



Istanbul Business Research

Submitted: 25.12.2020

Revision Requested: 12.09.2021

Last Revision Received: 09.11.2021

Accepted: 17.01.2022

Published Online: 30.03.2022

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Engaging with Social Media Influencers on Youtube: A Cluster Analysis

Zeynep İrem Erdoğan¹ , Melisa Karakaya Arslan² 

Abstract

Social media platforms have created a new industry where both influencers and consumers are empowered. Consumers do not only consume but also contribute to the content they face on social media. Through their narratives and content, they may even become social media influencers who have the power to shape the attitudes and behavior of fellow consumers. An important social medium, YouTube, allows people to engage with social media influencers by liking, commenting, sharing, etc. However, engagement practices are not similarly shared among every YouTube user, and people have different reaction styles. Thus, measuring success in creating engaging content becomes a controversial issue for brand endorsement. This research aims to uncover consumer typologies in terms of engagement behavior with social media influencers on YouTube. The influential motives of engagement for each typology are also analyzed in order to describe the groups. For this purpose, 341 participants from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk) platform participated in an online survey, and a two-step cluster analysis was conducted with eleven common social media engagement practices with influencers. The results implied a three-cluster solution, and the clusters were profiled according to several social media engagement motivations. The groups were named as 'positively active followers,' 'passive followers,' and 'analytical followers.' Implications for brand endorsement and content marketing strategies are discussed.

Keywords

Social Media, Social Media Influencers, Influencer Marketing, Consumer Engagement, Social Media Engagement, Uses and Gratifications Theory

Introduction

The social media environment has created its own dynamics by changing the relationship between firms and consumers as well as among consumers themselves. One of these changes pertains to the development of influencers, who can be described as social media celebrities, whose influence and followers are limited but whose content and personal narratives have the power to shape the attitudes of others (Wiedmann & von Mettenheim, 2020; Hearn & Schoenhoff, 2016). Since they have influential power upon other people's opinions, social media influencers have become natural mediums to promote or transfer messages about brands and sought-after brand endorsers in social media, for which they are rewarded economically by

1 Zeynep İrem Erdoğan (Prof. Dr.), Marmara University, Faculty of Business Administration, Department of Business Administration, Istanbul, Türkiye. E-mail: ireme@marmara.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0003-1648-3943

2 Corresponding Author: Melisa Karakaya Arslan (Res. Asst.), Marmara University, Faculty of Business Administration, Department of Business Administration, Istanbul, Türkiye. E-mail: melisa.karakaya@marmara.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0002-6889-2741

To cite this article: Erdoğan, Z. İ., & Karakaya Arslan, M. (2022). Engaging with Social Media Influencers on Youtube: A Cluster Analysis. *Istanbul Business Research*, 51(1), 359-373. <http://doi.org/10.26650/ibr.2022.51.842750>



brands (Childers et al., 2019; Raun, 2018; Hearn & Schoenhoff, 2016). Research shows that 72 % of Generation Z and Millennials follow at least one influencer on social media, and YouTube influencers are as popular as major celebrities for Generation Z. 50% of Millennials also trust the influencers they follow on product and brand recommendations (Morning Consult, 2019). The influencer marketing industry was set to grow to approximately \$9.7B in 2020, and the average earned media value per \$1 spent has increased to \$5.78 in years (Influencer Marketing Hub, 2020). Thus, advertisers and marketers believe in the effectiveness of influencer marketing and wish to collaborate with these newly empowered influencers to introduce their brands and communicate with their target audiences. Therefore, brand managers need to assess the requirements of a successful endorser in their brand endorsement decisions (Wiedmann & von Mettenheim, 2020; Arora et al., 2019; Valsesia et al., 2020; Hearn & Schoenhoff, 2016). Selecting the “right” influencer is recognized by practitioners as the biggest challenge in working with influencers online (Simpson 2016).

