (2012) claim that millennials are independent and choose which brands they engage with. Figure 19 also indicated no significant gender differences (p=0.53).

### 4.3.3 Popularity

The literature has identified that popularity influences millennials based on the presence the brand has in the external environment (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016). Figure 20 aimed to identify whether millennials were influenced by a brand’s popularity.

![Figure 20: Q21 – The popularity of the brand would a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.65  
S.d = 0.99

![Figure 21: Gender Analysis of Popularity](image)
Figure 20 indicates that popularity is a contributing factor in engaging students in social co-creation with the mean score being 3.65 (±0.99) and with 75% of respondents indicating a positive opinion. This agrees with the extant literature as Basak and Calisir (2015) link UGT to media behaviour, suggesting students will engage with brands to satisfy psychological needs, such as gain popularity. This suggests that if brands are deemed unpopular, the students will not feel the need to engage and therefore avoid them. This could be because interactions over social media are often visible among friends, therefore students do not want to be seen engaging with unpopular brands if it puts their status at risk. Figure 21 also indicated significant gender differences (p=0.23).

4.3.3 Trend

The literature shows that millennials engage to keep up to date with current affairs in the external environment (Smith and Gallicano, 2016). Figure 22 illustrates the influence that brands keeping up with trends has on students.

Figure 22: Q22 - Seeing a brand as part of a trend would a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
Figure 23 indicated that keeping up to date with trends was a contributing factor in engaging students in social co-creation with a mean score 3.25 (±0.1.10) and with 63.75% of respondents indicating a positive opinion which agrees with Smith and Gallicano (2013), who identified trends as a motivation for millennial engagement. This shows the importance of brands keeping up to date with trends affecting millennials in order to constantly update their image and inform the students of current affairs. Figure 23 further provides no significance in gender differences (P=0.20).

4.3.4 Social Status

The literature has revealed that individuals want to improve their social status or to be viewed by peers as associated with a reputable brand. Figure 24 illustrates the influence advancing social status has on students’ willingness to engage.
Figure 24: Q23 - Using a brand to advance social status would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

Figure 25: Gender Analysis of Social Status

Figure 24 indicates that engaging with a brand to advance their social status was a contributing factor with a mean of 3.23 (±0.15) and 50% of respondents indicating a positive opinion. This agrees with the standing literature, with Robert’s et al (2016) claiming people are engaged by egocentric motives, suggesting students could be engaging if they have identified an opportunity to increase their skills which could lead to a job with a reputable brand. If brands show opportunities to allow students to develop, the likelihood of students engaging increases. Figure 25 does not produce a significant difference between gender (P=0.10).
4.3.5 Summary

When reviewing the study findings with regard to Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model, figure 26 shows that ‘Peer Pressure’ has a mean of 2.79 which is lower than 3, indicating students largely disagree with this statement. Therefore, based on the findings only three of the four components have a mean score higher than 3. To make Kennedy and Guzman’s model applicable to social co-creation, these changes have been made in Figure 53. Popularity is also portrayed as the most agreed statement with a mean score of 3.65, suggesting brands should focus on gaining popularity with students.

![Figure 26: Mean Scores for Social Component](image)

In terms of gender difference, elements within the Social component all had a P value greater than 0.05 showing no significant difference. This disagrees with the standing literature as Barber et al (2009) claim that women seek advice from friends whilst men rely on published reports. With the P value being greater than 0.05, this is not the case.
for students who show similarity in social influences. This could be because students are exposed to similar environmental stimuli at University, leading to a similar influence.

4.3.6 Fun

The fun component of Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model consists of: Entertainment and Excitement. This component suggests that millennials are influenced by brands who can generate an enjoyment factor through their engagement. Figure 27 and 29 have been discussed together.

4.3.6 Entertainment

The literature identifies personal satisfaction as having a large impact on whether individuals engage with brands. They engage as they enjoy the collaboration with the brands. Figure 27 illustrates the influence entertainment has on students.

Figure 27: Q24 - Entertainment would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
Figure 28: Gender Analysis for Entertainment

Figure 27 indicates that Entertainment is a contributing factor in motivating students to engage in social co-creation with a mean score of 3.96 (±0.83) with 86.25% of respondents indicating a positive response. Figure 28 also reveals no significant difference between male and females (P=0.33).

4.3.7 Excitement

Figure 29: Q25 - Excitement would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
Figure 29 indicates that Excitement was a contributing factor in influencing students to engage in social co-creation with a mean score of 3.81 (±0.92) and 78.75% of respondents indicating a positive response. Figure 30 also indicates no significant difference in gender (P=0.10).

Figure 27 and 29 agree with the standing literature as Moore (2012) found that millennials use digital technology for entertainment purposes, showing students are seeing brand engagement as a form of entertainment and excitement. This suggests that if the students perceive the engagement to be unoriginal and boring, they will be less inclined to engage, showing the importance for brands to understand what stimulates students.

4.3.8 Summary

When reviewing the findings of the Fun component, both Entertainment and Excitement have a mean score above 3, showing they are applicable to social co-creation, providing overlapping motivations. These have both been included in the adapted model in Figure 53. Both elements proved no significant gender differences with P being greater than 0.05. This therefore disagrees with Kimbrough et al, (2013) who suggests that through social role theory, there should be a difference in how male and females are affected by certain influences. This could be because student lifestyles
are similar, therefore what the find the same activities enjoyable. Figure 33 displays the mean score for the Fun component.

