RESEARCH ARTICLE • FORSCHUNGSARTIKEL • ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

HOW PRODUCT VISIBILITY AND NATIONAL CULTURE INFLUENCES WHAT WE POST?[*]

ÜRÜN GÖRÜNÜRLÜĞÜ VE ULUSAL KÜLTÜR PAYLAŞIMLARIMIZI NASIL ETKİLİYOR?

Kemal Cem SÖYLEMEZ[**] ID

Abstract

Even though product visibility's effect on real-life consumer decisions is well-known, it is unclear whether these effects also extend to online consumer behaviors. In addition, many cross-cultural studies of user-generated content generation compared samples gathered from US and China, which may mislead scholars due to unique cultural aspects and internet regulations in China. As a continuation of Soylemez (2021a) and Soylemez (2021b), the present study utilized the equity theory and investigated how product visibility and individualism-collectivism influence the relative generation of brand-oriented and community-oriented content. Samples are collected from Turkey and the United States. The study found that members of more visible product communities to generate more brand-oriented content than community-oriented content, while members of less visible product communities generate more community-oriented content than they generate brand-oriented content. Similarly, individualist members are likely to generate more brand-oriented content than community-oriented content, whereas collectivist members are likely to generate more community-oriented content than brand-oriented content. Product visibility and individualism-collectivism do not interact significantly. Managerial and theoretical implications of the study are also discussed.

Keywords: User-generated content, online brand communities, product visibility, national culture.

JEL Classification: M31

Öz

Ürün görünürlüğünün gerçek hayattaki tüketici davranışlarını etkilediği bilinmesine rağmen, çevrimiçi davranışlar üzerindeki etkileri henüz incelenmemiş bir alandır. Kullanıcı tarafından oluşturulan içerik üretme araştırmalarının bir başka sorunlu yönü de birçok kültürler arası çalışmanın Amerikan ve Çin örneklemlerini karşılaştırmasıdır ki bu durum Çin'in kendine has kültürel yönleri ve internet düzenlemeleri nedeniyle bilim adamlarını yanlış yönlendiriyor olabilir. Soylemez (2021a) ve Soylemez (2021b)'nin devamı niteliğindeki bu çalışma eşitlik teorisini kullanarak ürün görünürlüğünün ve bireycilik-toplulukçuluğun, marka odaklı ve topluluk odaklı içeriğin göreceli üretimini nasıl etkilediğini araştırmaktadır. Örneklemler Türkiye ve ABD'den toplanmıştır. Çalışma, daha görünür bir ürünün çevrimiçi topluluğuna üye olanların görece daha çok markaya yönelik içerikler ürettiğini gösterirken, daha az görünür bir ürünün çevrimiçi topluluğuna üye olanların görece daha topluluğa yönelik içerikler ürettiğini göstermiştir. Benzer bir şekilde, bireyci topluluk üyelerinin görece daha fazla markaya yönelik içerik ürettiği gözlemlenmişken, toplumcu topluluk üyelerinin görece daha fazla topluluğa yönelik içerik ürettiği bulunmuştur. Ürün görünürlüğü ile ulusal kültür arasında kayda değer bir etkileşim yoktur. Çalışmanın teorik ve yönetsel çıkarımları da ortaya konmuştur

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kullanıcı tarafından yaratılan içerik, çevrimiçi marka toplulukları, ürün görünürlüğü, ulusal kültür.

JEL Sınıflandırılması: M31

1. Introduction

Muniz & O'guinn (2001) describe online brand communities as specialized, non-geographic communities based on structured social relationships among a product's fans. Members of online brand communities contribute to and utilize the collective intelligence of communities (Laroche et al., 2012). The value creation process is changing as digital platforms expand from a brand-centric perspective to interactive and personalized customer experiences. In today's Web 4.0 world, members of the online brand community play an active role as producers and distributors of information within the community ecosystem (Wang, 2021).

Despite the fact that the literature on the online branding community is growing rapidly, there are still two important gaps. First, previous research often assumed that user-generated content is undifferentiated and was only interested in analyzing what makes the users create few or more posts. However, members generate brand-oriented content and community-oriented content to engage with different audiences (Soylemez, 2021b) and create value for different stakeholders (Jiao et al., 2018). Therefore, having a monolithic view of user-generated content may mislead marketing practitioners and academics. Understanding this distinction is helpful for comprehending the narrative of online brand communities. Research like Kozinets et al. (2010) demonstrated that rather than merely conveying marketing messages and meanings, the narrative of a blog or online brand community modifies them. Because of the first gap, the second gap arises. It is unclear what factors drive online brand community members to generate different types of user-generated content. Brands have different expectations from their online brand communities. Some brands may prefer to utilize online brand communities as a hub of new product development, while others can position them as free customer service. Understanding who generates which type of content under which

motivations would help marketing scholars to better understand online consumer behavior and marketing practitioners to adjust their online strategy depending on their strategic goals.