What drives the success of an influencer is mostly focused on his/her engagement score, such as likes, comments, shares, and retweets (Arora et al., 2019; Wiedmann & von Mettenheim, 2020). The engagement statistics are an important criterion to show the popularity of an influencer on social media (Van Der Heide and Lim, 2016; Valsesia et al., 2020) and his/her ability to obtain reactions from followers (Arora et al., 2019; Freberg et al., 2011). Through engagement, an influencer can connect the endorsed brands to consumers (Childers et al., 2019; De Vries et al., 2012) and influence the attitudes and purchase intentions of followers towards the endorsed brand (Jiménez-Castillo and Sánchez-Fernández, 2019). Against this backdrop, it is important for brand managers to understand the nature of engagement and what motives drive this engagement. In line with this need, the aim of this research is: (1) to develop consumer typologies with regard to how consumers behaviorally engage and interact with influencers on social media (YouTube in this particular case) and (2) to explore which motivations are influential for engaging with YouTubers for different typologies of consumers. The results of this research are believed to add to the influencer marketing literature by understanding different levels of engagement with influencers and offering the consequent consumer typologies. The study also aims to contribute to the practice by suggesting content marketing strategies. Knowing what motivates different consumer groups will help influencers design and deliver the right content to their followers and increase chances of engagement and, hence, brand endorsement offers.

YouTube is an important medium for social media influencers to build up their brands, collaborate with and promote branded products on their channels, and influence consumers in the buying decision process (O’Connor, 2016; Holland, 2016). Research has shown that influencers who are present on YouTube have become popular among firms because their content often seems more realistic or organic than traditional advertising and they have a strong influence on others (Rasmussen, 2018). Further, YouTube, as a platform that converges traditional

entertainment choices of television, music, and film (Shao, 2009), provides opportunities for social interaction by allowing its users to seek and provide information through commenting as well, which makes the platform interesting for engagement research. Therefore, the context of this research is limited to consumer engagement with social media influencers on YouTube. Other social media channels were excluded from the research since means of engagement and consumer motivations are known to change from one channel to another.

Engagement Concept and Consumer Classifications Based on Engagement on Social Media

The engagement concept has drawn a lot of attention among marketers and practitioners because it is associated with positive consumer behavior and brand performance (Brodie et al., 2011; Bowden, 2009; Hollebeek et al., 2014) and is positioned as a pivotal concept of 21st Century marketing (Kumar and Pansari, 2016). One of the commonly accepted definitions of the concept is that it is a “psychological state that occurs by virtue of interactive, co-creative experiences with a focal agent/object in a focal service relationship” (Brodie et al., 2011, p. 262). The extant research treats engagement either as a multidimensional or a behavioral construct. The multidimensional definitions consist of three sub-dimensions of engagement: (1) cognitive engagement- a consumer’s level of brand-related thought processing and elaboration, (2) emotional or affective engagement- a consumer’s level of positive brand-related affect, and (3) behavioral/conative engagement-a consumer’s level of energy, effort, and time spent on using a brand (Brodie et al., 2011; Hollebeek et al., 2014). Behavioral definitions, on the other hand, consider engagement primarily as specific customer activity types or patterns (Van Doorn et al., 2010; Pham and Avnet, 2009).

Engagement consists of both online and offline activities. The focus of this study is on engagement with influencers over YouTube; therefore, it is digital engagement on social media. The literature provides many examples of digital engagement practices, including reading and writing customer reviews; liking, following, sharing, commenting, creating consumer-generated videos or advertisements; and playing advergames, to name a few (Eigenraam et al., 2018). However, digital engagement practices vary from one medium to another and from one classification to another. Therefore, one must study engagement in the context of each medium separately. Khan (2017), for example, posited that consumer engagement with YouTube is expressed through activities such as liking, disliking, commenting, sharing, and uploading videos. His approach in measuring engagement is behavioral.

Engagement practices have been used to classify consumers based on their level of engagement (Li and Bernoff, 2008; Shao, 2009; Muntinga et al., 2011). A behavioral approach is followed in these studies. Li and Bernoff (2008) distinguished six types of social media users based on their engagement level as inactives, spectators, joiners, collectors, critics, and

creators. Inactives are not active on social media at all. Spectators lightly participate in social media and mostly consume content delivered there. Joiners, on the other hand, participate a little more by maintaining their profile and uploading pictures. Collectors, on the other hand, collect and categorize content and leave it for others to enjoy. Critics love to rate products and write reviews and respond to posts and videos. Finally, creators make videos, blog, and write reviews for others to consume. Shao (2009) categorized different types of engagement activities consumers conduct online. He made a distinction between content consumption and participation. Content consumption is defined in terms of situations in which users watch videos, read comments, and view likes/dislikes but choose not to respond. Participation, instead, involves user-to-user and user-to-content interaction (commenting, sharing, liking, and disliking) in addition to watching videos. Finally, similar to Shao (2009), Muntinga et al. (2011) created a typology based on brand-related social media use and identified three different levels from passive to active as (1) consuming- viewing, listening, following, watching, reading, downloading, etc., (2) contributing- rating, joining a brand community, engaging in conversation, commenting, etc., and (3) creating- publishing, uploading videos, writing articles, etc.