Figure 31: Mean Scores for Fun Component

4.3.9 Brand Identification

The Brand Identification component consists of: Similar Values and Social Responsibility. This component identifies that millennials are motivated to engage if they perceive the brand to be similar to themselves and whether they act in an ethical way (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016).

4.3.10 Similar values

The literature shows that millennials are more likely to engage with brands if they identify with the values and can express themselves through the brand (Smith and
Gallicano, 2015: Weyland, 2011). Figure 32 illustrates the influence of having similar values has on student engagement in social co-creation.

![Figure 32: Q26 - Having similar values to a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media](image)

**Figure 32: Q26 - Having similar values to a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media**

![Gender Analysis for Similar Value](image)

**Figure 33: Gender Analysis for Similar Value**

Figure 32 indicates that having similar values to the brand is a contributing factor in motivating students to engage in social co-creation with a mean score of 3.58 (±0.97) and 62.5% of respondents showing a positive opinion. This agrees with the extant literature with Weyland (2011) stating that the appeal of strong brands is that their values can be identified. This suggests that students are identifying brands with similar values and using them as a method of expression. Brands should therefore look to
increase the strength and awareness of their brand so to allow identification. Figure 33 also did not show a significant gender difference (P=0.60).

### 4.3.11 Social Responsibility

The literature suggests that millennials are concerned about how brands operate. If millennials perceive a brand to be socially responsible they are more inclined to engage (Kennedy and Guzman, 2016). Figure 34 illustrates the influence social responsibility has on students.

![Figure 34: Q27 - A brand’s social responsibility would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice Count</th>
<th>Mean=3.40</th>
<th>S.d=0.94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 35: Gender Analysis for Social Responsibility](image)
Figure 34 shows that a brand’s social responsibility is a contributing factor for students engaging in social co-creation with a mean score 3.40 (±0.97) and 58.75% of respondents portraying a positive opinion. This agrees with the extant literature. O’Leary (2015) identified five traits which millennials look for in brands, including truthfulness and humility. This shows students are concerned about whether brands operate in an ethical fashion that benefits society and the environment. This could be because they are concerned about their futures and want brands to commit resources to aspects, such as, sustainability. Brands will need to identify contemporary issues effecting students and prove they are working towards the solution. Figure 35 did not provide a significant gender difference (0.78).

4.3.12 Summary

Having reviewed the findings of the Brand Identification component, both elements have a mean score greater than 3, showing they are appropriate and overlapping for social co-creation and have been placed in the adapted model (figure 53). Similar Values has a greater mean than Social Responsibility, suggesting brands should focus on generating shared values with the students. Significant gender differences were not identified with both components having a P value greater than 0.05 showing no significant gender difference. This disagrees with the literature as Hupfer and Deltor (2007) identifies that women use social media to campaign for the greater good, suggesting females would be influence more by a brand’s social responsibility,
however no significant difference was identified. This could be because male and females identified that having similar values as a brand is a contributing factor in their engagement (Figure 32). If the brand gains a negative reputation through being unethical, then students regardless of gender will not want to have the same negative associations as the brand.

![Figure 36: Mean Scores of Brand Identification Component](image)

**4.3.13 Communication Appeal**

The Communication Appeal component of Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model consists of: Appeal and Advertising. This component suggests that millennials are influenced by the attractiveness of a brand and how they portray themselves in the market.
4.3.14 Appeal

The literature shows that strong brands are influential in attracting millennials (Weyland, 2011). Figure 37 illustrates the extent students are influenced to engage in social co-creation based on a brand’s appeal.

Figure 37: Q28 - The appeal of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media

Figure 38: Gender Analysis for Appeal
Figure 37 indicates that the appeal of a brand is a contributing factor for motivating students to engage in social co-creation with a mean score of 3.84 (±0.97) with 80% of the respondents expressing a positive opinion. These results coincide with Weyland’s (2011) research, who states that millennials are attracted to strong brands as they can develop a more in-depth understanding, which could allow the students to identify with the brand. This means brands need to appeal to students’ interests as those perceived unappealing will generate low engagement levels. Figure 38 provided no significant gender difference (P=0.41).

4.3.14 Advertising and Communication Efforts

The literature shows millennials are influenced by a brand’s advertising and communication. Millennials can become disengaged based on the frequency and the perceived usefulness of the advertising and communication (Muk, 2013). Figure 39 portrays the impact the communication effort has on students.

Figure 39: Q29 - The advertising and communication efforts of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media
Figure 39 indicates that advertising and communication effort is a contributing factor for millennials engaging in social co-creation with a mean score of 3.69 (±0.92) with 70% expressing a positive opinion. This agrees with the extant literature with Phua et al (2016) identifying an increase in engagement with brands that are updating their pages. This is because millennials like keeping up to date with contemporary issues (Smith and Gallicano, 2015). Furthermore Knittel et al (2016) identifies millennials can become bored of advertising if it is updated too frequently or is distasteful. This could lead to disengagement if brands do not put the effort in to identify the ideal frequency students want to see advertisements and identify what is deemed distasteful. Figure 40 provided no significant gender difference within this question (P=0.41).

4.3.15 Summary

After reviewing the findings for the Advertisement and Communication component of Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model, figure 41 indicates that both elements have a mean score above 3, showing that they are appropriate overlapping motivations for social co-creation and can be incorporated into the adapted model (Figure 53). Figure 41 also shows Appeal has a greater mean of 3.84 suggesting brands should focus on
generating positive perceptions from students. Each element did not provide a significant difference in gender with both P values being greater than 0.05. This result contradicts the extant literature. Kolyesnikovo et al (2009) refer to differences between gender behaviour, however these results show similarities. This means both males and females look for brands that are attractive to them with advertising that is not distasteful.