Literature suggests that product visibility (Berger & Schwartz, 2011) and national culture (Sánchez-Franco, Martínez-López, & Martín-Velicia, 2009) influences online word-of-mouth behavior. Thus, studying the impact of product visibility and individualism-collectivism is a good starting point for understanding the dynamics of the relative generation of different UGC types. The research question for this article is, therefore, the following:

RQ: What is the impact of product visibility and individualism-collectivism on the relative contribution of brand-oriented content and community-oriented content?

Based on equity theory and cultural theory, this research study suggests that the relative generation of brand-oriented and community-oriented content is determined by two factors: product visibility and individualism-collectivism. Experiments have shown that these factors indeed influence the relative contribution of user-generated content types. Based on the results; theoretical and managerial implications along with future research directions are also discussed.

2. Literature Review

2.1. User-Generated Content Types

User-generated content is defined as brand-related content created by users (Tirunillai & Tellis, 2012). In online brand communities, the brand and the community are two stakeholders that participants can choose as target groups (Haikel-Elsabeh et al., 2019). For example, when members of the smartphone community offer advice on how to use smartphones more effectively, they reach out to the community. This community-oriented content also provides indirect value to brands, as community troubleshooting reduces the burden of customer service and increases brand loyalty due to high community interaction (Soylemez, 2021a). Therefore, if a brand wants to establish a community as a meeting place for fans or an informal information hub; therefore it should use strategies that maximize the generation of community-oriented content.

Members directly add value to the brand when they make brand suggestions and complaints or discuss brand-related news (Soylemez, 2021b). Companies are interested in the feedback and suggestions customers give them, which they use to improve the overall customer experience (Itani, El Haddad & Kalra, 2020). When members of a PC gaming series community make suggestions for an upcoming game or complain about bugs in a released game, their target audience is the brand. Although they appear to communicate with each other, members are aware that other members cannot develop new games or fix bugs. By communicating with other members, they try to force the brand to develop new games and address complaints. Therefore, if the brand wants to use the community for co-creation activities; then it shall cultivate drivers that make members generate more brand-oriented content.

2.2. Product Visibility

Although product attributes are known to influence the behavior of e-WOM and online product reviews, this is a relatively unknown area in the online brand community literature (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017). Although studies such as Schulze, Schöler, and Skiera (2014) have compared utilitarian and hedonic products, product visibility has not been examined. Marketing practitioners generally agree that products must be novel, surprising and interesting to be talked about (Sernovitz, Kawaski and Godin, 2006). A recurring theme in previous research is the management of self-image. Consumers like to talk about brands with high social value (Hughes, 2005) because they use ownership and brands as resources to create and express their identity (Gensler et al., 2013). While this argument is valid, Berger and Schwartz (2011) argue that accessibility, rather than novelty, creates immediate and continous word-of-mouth. Their claim is that different products have different levels of visibility (Wyer & Srull, 1981) and accessibility (Nedungandi, 1990) and that using products stimulates memory (Andersen, 2005).

It has long been known that consumers behave differently in the presence of others and are motivated to create desired identities in their interpersonal encounters (Chuang, Cheng & Hsu, 2012). manage their public image (Cheng et al., 2015). Physical presence of others is not a requirement for image management. In fact, impression management is defined as "the attempt to control the images projected in real or imagined social interactions" (Schlenker, 1980). While online brand community members often lack real social connections, other studies, such as Lee (2004), show that presence is a psychological rather than a physiological construct. Thus, members can also use the community to gain approval and build reputation (Nov, Naaman & Ye, 2010). Because online brand communities involve direct or indirect human contact (Gefen & Straub, 2004), individuals are likely to view community members as an extended circle of friends (Cheung, Chiu, & Lee, 2011). Therefore, it can be argued that members of the online brand community are likely to see the online brand community as a complementary resource to their real-life social interactions. As traditional ties and identities become weaker, ties in online communities become more prominent (Cova, 1997).