Consumer Motivations for Engagement in Social Media

In the context of media use, motivations can be understood as the incentives that drive people's selection and use of media and media content (Rubin, 2002). They also influence media effectiveness, consumer attitudes and purchase intention towards brands and advertisements (Rodgers, 2002; Ko et al. 2005). Hence, extant literature has recognized the importance of consumer motivations in many studies. Uses and gratifications (U&G) theory (Katz et al., 1973) is a widely used framework that helps understand why and for what purposes people use media. The theory has been widely applied in social media studies to understand consumer motivations to engage in social media. Some of these motivations were found to be specific to the kind of social media, even to some of their particular features of those media such as music applications on Facebook (Krause et al., 2014). However, common themes could be recognized among the numerous studies on motivations, uses, and gratifications satisfied by engaging with social media. These themes include social interaction (socializing with people), information seeking (self-educating), exploration (exploring new, relevant topics), passing the time (staving off boredom), entertainment (pleasure, fun), relaxation (relieving stress, escaping from reality), escape (getting away from daily routine, work, etc.), self-status seeking (portraying a self-image to get acceptance of others), companionship (sweeping away loneliness), relational (facilitating interpersonal expression, gossip), convenience utility (accessible anytime, anywhere), and incentives (rewards, sweepstakes, presents etc.) (Smock, 2011; Sundar 2013; Whiting and Williams, 2013; Gao and Feng, 2016; Krause et al., 2014; Dolan et al., 2015; Haridakis and Hanson, 2009; Khan, 2017).

Studies on YouTube, on the other hand, include Haridakis and Hanson (2009)'s and Khan (2017)'s studies. The results of Haridakis and Hanson (2009) revealed that while people watched videos to seek information and for entertainment, they shared them as a means of interpersonal expression (to express themselves and have a voice in the information marketplace). A study by Khan (2017) demonstrated that seeking and providing information was related to all participatory acts on YouTube, including liking, disliking, and commenting, as well as sharing and uploading videos.

Methodology

An online survey was carried out to collect data in this study. The survey included engagement items, motivation items, and demographic questions. A behavioral approach was preferred to define engagement with influencers and classify consumers. Thus, engagement with influencers on social media was defined as “consumer’s manifestations, interactions, and co-creative experiences with influencers on social media” on YouTube in this study. Engagement was measured with eleven YouTube activities rated on a seven-point Likert scale. Engagement motives were measured with a total of 62 items representing 12 distinct constructs (Appendix 1), aiming to uncover consumer motivations to engage with social media influencers on YouTube. The motivational items were to reflect YouTube’s dynamics. Lastly, demographic information, including age, gender, and marital status, were collected.

The sampling frame was determined as individuals who follow at least one social media influencer on YouTube. Following one social media influencer served as a filter for ensuring the representativeness of the sample of interest and making the respondents eligible to answer engagement-related questions. The respondents were recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) platform, on which participants opt-in to research studies in return for nominal compensation. Since accessing the questionnaire required MTurk access, respondents were among those who were already registered to the platform, making the sampling method a non-probability sampling. However, several benefits of utilizing MTurk made the platform suitable for the research. Firstly, participants’ anonymity and confidentiality could be ensured. Further, the platform provides an affordable way to reach participants outside the university community and student samples. The access to non-student samples along with student samples enhances representativeness. Another hallmark of the MTurk platform is that the recruitment pool closely reflects the diversity of the US population since respondents are dispersed across a wide geographical area. Though, as a drawback, the MTurk participants were found to be younger and more educated and have more familiarity with online questionnaires on average (Landers and Behrend, 2015; Smith et al., 2015). However, reaching younger generations did not conflict with the research’s purpose. Half of the respondents were aged between 25 and 35. After omitting outliers and missing data (due to filter question), 341 of

the participants were deemed appropriate for further analysis. Men accounted for 58% of the participants and 54% of the respondents were single.

In order to develop consumer typologies based on engagement and interaction behaviors, a two-step cluster analysis, using hierarchical and non-hierarchical methods, was conducted. Row-centering standardization was applied to the data in order to remove response style effects (Hair et.al.,2010). That is, each engagement activity was standardized to the respondent's average score so that individual response patterns were controlled, and the data can truly reflect the differences in activities conducted on YouTube rather than a differential style that occurs when people face a spectrum of responses. Eleven engagement activities (presented in Table 1) were used to form the clusters.