![Figure 41: Mean Scores for Communication Appeal Component](image)

4.3.16 Brand Commitment

The Brand Commitment component of Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model consists of two elements: Brand Loyalty and Brand Recognition. This component suggests that millennials are influenced by aspects such as brand awareness and the degree of loyalty millennials show.
4.3.17 Brand Loyalty

The literature review reveals that loyalty is an advantage generated by co-creation (Cossio-Silva et al, 2016). With Rissanen and Luoma-Aho (2016), stating millenials actively contribute, the literature suggests loyalty should be highly influential. Figure 42 displays the influence brand loyalty has on students in motivating them in engaging in social co-creation.

![Figure 42: Q30 - Brand loyalty would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media](image1)

![Figure 43: Gender Analysis for Brand Loyalty](image2)

Figure 42 shows that Brand Loyalty is a contributing factor in motivating students to engage in social co-creation with a mean score of 3.63 (±0.92) and 65% of respondents...
portraying a positive opinion. The results show that students will engage with brands they have a degree of loyalty to, meaning brands will need to go beyond the students’ expectations in order to keep them loyal and avoid switching to competing brands, therefore disagreeing with Adkins (2016) who states millennials are more likely to be brand destroyers. Figure 43 also shows a significant gender difference (P=0.01) with more females disagreeing that loyalty is a contributing factor with males expressing a neutral opinion.

4.3.18 Brand Recognition

The literature suggests that the stronger the brand, the more influence they have with millennials (Weyland, 2011). With strong brands being recognisable, it suggests that millennials are influenced by brand recognition. Figure 44 illustrates students’ perception on how recognising the brand can influence their engagement in social co-creation.

![Figure 44: Q31 -Being able to recognise the brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media](image-url)

Mean=3.69
S.d=0.93
Figure 45: Gender Analysis of Brand Recognition

Figure 44 indicates that being able to recognise the brand would be a contributing factor in motivating students to engage in social co-creation with a mean score of 3.69 (±0.93) and 68.75% portraying a positive opinion. This agrees with the extant literature as Vieseli and Shaw (2010) found a link between brand knowledge and brand salience. If the brand does not come to the mind of the students then they will not have the awareness needed to engage on social media. Therefore by recognising the brand, they will have a degree of awareness increasing the chance of engagement. This suggests that brands should focus on increasing their brand awareness. Figure 45 also portrays no significant Gender difference (P=0.21).

4.3.19 Summary

After reviewing the results for the Brand Commitment component of Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model, Figure 46 identifies that both elements have a mean score above 3, identifying them as overlapping motivations that can be incorporated in the adapted model (figure 53). Brand recognition has a higher mean score of 3.69, suggesting brands should focus on increasing their recognition with students. Brand loyalty generated a P value less than 0.05, showing a significant gender difference. This agrees with the extant literature as (Porter et al, 2012) identifies different trust
levels between male and females. This could result in brands finding it more difficult to generate loyalty amongst females due to the lower trust levels.

![Figure 46: Mean Score for the Brand Commitment Component](image)

4.3.20 Brand Offering

Brand Offering consists of two elements: Financial Incentives and the Need for a New Product. Brand offering is not a component of Kennedy and Guzman’s Model, however the component has been included based on the literature identifying the two elements as motivations for social co-creation.

4.3.21 Financial Incentives

The literature strongly identifies financial incentives as being a contributing factor for engaging in co-creation (Tang et al, 2016). Figure 47 portrays how financial incentives motivate students to engage with social co-creation.
Financial incentives would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media. Figure 47 portrays that Financial Incentives are a contributing factor in influencing engagement in social co-creation with students. The results provided a mean score of 3.74 (±0.93) and showed 63.75% of respondents expressed a positive opinion. This agrees with the extant literature with Tang et al (2016) linking the social exchange theory with extrinsic motivations, such as financial incentives. With students heavily relying on student finance, the offer of extra income would be enough for students to give up their time and engage in social co-creation. Therefore brands need to offer a range of rewards to students who engage. Figure 48 did not provide a significant gender difference (P=0.50).
4.3.22 New Product

The literature identifies the need for a new product as being a motivation for co-creation as it resembles a problem in which a solution is needed (Roberts et al, 2014). Figure 49 portrays the influence the need for a new product has on students in terms of their engagement.

Figure 49: Q33 - The need for a new product would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media.

Figure 50: Gender Analysis for New Product
Figure 49 illustrates that the need for a new product is a contributing factor in student engagement with a mean score of 3.46 (±1.01) and 55% of respondents expressing a positive opinion. This agrees with the extant literature with Sobh and Martin (2011) stating that in order to avoid negative end state, people engage in co-creation to create new products. Further Roberts et al (2014) states that individuals use brands as a solution to their problems. The student will therefore engage if the brand is viewed as a vehicle to achieve a positive end state. However, this could lead to a one-off interaction. If the brand helps solve the student’s problem, the motivation is eliminated. Figure 50 also provides no significant gender difference (P=0.33).