Equity theory states that individuals strive for fairness and strive to balance their contributions with the outcomes they receive (Adams, 1965). When it comes to online brand communities, the brand and the community are two important stakeholders. People show a positive attachment to individuals or organizations who acknowledge and give positive feedback and rewards (Simon & Tossan, 2018). Depending on the relationship with these stakeholders, members create more brand – or community-oriented content.

Members of the online brand community expressly or implicitly engage in self-promotion. Explicitly, members can promote themselves by generating envy in the community through braggarts, for whom visible products seem more probable than less visible ones. For example, in a motorcycle community, members can post their photos with their motorcycles in favorable public places. This is an opportunity that less visible products like desktop PCs can't quite match. Therefore, it can be

rightly assumed that members of the more visible product communities will perform in a similar way and prioritize the community over the brand.

However, community members of the more visible products are expected to prioritize the brand over the community for two reasons: the first is that these members have already been provoking the envy of their real-life friends by driving their motorcycles around. Thus, their need for getting approval is already satisfied. And second, the other community members also own similar motorcycles. I can make my co-workers jealous by simply owning a Harley Davidson but in a Harley Davidson community; everybody owns a Harley Davidson. Therefore, for the same effort, they receive less appreciation from other community members than they receive from their real-life friends. Therefore, community members of the more visible products have greater incentives for using the online brand community to follow the latest brand news, develop their skills and more importantly establishing themselves as a renowned brand authority by engaging in co-creation activities and demonstrating their knowledge and mastery regarding the brand. Therefore, the following hypothesis is put forward:

H_{1a}: *Brand community members pertaining to a more visible product category are likely to generate more brand-oriented content than community-oriented content.*

Members can implicitly advertise themselves by demonstrating their product expertise and capabilities. Privately consumed products are often considered less suitable for image congruence because managing expectations is less important and consumers don't have anyone but themselves to satisfy (Graeff, 1996). Same as community members of more visible product categories, community members of less visible product categories are also likely to see their engagements in the online brand community as a supplement to in-person brand-related interactions. Less visible products are often purchased by self and for the self and a personal relationship with the brand already exists (Graeff, 1996). Community members of less visible products are therefore likely to participate in online brand communities to interact with like-minded people and satisfy their desire for image management, which they barely do in real life. Consequently, the following hypothesis is put forward:

H_{1b}: *Brand community members pertaining to a less visible product category are likely to generate more community-oriented content than brand-oriented content.*

2.3. Individualism-Collectivism

Many definitions of culture have been used over the past 50 years (Gelfand, Erez & Aycan, 2007), such as: Hofstede, 1984). Although the wording is subject to change, all definitions indicate that culture is a set of common norms adopted and transmitted over time by those who share a common geography, history and language (Shweder et al., 1984) . National cultures are known to influence the intentions and behaviors of individuals (Sánchez-Franco, Martínez-López & Martín-Velicia, 2009). Natural cultures reflect the fundamental issues and problems that societies face in regulating human activities (Schwartz, 1994), and national cultures differ in the degree to which cooperation and competition are emphasized (Mead, 1967).

As far as online brand communities are concerned, national culture can influence the priorities of the members (Gong, 2018). Telepresence theory states that messages are created in the medium rather than simply being sent from the sender to the recipient (Song & Zinkhan, 2008). Indeed, one of the main differences between collectivists and individualists is the emphasis on context rather than content (Triandis, 2004). While online brand communities are known to create their own rituals and subcultures (Cova & Pace, 2006), the members themselves are also influenced by the culture of the society in which they live. The literature on online brand communities and national cultures remains limited, problematic (Okazaki & Taylor, 2013) and far from conclusive (Pezutti & Leonhardt, 2021). Most cross-cultural studies compare China and the United States. Although this choice is understandable, China's strict internet regulation significantly alters online brand engagement (Song et al., 2017). Although there are other multinational studies, they often use student samples (Cummins et al., 2014). As a result, previous findings about the effects of individualism and collectivism may not be as conclusive as it appears.

Individualism means putting "I" before "we" and expecting the individual to care only for themselves and their inner circle (Hofstede, 1984). Individualists focus on self-perception independent of groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). They prioritize their own goals over those of the team (Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990) and their relationship depends on a cost-benefit analysis (Kim et al., 1994). Individualists prefer more relaxed group relationships that require less commitment and consistency (Triandis & Suh, 2002). In individualistic cultures, the self is a separate entity, the individual strives for self-glory and self-power (Triandis, 1993), prefers productivity competition and self-acquisition to equality (Leung, 1997) and individual action than joint action (Brandt, 1974). Individualistic cultures value joy, success, competition, freedom, autonomy, and fair exchange (Triandis, 1993). Individualists prefer to do what they find comfortable rather than what is required, as long as the costs are not excessive (Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988). Individualism has been associated with personal goals, personal achievement, personal uniqueness, and personal control (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002), even to the detriment of groups (Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988). Especially when their contribution to society is ignored (Earley, 1989).