The first step in the process was to determine the number of clusters within the sample by using the hierarchical clustering method. For this purpose, Squared Euclidean Distance was selected as a proximity measure, and Ward's method of clustering was used to establish clusters. The high heterogeneity increase observed in the agglomeration schedule suggested a three-cluster solution over the alternatives. As a second step, non-hierarchical clustering was applied. K-means clustering algorithm was used in SPSS.22, and each respondent was assigned to one of the three clusters determined by the algorithm. Finally, the clusters were profiled according to twelve engagement motives (entertainment, exploration, information seeking, self-status seeking, social interaction, passing the time, escape, relaxation, convenience, companionship, relational and incentives) that were mentioned in the social media engagement literature.

Results

The clusters were named as 1) 'positively active followers' (those who avoid engaging in negative activities), 2) 'passive followers' (those who watch videos and subscribe to the channels but don't engage in any other activities), and 3) 'analytical followers' (those who read comments, check likes/dislikes). The number of cases in each cluster was 167 (49% of the sample), 61 (18% of the sample), and 113 (33% of the sample), respectively. The final cluster centers with row-centering standardization are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Cluster Centers

		Positively Active Followers (1 st cluster)	Passive Followers (2 nd cluster)	Analytical Followers (3 rd cluster)
ACT1	I watch videos on Youtube.	1,20	2,02	1,22
ACT2	I click on the like button after watching videos on Youtube.	1,15	,89	1,01

		Positively Active Followers (1 st cluster)	Passive Followers (2 nd cluster)	Analytical Followers (3 rd cluster)
ACT3	I click on the dislike button after watching videos on Youtube.	,69	,58	,78
ACT4	I check the number of likes.	1,03	,66	1,34
ACT5	I check the number of dislikes.	,76	,55	1,26
		Positively Active Followers (1 st cluster)	Passive Followers (2 nd cluster)	Analytical Followers (3 rd cluster)
ACT6	I read the comments below Youtube videos.	1,12	1,16	1,14
ACT7	I comment on Youtube videos.	1,00	,54	,56
ACT8	I share Youtube videos.	1,09	,85	,78
ACT9	I subscribe to the channels of the Youtubers I like.	1,04	1,60	1,06
ACT10	I unsubscribe when I dislike a Youtuber.	,83	1,29	1,06
ACT11	I follow Youtubers from other social media platforms, as well (e.g., Instagram, Facebook, Twitter, Snapchat)	1,09	,87	,79

Table 2 demonstrates the ANOVA statistics of the clusters, indicating differences among clusters based on activities performed. It is seen that the clusters significantly differ from each other with an exception for the 6th activity ‘reading comments below YouTube videos.’ The groups resemble each other in terms of participating in this activity. Despite its lack of differential effect, the item was not removed since it is a theoretically appropriate and reasonable activity to be considered in engagement studies.

Table 2
ANOVA Results

	Cluster		Error		F	Sig.
	Mean Square	df	Mean Square	df		
ACT1	16,674	2	,197	338	84,627	,000
ACT2	1,728	2	,132	338	13,101	,000
ACT3	,854	2	,121	338	7,069	,001
ACT4	9,402	2	,113	338	83,411	,000
ACT5	12,492	2	,102	338	121,962	,000
ACT6	,031	2	,165	338	,184	,832
ACT7	8,438	2	,074	338	114,296	,000
ACT8	3,526	2	,138	338	25,583	,000
ACT9	7,526	2	,151	338	49,796	,000
ACT10	5,015	2	,183	338	27,420	,000
ACT11	3,347	2	,145	338	23,018	,000

Further, cluster stability was assessed by sorting the data in different ways and comparing the cluster memberships (Hair et.al., 2010). The cross-tabulation of two different K-Means groupings indicated that 79% of the cases remained in the same clusters.

As a final step, the clusters were profiled according to twelve engagement motives which were categorized as entertainment, exploration, information seeking, self-status seeking, social interaction, passing the time, escape, relaxation, convenience, companionship, relational, and incentives. The CFA of these motivational constructs suggested the significance of parameter estimates. Besides, all of the standardized loading estimates were over 0.5, showing that the items were strongly related to their associated factors. Convergent validity was assessed by evaluating the factor loadings, average variance extracted (AVE), and composite reliability values. All the factor loadings were significant, and the standardized loading estimates were over 0.5. The AVE values of the constructs were over 0.5, and all the composite reliability values were over 0.7, indicating the presence of convergent validity. The square roots of the AVE of the constructs were greater than the correlation values of the other constructs, assessing the discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Both the maximum shared squared variance (MSV) values were lower than the average variance extracted (AVE) values, which also points out the existence of discriminant validity. Detailed cluster profiles are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Cluster Profiles