4.3.23 Summary

After analysing the findings from Brand Offering, Figure 51 illustrates that both elements have a mean score greater than 3. Based on the findings, these can be considered contributing factors in motivating students and have therefore been added to the adapted model as a new component (Figure 53). The results further show that Financial incentives has the greater mean of 3.74, suggesting brands should focus on rewarding students for their engagement. There was no significant gender difference identified within this component with both elements having a P value greater than 0.05. This could be because most students are in a similar situations, for example, student debts, leading both males and females to co-create to achieve the financial incentives or new products.
4.3.24 Summary of Kennedy and Guzman’s Model

After analysing the findings from the five components from the model and the additional component adapted from the literature, Figure 52 presents the mean scores from each component to identify which component has the most influence on students engaging in social-co-creation.
The mean was worked out for each component to assess which component had the greatest influence on millennial students. The calculations included all the elements that had a mean score over 3, helping create the adapted model. The results show that ‘Fun’ had the most influence on student motivations with a mean score of 3.89. Social has the least influence with a mean score of 3.45. This suggests that the primary focus of a brand should be creating an enjoyable experience.

4.3.25 Chapter Summary

This chapter has analysed and made sense of the data collected from the questionnaire and has put it in a form that can answer the objectives. The main findings were the differences between students and the millennial cohort in terms of engagement type, Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) models is not appropriate for social co-creation and there is little differences between male and female students.
5.0 Conclusion

This chapter will look to use the analysed data from the previous chapter to identify whether this dissertation has answered the main objectives that were identified at the start of the dissertation before identifying any areas for further research.

The overarching aim of this dissertation was to identify the main motivations behind student millennials engaging in social co-creation. To identify this, the researcher looked at how frequently students engaged with social media and brands. The literature consisted of secondary research and was used to generate an understanding on how the millennial cohort is perceived which formed a basis of comparison with the primary research findings on millennial students. The main findings in the literature review were that millennials are avid users of social media (Muk, 2013) who saw it as the best way to engage with brands (Paulin et al, 2014). This contributed to the perception of active engagement where they looked to contribute and co-create (Bolton et al, 2013).

5.1 Conclusion 1 – Students show similarities in the usage of social media but differ in engagement levels in comparison to the millennial cohort

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the results is that students are active on social media across multiple platforms. This provides a similarity with the millennial cohort with the literature portraying them as being active (Bolton et al, 2013). This can be seen in figures 8 and 2 which identify high usage rates of Facebook, Instagram and Snapchat. However, the fundamental difference within the cohort is the type of engagement. With Rawnet (2015) claiming 40% of millennials want brands to let them influence products, engagement levels are high with millennials. However, students
do not actively engage with brands on social media. Active engagement would require students to be engaging on a level more than just reading brand posts and liking brand pages. With section 2 of the questionnaire identifying student engagement, the results showed very little engagement on anything above reading brand posts, therefore showing the passive nature students exhibit in engaging with brands. This shows that the millennial cohort is not the same agreeing with Gurău (2012) who stated millennials are not homogenous. This means brands will have to segment the cohort.

5.2 Conclusion 2 – Students can be motivated to engage in social co-creation through six main components and show similarities with the millennial cohort

With Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model identifying 5 components that motivate millennials in co-creating, this provided a range of elements to test the similarity within the cohort. Section 4 of the questionnaire revealed that 11 of the 12 elements can be considered a contributing factor in encouraging students to engage in social co-creation by generating a mean score greater than 3. These include a range of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations which can be combined to create a strong motivational force as discussed by (Fernandes and Remelhe, 2015) in the literature review. Section 4 of the questionnaire further identified an additional component (Brand Offering) which has been placed in the adapted model (Figure 53). However, this component could not be compared to the millennial cohort as it was adapted from the literature and not Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model. The 6 components can be seen in Figure 53. This shows a similarity within the millennial cohort. Although their engagement levels differ, their engagement can be influenced by similar factors with Peer Pressure being the only exception.
5.3 Conclusion 3 – Social co-creation and co-creation of brand identity share a range of overlapping motivations.

Roberts et al (2014) discussed how motivations differ depending on the type of co-creation. Considering the model tested was used for co-creation of brand identities and this dissertation was looking at social co-creation, any motivations that demonstrating a positive opinion with a mean score greater than 3, could be considered an overlapping motivation. As identified, 11 of the 12 motivations proved to be significant, therefore 11 overlapping motivations have been identified, showing there are similarities between the two concepts. Figure 53 is the adapted version of Kennedy and Guzman’s model containing each overlapping motivation.

5.4 Conclusion 4 – Millennial students do not exhibit significant gender differences

After analysing the results from the T-tests, the results indicate that millennial students display similar engagement levels, social media usage and motivations for social co-creation. Each question apart from brand loyalty produced a P value greater than 0.05 showing no significance. This suggests that gender differences are becoming blurred and is not an effective segmentation tool as suggested by (Kolyesnikovo et al, 2009). This contrasts the extant literature. Kimbrough et al, (2013) claims motivations differ between males and female, however only brand loyalty proved to have a significant difference (P=0.01), which could be explained through differing trust levels (Porter et al, 2012). Therefore, students regardless of gender exhibit similar behaviour in terms of social media engagement and motivations for engagement.
5.5 Adapted model for what motivates students to engage in social co-creation

After analysing the findings in figure 26, the results indicated that Peer pressure could not be considered a motivation for millennial students. Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model was therefore deemed inappropriate for engaging students in social co-creation. This meant the model needed to be adapted to be appropriate for social co-creation which can be seen in Figure 53.

Figure 53: Adapted Model for Social Co-creation
Figure 52 illustrated the mean scores generated from the students’ responses for each component in Kennedy and Guzman’s model. This helped form the order in which the adapted model has been presented. Each component has been placed in descending order based on the influence it has in motivating students in engaging in social co-creation. With the Fun component generating the greatest mean score of 3.89, it shows students are influenced by this component the most. Therefore, Fun has been put at the top of the adapted model. Brand Identification generated the lowest mean score of 3.45 showing this component is the least influential on students and has therefore been placed at the bottom.