According to equity theory, social exchange is judged by the perceived fairness of the relationship (Adams, 1965). Individualistic members are expected to put the brand above the community for two reasons. First, individualists are less likely to participate in online brand communities (Amin, 2019), and when they do, they usually do so to gain brand benefits for themselves (Kitirattarkarn, Araujo & Neijens, 2020) or to express their perceptions of the brand (Leonhardt, Pezutti & Namkoong, 2020). Second, individualistic members prefer many but superficial connections with other members. With this in mind, in individualist countries (Yaniv & Levy, 2021), marketing communications are more direct, product information is more comprehensive, and they have no incentive to engage more deeply with other people. Based on the literature search, the following hypothesis is made:

H_{2a}: *Individualist online brand community members are likely to generate more brand-oriented content than community-oriented content.*

In collectivism, the group is expected to take care of individuals in exchange for loyalty to the group (Hofstede, 1984). Groups and their harmony, rituals and expectations are more important than individual goals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Group goals are focused and prioritized over individual goals (Schwartz, 1990), and relationships are less dependent on costs and benefits (Kim et al., 1994). Collectivism revolves around face, honor and public reputation (Hollebeek, 2018), while collectivists are heavily influenced by the actions and thoughts of others (Cialdini et al., 1999). In fact, for collectivists, relationships come first and individuals second (Triandis, 1993). Individualists may act simply because they want to do something, but individuals from collectivist cultures are more likely to please others and succumb to social pressure (Ahuvia, 2002). Group feedback is even more important in collectivist cultures, where rules promote solidarity, altruism (Earley, Gibson, & Chen, 1999), and altruism (Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988). Collectivists prefer equality to self-interest (Leung, 1997), even if their contribution is significantly greater than that of other members (Hui, Triandis, & Yee, 1991).

Like individualists, collectivists participate in online brand communities for information and entertainment. However, for collectivist members, communication with peers is even more important (Tsai & Men, 2017). Collectivist members are more likely to seek and offer advice (Leonhardt, Pezutti & Namkoong, 2020). In collectivist cultures, implicit and indirect messages that emphasize enjoyment and socialization are often used to foster customer loyalty and relationships (Yaniv & Levy, 2021). Collectivists participate in online brand communities to enhance their status (Madupu & Cooley, 2010b) and to express a sense of belonging (Kitirattarkarn, Araujo, & Neijens, 2020). Collectivist members view user-generated content as more credible than individualist members (Luo et al., 2014). Social interaction is more important for collectivists than for individualists (Xu-Priour, Truong & Klink, 2014).

Collectivist members should put community above brand for two reasons. First, cross-cultural studies from other fields show that collectivist cultures promote knowledge sharing with other individuals in the group (Walsahm, 2001) and helping each other is seen as a moral obligation rather than a personal choice (Triandis & Suh, 2002). In collectivist cultures, success depends on the help of others rather than individual abilities (Triandis, 1993). Second, collectivistic people derive their identity from in-groups, tend to develop more long-term in-group relationships, and are concerned with group harmony (Triandis, 1993). Based on the literature research, the following hypothesis is proposed.

H_{2b}: *Collectivist online brand community members are likely to generate more community-oriented content than brand-oriented content.*

3. Methodology

3.1. Procedure

The experiment was designed as a two-country, two-condition study examining the impact of product visibility and individualism-collectivism on the relative generation of different types of user-generated content in an online brand community. Samsung desktop computers were chosen to represent the less visible products and Samsung smartphones were chosen to represent the more visible products. Choosing two products of the same brand and category (consumer electronics) should minimize the impact of non-visibility factors. The United States was chosen to represent individualist countries because of its high individualism score (91), and Turkey was chosen to represent collectivist countries because of its low individualism score (37) (Hofstede Insights, 2022). Countries with a high individualism score have a more individualistic culture and countries with a low individualism score have a more collectivist culture. In each country sample, members who don't know or are totally unfamiliar with their assigned products are removed.