	Entertainment	Relaxation	Escape	Passing the time	Companionship	Information Seeking	Exploration	Social Interaction	Incentives	Self-status seeking	Convenience	Relational
Positively Active Followers	5,68	5,53	4,71	4,03	4,53	5,26	5,36	4,94	4,05	3,79	5,32	4,90
Passive Followers	5,24	5,39	4,02	3,57	2,55	4,01	4,22	2,58	1,48	1,52	4,73	2,41
Analytical Followers	5,35	5,22	4,37	3,67	3,06	4,59	4,75	3,17	1,93	2,00	4,91	3,02
<i>Mean</i>	5,49	5,40	4,47	3,83	3,69	4,82	4,95	3,93	2,89	2,79	5,08	3,83

It is seen that the highest means are observed in more hedonic motives such as entertainment (M=5,49), relaxation (M=5,40), convenience (M=5,08), and exploration (M=4,95). These motives score high in each cluster. On the other hand, self-status seeking (M=2,79) and incentives (M=2,89) appear to be the least motivating factors in engaging with Youtubers.

Positively active followers have higher scores in every motive compared to other groups. They are also motivated by incentives (M=4,05), unlike the other groups. The most important motive for this group is entertainment. They do not dislike YouTube videos and do not check the dislike figures. Further, they are less prone to unsubscribing a YouTube channel, but they comment and share more than the other groups.

Passive followers are driven by relaxation and entertainment. They care less about companionship, social interaction, and the relational benefits of engagement. Their video watching and

subscription scores are higher. Nevertheless, they are also the ones who unsubscribe the most when they don't like a Youtuber. However, they do not contribute by disliking or commenting.

Analytical followers have similar motives compared to passive followers, yet they score slightly higher in every motive. They are influenced by entertainment and relaxation but also seek information and exploration.

Discussion

The results of this study show that consumers can be classified into three groups based on their level of engagement with influencers. One of these groups, the positively active followers, is actively engaging with the influencers. They follow influencers on different platforms and like, comment on, or share the posts created by influencers. As Shao (2009) put in his study, this group acts participatory and contributes to the engagement score of the influencers with their activities. They are also similar to contributors, described in Muntinga et al. (2011)'s study. The positively active group is the group that is highly responsible for the engagement scores influencers receive. Therefore, their motivations are important to acknowledge and work upon. The other two groups, the passive followers and analytical followers, on the other hand, are content consumers with slight differences between them. Shao (2009) and Muntinga et al. (2011) also mentioned in their studies about the content-consuming individuals who are reading, analyzing, and viewing but not reacting much. The major difference between the passive followers and analytical followers in this study is that analytical followers check the like and dislike figures of the influencers more than the other group.

When the motivating factors in different groups are investigated, it is seen that entertainment, relaxation, and convenience of the medium are commonly motivating all the followers. Exploration and information-seeking are also strong motivators for all the groups. When we compare the results of this study to previous studies on identifying motivations to use different types of social media (e.g.; Haridakis, 2009; Leung, 2009; Logan, 2017), it is seen that they correspond to each other; entertainment, exploration, and information-seeking are evident as strong motivators to engage with influencers in all types of social media.

When the motivations are investigated for each group, it is seen that the positively active group is also motivated by social interaction among followers and relational and companionship provided by the influencers. Thus, this group is highly socially motivated when compared with the other two groups. Social motives of relational bond-building with friends and relatives, decreasing of loneliness, and socialization over the medium are actively affecting engagement with influencers. This is not surprising since the interaction and engagement with influencers include socialization even if it is over the medium and sometimes one-sided from the followers. The literature has recognized the importance of such interaction as parasocial