5.6 Limitations
This dissertation presented a number of limitations. Firstly, the use of a questionnaire as a data collection method was a good way to generate responses quickly to give a good outline on how students engage on social media and to find their motivations. However, this questionnaire would have benefitted from a mixed methods approach. Whilst the data collected provides the researcher with enough data to answer the objectives, it does not give enough for in-depth analysis on aspects such as, the reasons the students are motivated by certain components more than others and why they are only passively engaging. If a qualitative method was use, such as a focus group, the researcher could have the reasoning behind their decisions and identify any further trends, especially as the open questions generated a low response rate.

5.7 Recommendations and further research
With this research generating a model presenting the factors that most influence students in engaging in social co-creation, brands should look to utilise this to target students. Student millennials are active on social media and have an attractive and
educated background (Men and Tsai 2014) which makes them an ideal target for social co-creation. Having a model which ranks the most influential motivations, brands can effectively engage students by offering them the right combination of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. This will allow brands to reduce costs of interactions and increase their efficiency (Kang, 2014).

Furthermore, for brands to target the millennial cohort, they need to segment them based on lifestyle rather than treat the cohort as homogenous. The research has proven that the type of engagement differs within the cohort. Brands will need to identify whether their target demonstrates passive or active engagement as this will affect the extent to which they interact with the brand. If a brand can successfully target those passively engaging with the right incentives, active engagement can be generated allowing value to be created through the co-creation process (Zwass, 2010).

The limitations of this study have identified possible areas for further research by looking into why the students selected their responses in the questionnaire. Furthermore, there has been a comparison between the millennial cohort and millennial students in which a difference was identified. Further research could look at comparing additional sub-groups within the cohort to assess any further similarities or differences within the cohort. For example, millennial lawyers. This could identify any overlapping motivations if an additional type of co-creation is used.
Appendix 1: Kennedy and Guzman’s Model of co-creation of brand identities

(Kennedy and Guzman, 2016)
Appendix 2: Removed Fast Moving Consumer Goods Objective

To critically assess the frequency of interactions from millennial students across product categories in the Fast Moving Consumer Goods Industry.

The dissertation will focus on millennial students engaging in the Fast Moving Consumer Goods Industry (FMCG). Leahy (2011) found that there is a lack of relationship building in the FMCG market due to the lack of personal contact. However, many brands are using co-creation in an attempt to gain consumer knowledge and develop their brand. Walkers’ ‘Do us a flavour’ campaign is a prime example of a FMCG product using co-creation. Consumers were asked to create some new crisp flavours and out of the six chosen they were asked to vote for their favourite, leading to a new flavour produced through co-creation. This campaign was a success by increasing awareness of Walkers with advertisement awareness of people being able to remember the advertisement increasing from 17% to 27% as well as increasing sales by 3% in the first month of the campaign and word of mouth increasing by 4% (Shakespeare, 2014). This provides an interesting topic of debate due to the lack of relationship building but also highlights how campaigns can be successful in terms of awareness and sales.

The fast moving consumer goods market

Fast moving consumer goods are low involvement products due to their low shelf life and low cost and are frequently purchased as they are consumed quickly (Leahy, 2011). Due to high competition, brands in this industry are constantly under pressure to deliver new products (Farmer, 2013). Doyle et al (2006) argue that the short life-cycle of the products has resulted from consumers ever changing desires and the want for a variety of new products and experiences which are often influence by trends. Doyle et al (2006) further say that the need for interaction in industries of this nature is high as it helps achieve a competitive advantage and flexibility in what the brand offers to consumers.

Customer Engagement and loyalty in the Fast Moving Consumer Goods Market

According to Javornki and Mandelli (2012), establishing meaningful interactions and relationships with consumers is especially difficult in the FMCG industry, suggesting that companies may struggle to generate repeat purchases and therefore customer loyalty and with customer loyalty leading to reward benefits such as increased competitive advantage (Chen and Wang, 2016), it could be argued that FMCG companies need to find a way to generate loyalty intentions. Customer loyalty is defined on the basis of attitudinal and behavioural loyalty in a relationship between an organisation and another actor when there are other choices on offer (Wang, 2015). Furthermore, loyalty can also contribute to an organisation’s long term viability (Chen and Chen, 2009). Leahy (2011) conducted a study aiming to establish whether relationships in the FMCG industry existed or not. Using focus groups, Leahy (2011)
found that relationships do not exist in the FMCG industry for multiple reasons, such as, difficulties in generating interactions. In addition, Javornki and Mandelli (2012) found that consumers do not hugely engage with brands in the FMCG industry although through aspects such as a creative approach, they can be persuaded to engage in an online setting.

Brodie et al (2011) argues that customer engagement is dependent on context, suggesting there may be differences in engagement depending on product category. Wirtz et al (2013) found that the amount of involvement a consumer has with a product will affect their engagement levels on online brand communities. Furthermore, Fernades and Esteves (2016) used a convenience sample of 516 individuals across a high and a low contact service setting and found that loyalty and engagement behaviours differed depending on the context. As identified, fast moving consumer goods require little involvement which suggests that engagement levels in the FMCG industry are low. However, (Meister, 2012) states that engaging consumers in online communities will generate more involvement and turn low involvement products into high involvement products by those in the online community suggesting that brands can create engagement in the FMCG market. Javornki and Mandelli, (2012) state that consumers will not engage with brands in the FMGC industry unless their value proposition is offering something unique. A Blue Ocean Strategy is a strategy coined by Kim and Mauborgne (2005), in which they describe the creation of new demand through creating a new uncontested market. Yang and Yang (2011) integrated a value creation model with the Blue Ocean Strategy framework which can help firms achieve a situation where both the firm creates value and the consumer creates value leading to customer retention and acquisition benefits. This shows the importance of creating value and therefore getting consumers engaged in an industry where relationships are difficult to establish.