interaction, an individual's '*illusion of a face-to-face relationship with a media personality*' (Horton & Wohl, 1956, p. 188), and it has been a growing topic of interest in influencer marketing research (e.g.; Daniel Jr. et al., 2018; Rasmussen, 2018; Yuan and Lou, 2020). The involvement of the followers with the personal narratives of influencers may lead them to build parasocial relationships that would ease their loneliness. The narratives may also produce cognitive and emotional responses and create topics of discussion to be shared with the followers' social circle of friends and relatives as well as other followers on YouTube, and help with social interaction over the medium and bond-building in personal circles (Brechman & Purvis, 2015). Therefore, the strategies built around personal narratives and story-telling need to be carefully designed. The positively active group is also the only group that is influenced by remuneration or incentives. Remuneration and incentives are frequently used tools on social media; they tend to draw interest on brands if used honestly and openly disclose the promotion-related purpose (Abendroth and Heyman, 2013). They are also known to create high acceptance and interaction with the influencers (Silva et al., 2019). Finally, the positively active group is motivated by a self-status-seeking drive. In other words, they follow social media influencers to increase their status in life, to impress others, and to appear cool. Self-status seeking was also identified as a factor to join online groups (Park et al., 2009) and consume YouTube videos (Khan, 2017). In a similar sense, people may have felt peer-pressured to follow social media influencers, who are the new cool activity to do on social media.

Implications for Theory and Practice

The results of the study have implications for theory and practice. First, the results of this study extended the research on social media engagement practices and U&G theory with a cluster analysis approach. The previous studies focused on explaining the motivations for social media engagement with U&G theory by treating the study samples as a homogenous group with similar customer engagement characteristics (e.g.; Haridakis and Hanson, 2009; Khan, 2017; Sundar 2013). The approach in this study, on the other hand, recognizes that distinct customer engagement subgroups potentially exist within the sample and different U&G may apply for each subgroup. Thus, this research compares and contrasts the U&G for different types of followers. Identification of the U&G for the subgroups showed that social motivations are more evident in the group with the highest engagement when compared to the other groups. This was not surprising given that engagement with social media influencers is essentially an engagement with an individual rather than engagement with a medium; therefore, it is understandable that social motives are more influential in this case. Furthermore, the results of the study extended the scope of studies on social media engagement and U&G by incorporating engagement with social media influencers on YouTube, which was not previously studied as far as the authors acknowledge.

The results of the study also posit implications for practice. Engagement is an important metric for marketers to select the right social media influencer for brand endorsement. The results of this study may provide clues to social media influencers to apply the right content marketing strategies and ensure the likelihood of brand endorsement. The results show that for any type of group, the content of the influencer should provide a nice balance of information and entertainment, and his/her attitude to followers should be towards relaxing them from daily stress. The motivating factors of positively active followers, who score high on engagement behavior, on the other hand, show that they are socially encouraged; thus, in order to procure more engagement, situations and contents to socialize should be fomented. For example, personal narratives to relate with, interactive questions and answers may draw on social interaction. Uniqueness in ideas, behavior, or speech that is entertaining and thought-provoking may also work well to differentiate the influencer and secure word-of-mouth popularity among the social circles of followers. Furthermore, remuneration motives such as drawings and sweepstakes may also attract followers and create engagement activities. Sweepstakes and drawings may induce excitement and immediate response to influencers' posts (Silva et al., 2019). Indirectly, remuneration may also encourage social interaction in the personal circles of the followers through word-of-mouth. Furthermore, brand managers may create entertaining and informative brand narratives and content and apply remuneration tactics to obtain positive results in their influencer-induced brand endorsements.

This research is a preliminary step to understand U&G among different customer engagement subgroups. Further research can be carried on uncovering consumer engagement profiles related to different social media channels or social media influencers on different channels (such as Instagram) or across channels. This research focused on the antecedents of engagement. Other research may focus on consumer behavior outcomes such as attitude towards the endorsed brand or purchase intention towards the endorsed brand and try to understand the outcomes among the customer engagement subgroups. Furthermore, cross-cultural, comparative studies may be carried on to understand the differences in U&G to engage with influencers across cultures.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Author Contributions: Conception/Design of study: Z.İ.E.; Data Acquisition: Z.İ.E.; Data Analysis/Interpretation: Z.İ.E., M.K.A.; Drafting Manuscript: Z.İ.E., M.K.A.; Critical Revision of Manuscript: Z.İ.E., M.K.A.; Final Approval and Accountability: Z.İ.E., M.K.A

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

References

Abendroth, L. J., and J. E. Heyman. 2013. "Honesty Is the Best Policy: The Effects of Disclosure in Word-of-Mouth Marketing." *Journal of Marketing Communications* 19 (4): 245–257.