With co-creation being seen as an engagement behaviour in the literature (Fernades and Esteves, 2016), having low levels of engagement would suggest low levels of social co-creation. However, Leahy and Javornki and Mandelli’s studies were conducted in 2011 and 2012 retrospectively and with the literature identifying the rise in social media which creates a platform that connects individuals with brands, it could be argued that engagement levels could be higher in the FMCG market.
Results:

Q12 – Chocolate Confectionary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you communicate or interact (For example, Liking, Sharing/Retweeting or Commenting)</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chocolate Confectionary gender difference: P=0.73

Q13 - Sweet Biscuits, Snack Bars and Fruit Snacks
Sweet Biscuits, Snack Bars and Fruit Snacks gender difference: P=0.73

Q14 – Soft Drinks Industry

Soft Drink Industry gender difference: P=0.92
**Q15 – Beauty and Personal Care Industry**

How often do you communicate or interact (for example, liking, sharing, retweeting or commenting etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beauty and Personal Care Industry: 0.75

**Q16 – Home Care Industry**

How often do you communicate or interact (for example, liking, sharing, retweeting or commenting etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Yearly</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Home Care Industry gender difference: \( P=0.87 \)

**Q17– Fast Fashion Industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fast Fashion Industry gender difference: \( P=0.09 \)
**Appendix 3: Additional Literature**

**Millennials**

Shamhuyenhanzya (2016) mentions how the millennial cohort has a large amount of spending power. However, referring back to Tynan (2016), millennials have different occupations, such as lawyers and students. This suggests that the spending power throughout the cohort could be varied.

Furthermore, according to Mintel (2016b), 80% of millennials claim their favourite brands are the ones which their friends are also aware of, suggesting peer pressure has a large influence on how the millennial generation perceive brands.

Ordun (2014) furthers this by calling millennials the first global generation as the internet and social networking sites has allowed great connectivity with Moore (2012) claiming that millennials are a part of a cross border cohort due to technology creating homogeneity within the world’s population.

Rawnet (2015) argues that millennials are the reason for the eruption in social media and when considering that some of the most popular social network sites, such as Facebook and Instagram were created by millennials (DeVaney, 2015), it could be argued that the statement is true.

According to Eastman and Liu (2012) a generation cohort is a group of individuals with shared experiences and characteristic. Ozcelik (2015) argues that the millennial cohort differs from all previous cohorts. Generation X are those born between 1961 and 1980 (Gurău, 2012) and grew up with social and economic uncertainty such as the recession in the 1980’s and divorce (Lissista and Kol, 2016). Both Generation X and Millennials are considered to have a high internet adoption rate (Lissita and Kol, 2016).

Rissanen and Luoma-Aho (2016) state that millennials look to be active contributors with brands and look to social media for information about brands, suggesting that their engagement levels are high. In contrast, for example, pictures from fast food restaurants, such as, a Dominos employee sneezing over the food during preparation was easily shared over various social media platforms and was seen by millions in only a few hours which could have had disastrous effects on Dominos’ reputation (Guidry et al, 2015).

Anonymous (2015), states that social media has contributed to brand communities on social media which contribute to greater brand engagement, brand loyalty and brand equity. The term brand community was coined by Muniz and O’Guinn (2001) and refers to a socially structured relationship among a group of people from various geographic locations who all have admiration for the same brand.

The target population for this dissertation was millennial students. With 532,300 individuals entering University in 2015 (UCAS 2015), it shows the unrealistic nature of targeting the whole population.
Appendix 4 – Participants Information Sheet and Questionnaire

Participant’s information sheet

An analysis of Millennial engagement in social co-creation. A study of fast moving consumer goods.

Ethics reference number: 2016DO34G

Project summary

This research will be trying to identify the motivations behind why millennials engage in brand co-creation. By participating you will be providing data which will help complete a dissertation at Cardiff Metropolitan University.

Data collection

The data will be collected through the completion of a questionnaire which should take no longer than 10 minutes. All data collected will be confidential.

Why have you been asked to participate?

You have been asked to participate because you are a millennial student at university and fall in the age range of 18-25. If you decide to join the study you can change your mind and stop at any time, you do not have to give a reason why. Your decision will be respected. There are absolutely no penalties.

Project risks

By undertaking this research you will not be exposed to any risks. Your rights will not be effected if you choose to participate.

How your data will be protected

Any data collected from this questionnaire will be held confidentially. There will be no sensitive data collected so you cannot be identified from your results. The results will be held in a secure location and will be destroyed once analysed and the study has finished.

If you require any further information about this project then please contact: Alfie Cross
Email: st20057767@cardiffmet.ac.uk
Questionnaire (Exported from Qualtrics)

Q1 Have you read and understood the above information?

☐ Yes - I have understood the above information and I am willing to take part in the study and I understand I can ask questions and withdraw at any time and I am currently a student.