- Arora, A., Bansal, S., Kandpal, C., Aswani, R., & Dwivedi, Y. (2019). Measuring social media influencer index-insights from Facebook, Twitter and Instagram. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 49, 86-101.
- Bowden, J.L.H. (2009), "The process of consumer engagement: a conceptual framework", *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 63-74.
- Brechman, JM., Purvis, S.C. (2015) Narrative transportation and advertising. *International Journal of Advertising*, 34 (2) pp. 366-381.
- Brodie, J.R., Hollebeck, L., Juric, B. and Ilic, A. (2011), "Consumer engagement: conceptual domain, fundamental propositions and implications for research", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 252-271.
- Childers, C.C., Lemon, L.L. and Hoy, M.G. (2019), "#sponsored #ad: agency perspective on influencer marketing campaigns", *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 258-274.
- Daniel Jr, E. S., Crawford Jackson, E. C., & Westerman, D. K. (2018). The influence of social media influencers: Understanding online vaping communities and parasocial interaction through the lens of Taylor's six-segment strategy wheel. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 18(2), 96-109.
- De Vries, L., Gensler, S. and Leeflang, P.S.H. (2012). Popularity of brand posts on brand fan pages: an investigation of the effects of social media marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(2), 83-91.
- Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J., & Goodman, S. (2016). Social media engagement behaviour: a uses and gratifications perspective. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 24(3-4), 261-277.
- Eigenraam, A. W., Eelen, J., Van Lin, A., & Verlegh, P. W. (2018). A consumer-based taxonomy of digital customer engagement practices. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 44, 102-121.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics 18(3), 382-388.
- Freberg, K., Graham, K., McGaughey, K., & Freberg, L. A. (2011). Who are the social media influencers? A study of public perceptions of personality. *Public Relations Review*, 37(1), 90-92.
- Gao, Q., & Feng, C. (2016). Branding with social media: User gratifications, usage patterns, and brand message content strategies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 868-890.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: Global edition*.
- Hanson, G., & Haridakis, P. (2008). YouTube users watching and sharing the news: A uses and gratifications approach. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 11(3).
- Haridakis, P., & Hanson, G. (2009). Social interaction and co-viewing with YouTube: Blending mass communication reception and social connection. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(2), 317-335.
- Hearn, A., & Schoenhoff, S. (2016). *From celebrity to influencer* in *A Companion to Celebrity* ed by P.D. Marshall and S. Redmond, Wiley: London, 194-212.
- Holland, M. (2016). "How YouTube Developed into a Successful Platform for User-Generated Content." *Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications*, 7(1). Retrieved from <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/a?id=1477>
- Hollebeck, L.D., Glynn, M.S., Brodie, R.J. (2014), Consumer Brand Engagement in Social Media: Conceptualization, Scale Development and Validation, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28, 149-165.
- Horton, D. and Wohl, R. (1956). Mass communication and PSI interaction: Observations on intimacy at a distance. *Psychiatry*, 19, 215-229.

- Influencer Marketing Hub (2020), The State of Influencer Marketing 2020: Benchmark Report, Retrieved from <https://influencermarketinghub.com/influencer-marketing-benchmark-report-2020/>
- Jiménez-Castillo, D., & Sánchez-Fernández, R. (2019). The role of digital influencers in brand recommendation: Examining their impact on engagement, expected value and purchase intention. *International Journal of Information Management*, 49, 366-376.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509-523.
- Khan, M. L. (2017). Social media engagement: What motivates user participation and consumption on YouTube?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 66, 236-247.
- Ko, H., Cho, C. H., & Roberts, M. S. (2005). Internet uses and gratifications: A structural equation model of interactive advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, 34(2), 57-70.
- Krause, A. E., North, A. C., & Heritage, B. (2014). The Uses and Gratifications of using Facebook music listening applications. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 39, 71-77.
- Kumar, V., & Pansari, A. (2016). Competitive advantage through engagement. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53(4): 497-514.
- Landers, R. N., & Behrend, T. S. (2015). An inconvenient truth: Arbitrary distinctions between organizational, Mechanical Turk, and other convenience samples. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 142-164.
- Leung, L. (2009). User-generated content on the internet: an examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. *New media & society*, 11(8), 1327-1347.
- Li, C. & Bernoff, J. (2008) *Groundswell: Winning in a World Transformed by Social Technologies*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Lim, H., & Kumar, A. (2019). Variations in consumers' use of brand online social networking: A uses and gratifications approach. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 51, 450-457.
- Logan, K. (2017). Attitudes towards in-app advertising: a uses and gratifications perspective. *International Journal of Mobile Communications*, 15(1), 26-48.
- Morning Consult (2019), The Influencer Report Engaging Gen Z and Millennials, Retrieved from <https://morningconsult.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/The-Influencer-Report-Engaging-Gen-Z-and-Millennials.pdf>
- Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M. & Smit, E. G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring Motivations for Brand-Related Social Media Use. *International Journal of Advertising*, 30(1), 13-46.
- O'Connor, F. (2016). *'Millennials & Youtube': An investigation into the influence of user-generated video content on the consumer decision making process* (Doctoral dissertation, Dublin, National College of Ireland).
- Park, N., Kee, K. F. & Valenzuela, S. (2009). Being immersed in social networking environment: Facebook groups, uses and gratifications, and social outcomes. *Cyberpsychology & behavior*, 12(6), 729-733.
- Pham, M. T. & Avnet, T. (2009). Rethinking regulatory engagement theory. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(2), 115-123.
- Rasmussen, L. (2018). Parasocial Interaction in the Digital Age: An Examination of Relationship Building and the Effectiveness of YouTube Celebrities. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, 7(1), 280-294.
- Raun, T. (2018). Capitalizing intimacy: New subcultural forms of micro-celebrity strategies and affective