☐ No - I do not give my permission

Q2 Gender

☐ Male

☐ Female

Q3 Are you currently studying a degree or equivalent?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q4 Which of the following social media platforms do you use? (Tick all that are appropriate)

☐ Facebook

☐ Twitter

☐ Instagram

☐ Snapchat

☐ LinkedIn

☐ Other (Please State) ________________________________________________

☐ I do not use social media

Q5 Which social media platform do you spend the most time on in a week? (Please tick one option)

☐ Facebook

☐ Twitter

☐ Instagram

☐ Snapchat

☐ LinkedIn

☐ Not Sure

☐ The same amount

☐ Other (Please State) ________________________________________________

☐ I do not use social media
Q6 How many hours per week do you spend on Social Media? (Please tick one option)
- 0 hours
- Less than 5 hours
- 5-25 hours
- More than 26 hours

Q7 How many organisation/brand pages do you like or follow on Social media? (Please tick one option)
- 0 pages
- Less than 5 pages
- 5-15 pages
- More than 16 pages

Q8 How often do you read messages posted by the brands you follow on Social Media? (Please tick one option)
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q9 How often do you Share/Retweet messages posted by brands that you follow with others on Social media? (Please tick one option)
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q10 How often do you comment on messages posted by brands that you follow on social media? (Please tick one option)
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never
Q11 Do you invite friends to join organisation/brand pages on social media? (Please tick one option)
- Yes - Occasionally
- Yes - Frequently
- No

Q12 How often do you communicate or interact (For example, Liking, Sharing/Retiweeting or Commenting) with brands on social media from the Chocolate Confectionery industry? Popular brands in this industry include Dairy Milk, Galaxy and Mars (Please tick one option)
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q13 How often do you communicate or interact (For example, Liking, Sharing/Retiweeting or Commenting on brand posts) with brands on social media from the Sweet Biscuits, Snack Bars and Fruit Snacks Industry? Popular brands in this industry include McVite's, Oreo, Fruit Bowl and Go Ahead (Please tick one option)
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q14 How often do you communicate or interact (For example, Liking, Sharing/Retiweeting or Commenting on posts) with brands on social media from the Soft Drinks Industry? Popular brands in this industry include: Coca-Cola, Pepsi and Fanta (Please tick one option)
- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q15 How often do you communicate or interact (For example, Liking, Sharing/Retiweeting or Commenting on posts) with brands on social media from the Beauty and Personal Care
Industry? Popular brands in this industry include: Right Guard, Dove, Nivia, Lynx and L’oreal (Please tick one option)

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q16 How often do you communicate or interact (For example, Liking, Sharing/Retweeting or Commenting on posts) with brands on social media from the Home Care Industry? Popular brands in this industry include: Fairy, Persil, Cilit Bang and Mr Sheen (Please tick one option)

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q17 How often do you communicate or interact (For example, Liking, Sharing/Retweeting or Commenting on posts) with brands on social media from the Fast Fashion Industry? Popular brands in this industry include: Topshop/Topman, Asos, Next, H&M and River Island (Please tick one option)

- Hourly
- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Never

Q18 Are there any brands that you communicate or interact with on social media on a weekly basis?

- No
- Yes: Please state the brand name(s) on the line below:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Below are a range of statements that include the motivations behind why someone might interact with a brand on social media. Please use the scale provided to rate each
statement based on whether they would motivate you to interact or communicate with a brand over social media, by stating how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

Q20 Peer pressure would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q21 The popularity of the brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q22 Seeing a brand as part of a trend would a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q23 Using a brand to advance social status would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Q24 Entertainment would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q25 Excitement would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q26 Having similar values to a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q27 A brand’s social responsibility would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q28 The appeal of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Q29 The advertising and communication efforts of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q30 Brand loyalty would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q31 Being able to recognise the brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q32 Financial incentives would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Q33 The need for a new product would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
Q34 Are there any other contributing factors for interacting with a brand on social media?

☐ Yes (Please state here)

_______________________________________________________

☐ No
Appendix 5 – Questionnaire Justification

Section 1

The questionnaire incorporated four sections in order to answer the objectives. This dissertation was passed by the ethics committee and to comply with ethical procedures, the first question on the questionnaire required the participant to read the participant information sheet to make sure they have understood what is required of them, what the data is for and that they have understood their rights and will not be exposed to any risks. This also made sure that the participant was a millennial student. A number of questions throughout the questionnaire were inspired from Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) model on co-creation motivations and Fraday (2015) who conducted research on brand engagement.

Section 2

The second section consisted of questions 4-11 and aimed to identify the first objective ‘To critically evaluate millennials’ interactions with brands on social media’. For questions 6-7, the options were based on Brodie et al (2011) who stated that customer engagement can vary from non-engaged, marginally engaged, engaged and highly engaged. Questions 8-10 were used to identify the frequency of brand engagement over social media. The reason for not asking their exact usage was because of the assumption that if the respondent does not actively record their usage or count the brand pages liked, it will likely be a guess effecting the validity of the results. The questions were adapted from Erkan (2015) stating that engagement can be done through liking, sharing, commenting and inviting friends to join. Questions 4-5 were used to try and identify what platforms of social media were used which could lead to identifying what the most popular platforms for social co-creation. Questions 4-5 allowed commentary to identify if there are any other highly used social media sites.