- labor on YouTube. *Convergence*, 24(1), 99-113.
- Rodgers, S. (2002). The interactive advertising model tested: The role of motives in ad processing. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 2(2), 22-33.
- Rubin, A. M. (2002). *The uses-and-gratifications perspective of media effects*. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *LEAs communication series. Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (p. 525–548). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Shao, G. (2009). Understanding the appeal of user-generated media: a uses and gratification perspective. *Internet Research*, 19(1), 7-25.
- Silva, M. J., De Farias, A., S., Grigg, M.K., & Barbosa, M. L.A. (2019). The Power of the Body in Social Media: Analyzing Digital Fitness Influencers As Product Endorsers. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Simpson, Jack (2016) Eight Influencer Marketing Stats for Fashion and Beauty Brands., Econsultancy, *Xeim: Excellency in Marketing*. Accessed 7-9-19 at <https://econsultancy.com/eightinfluencer-marketing-stats-for-fashion-beauty-brands/>
- Smith, N. A., Sabat, I. E., Martinez, L. R., Weaver, K., & Xu, S. (2015). A convenient solution: Using MTurk to sample from hard-to-reach populations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 8(2), 220.
- Smock, A. D., Ellison, N. B., Lampe, C., & Wohn, D. Y. (2011). Facebook as a toolkit: A uses and gratifications approach to unbundling feature use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(6), 2322-2329.
- Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57(4), 504-525.
- Valesia, F., Proserpio, D., & Nunes, J. C. (2020). The Positive Effect of Not Following Others on Social Media. *Journal of Marketing Research*, accessed on <http://faculty.marshall.usc.edu/Davide-Proserpio/papers/following-followers.pdf>.
- Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research directions. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 253-266.
- Van Der Heide, B. and Lim, Y.S. (2016). On the conditional cueing of credibility heuristics: the case of online influence. *Communication Research*, 43 (5), 672-693.
- Whiting, A., & Williams, D. (2013). Why people use social media: a uses and gratifications approach. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 16(4), 362-369.
- Wiedmann, K. P., & von Mettenheim, W. (2020). Attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertise—social influencers' winning formula?. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*. Bol. Ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.
- Yuan, S., & Lou, C. (2020). How Social Media Influencers Foster Relationships with Followers: The Roles of Source Credibility and Fairness in Parasocial Relationship and Product Interest. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, (just-accepted), 1-42.

APPENDIX

TABLE A: Sources of the Motivational Construct Items

Construct	Number of Items	Sources
Entertainment	7	Haridakis and Hanson (2009), Khan, (2017), Leung (2009), Lim and Kumar (2017), Park et.al. (2009), Smock (2011)
Exploration	7	Krause et al. (2014), Leung (2009), Logan (2017), Sundar (2013)
Information seeking	8	Haridakis and Hanson (2009), Hanson and Haridakis(2008), Khan (2017), Logan (2017)
Self-status seeking	6	Khan (2017), Krause et al. (2014), Leung (2009)
Social interaction	8	Haridakis and Hanson (2009), Khan, (2017), Logan (2017), Park et.al. (2009), Sundar (2013)
Passing the time	6	Khan (2017), Krause et al. (2014), Logan (2017), Lim and Kumar (2017), Smock (2011)
Escape	5	Haridakis and Hanson (2009), Krause et al. (2014), Logan (2017)
Relaxation	3	Khan (2017), Smock (2011)
Convenience	3	Liu et al. (2010)
Companionship	3	Smock (2011)
Relational	3	Haridakis and Hanson (2009), Logan (2017)
Incentives	3	Dolan et al. (2015), Lim and Kumar (2017)