Section 3

The third section had the aim of identifying the second objective ‘To assess differences in engagement across product categories in the Fast Moving Consumer Goods Market’. This section consisted of five different industries from the FMCG industry and the fast fashion industry due to the similar nature between the industries. The six used industries were:

1. Chocolate Confectionary Industry
2. Sweet Biscuits, Snack Bars and Fruit Snacks Industry
3. Soft Drinks Industry
4. Beauty and Personal Care Industry
5. Home Care Industry
6. Fast Fashion

Industries 1, 4 and 6 were selected as reports from Mintel showed that young millennials are highly likely to engage with brands from the fashion, beauty, food and
drink and health care industry (Mintel, 2015 and Mintel, 2016a). The home care industry was selected as Mintel (2015) states that millennials do not like brands that their parents buy. It could be argued that the home care industry is adult dominated which would suggest there would be little engagement. The FMCG industries were selected from Euromonitor (2017) with a selection of the most popular brands (based on market share) being incorporated into the questions to show the participant some of the brands that are in that industry in attempt to avoid any misunderstanding. The questions looked to identify whether there is engagement in these industries and the frequency of which they engage. This will be done through using a continuum ranging from hourly to yearly for those who engage and a never option for those who do not. Question 18 is an open question that asks for names of brands (if any) the participant engages with as this could provide more insight to millennial student brand engagement. The question states for weekly engagement as it suggests more meaningful engagement rather than if they engaged as a one off.

**Section 4**

The final section will aim to identify objective three ‘To explore the motives and drivers that formulate co-creation’. Question 19-30 are results taken from Kennedy and Guzman’s (2016) study which looked to identify the main motivations behind co-creation of brand identities. In their study they proposed a model which has been used with each component of the model being incorporated into a question. By using a Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, the results will show whether these are motives for millennial students engaging in social co-creation or not. Questions 31-32 were added as the literature revealed that people are often motivated by financial incentives and the need for a new product and could therefore potentially be identified as a motive. Question 33 is an open questionnaire allowing the participants to identify any other factors that would motivate them into engaging in social co-creation. If a recurring motivation arises here then it will show a difference in the millennial cohort. This section will also identify whether there are any crossovers in motivations between social co-creation and co-creation of brand identities.
Appendix 6 – Analysed Data and Statistical Analysis

The data generated from the questionnaire was placed in a default summary sheet on Qualtrics.

Default Report

Dissertation
April 30th 2017, 12:03 pm MDT

Q1 - Please select the Yes or No option below to state whether you have understood this information. By ticking Yes you are giving your permission to take part in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - I have understood the above information and I am willing to take part in the study and I understand I can ask questions and withdraw at anytime and I am currently a student.</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No - I do not give my permission</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Q2 - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.50%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.50%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 - Are you currently studying a degree or equivalent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 - Which of the following social media platforms do you use? (Tick all that are appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>96.25%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>51.25%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (Please State)</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do not use social media</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4_6_TEXT - Other (Please State)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other (Please State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WeChat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumblr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club penguin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 - Which social media platform do you spend the most time on in a week? (Please tick one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>63.75%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The same amount</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other (Please State)</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I do not use social media</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other (Please State)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other (Please State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whatsapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WeChat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 - How many hours per week do you spend on Social Media? (Please tick one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 hours</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less than 5 hours</td>
<td>26.25%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-25 hours</td>
<td>66.25%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More than 26 hours</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 - How many organisation/brand pages do you like or follow on Social media? (Please tick one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 pages</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less than 5 pages</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5-15 pages</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More than 16 pages</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 - How often do you read messages posted by the brands you follow on Social Media? (Please tick one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>38.75%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 - How often do you Share/Retweet messages posted by brands that you follow with others on Social media? (Please tick one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 - How often do you comment on messages posted by brands that you follow on social media? (Please tick one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>67.50%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11 - Do you invite friends to join organisation/brand pages on social media? (Please tick one option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - Occasionally</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes - Frequently</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.75%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20 - Peer pressure would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>26.25%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21 - The popularity of the brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The popularity of the brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22 - Seeing a brand as part of a trend would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeing a brand as part of a trend would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48.75%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100% 80
Q23 - Using a brand to advance social status would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using a brand to advance social status would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q24 - Entertainment would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66.25%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25 - Excitement would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excitement would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q26 - Having similar values to a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having similar values to a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48.75%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q27 - A brand’s social responsibility would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A brand’s social responsibility would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q28 - The appeal of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The appeal of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q29 - The advertising and communication efforts of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The advertising and communication efforts of a brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with that brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q30 - Brand loyalty would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brand loyalty would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q31 - Being able to recognise the brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to recognise the brand would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q32 - Financial incentives would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q33 - The need for a new product would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The need for a new product would be a contributing factor in interacting with a brand on social media</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41.25%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q34 - Are there any other contributing factors for interacting with a brand on social media?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes (Please state here)</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes (Please state here)

- Only if there was something to be gained from the interaction e.g. Like/share competitions
- Their fit with my lifestyle
- Creating self image
- Competition
- On the look out of sales
- If they're associated with particular celebrities or models
- Customer service, promotion and customer satisfaction
- Complaints, feedback
- Competition/give away
- Competition/give away
Qualtrics further allowed the researcher to use the cross tabulation function to carry out T-tests to generate a P value. Below are two examples of how Qualtrics generated the P value of Peer Pressure.

*Note: The Chi-Square approximation may be inaccurate - expected frequency less than 5.*
Appendix 7: Thematic Analysis for ‘Other’ Option (Questions 4, 5, 34)

‘Other’ options for Questions 4, 5 and 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional social network sites</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whats App</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinder</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Chat</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Penguin</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumblr</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4 ‘Other’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional social network sites</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whats App</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Chat</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5 ‘Other’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional brands</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Choice Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-image / Lifestyle</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives (Competitions)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity Endorsement</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive/ Negative Feedback</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q34 Are there any other contributing factors for interacting with a brand on social media?
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