For the United States, the study included 108 qualified Amazon M-Turk users who engaged with an online brand community in the last 30 days prior to the experiment participated in the study. Forty-six of the participants were women (43%) and Sixty-two of them were men (57%) with an average age of 35 to 44 years. Eighty of the participants (74%) earned a college degree at least and eighty-six of them (80%) had full-time jobs with a median annual income between $50,000 and $60,000.

For Turkey, 108 qualified participants were recruited through the Pragma Panel. Same as their American counterparts, Turkish participants were also required to be engaged with an online brand community in the last 30 days prior to the experiment. Eighty-two of the participants (76%) were women and 26 of them were men (24%), with an average of 25 to 34 years. Seventy-two participants (66%) earned a college degree at least and Fifty-eight of them (54%) had full-time jobs with a median annual income between $9,000 and $10,000.

In each country, participants were randomly assigned to more visible product or less visible product conditions. First, participants were asked about their familiarity, knowledge and attitude toward the product assigned to the condition. Then each participant saw the Samsung logo and the image of the assigned product. Afterward, the participants were asked to imagine themselves in an online community of their assigned product. The participants were shown six types of content and asked how likely they would post these six types of content in their assigned communities.

As a manipulation check, participants were also asked to rate the visibility of their assigned Samsung product (see Appendix B).

3.2. Measures

To determine content orientation, participants were asked to what extent they are likely to post particular types of content in the online brand community on a 7-point scale. The six content types that were used in Soylemez (2021a) were used in the experiment (See Appendix A). Content orientation was calculated in the same way, by dividing the average brand-oriented content score by the average community-oriented content score. A higher content orientation score indicates a higher inclination toward posting brand-oriented content as opposed to community-oriented content, while a lower content orientation score indicates a higher inclination toward posting community-oriented content as opposed to brand-oriented content.

Participants' socio-economic status and real-life online brand community experiences were used as control variables (number of communities they are members of, length of membership, anonymity characteristics, the existence of reputation systems). These variables have been found to influence content generation in previous studies (Resnick & Zeckhauser 2002; Madupu & Cooley 2010a; Kusumasondjaja, Shanka & Marchegiani, 2012; Lee & Shin 2014).

3.3. Analysis

To confirm that the products were perceived as intended, a regression analysis with product visibility score as the dependent variable; product visibility condition, familiarity, attitude and knowledge as independent variables was conducted. The results show that Samsung smartphones (M=5.01, SD= 1.63) were indeed perceived as more visible than Samsung desktop computers (M=3.37, SD= 1.74, t (215)=6,244, p < .001). The finding was also confirmed for each country sample.

Table 1: Manipulation Check

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2,507	0,610		4,113	0,000		
Product Visibility (B)	**1,603**	**0,257**	**0,427**	**6,244**	**0,000**	**0,805**	**1,242**
Familiarity	-0,213	0,179	-0,134	-1,190	0,235	0,296	3,382
Knowledge	0,200	0,171	0,126	1,169	0,244	0,323	3,096
Attitude	0,252	0,186	0,102	1,352	0,178	0,659	1,518

To analyze the relationship between product visibility, individualism-collectivism, and user-generated content types, an ANCOVA with content orientation as a dependent variable; product visibility and individualism-collectivism as independent variables, and control variables as covariates. ANCOVA results show that product visibility has a significant and positive effect on content orientation (β=0.138, F(1.198)= 12.760, p<0.001). This result suggests that members of more visible product communities

generate more brand-oriented content than they generate community-oriented content (higher content orientation) and members of less visible product communities generate more community-oriented content than they generate brand-oriented content (lower content orientation) Therefore, we can say that H_{1a} and H_{1b} are supported.

ANCOVA results also show that individualism has a significant and positive effect on content orientation as well ($\beta=0.118$, $F(1.198)= 6.282$, $p=0.013$). This result suggests that individualistic members generate more brand-oriented content than they generate community-oriented content (higher content orientation) and collectivistic members generate more community-oriented content than they generate brand-oriented content (lower content orientation). Therefore, we can say that H_{2a} and H_{2b} are supported as well.

Table 2: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[b]
Corrected Model	2,531[a]	17	0,149	2,857	0,000	0,197	48,571	0,998
Intercept	3,497	1	3,497	67,107	0,000	0,253	67,107	1,000
Familiarity	0,017	1	0,017	0,320	0,572	0,002	0,320	0,087
Knowledge	0,001	1	0,001	0,025	0,875	0,000	0,025	0,053
Attitude	0,092	1	0,092	1,771	0,185	0,009	1,771	0,263
NoC	0,003	1	0,003	0,057	0,812	0,000	0,057	0,056
LoM	0,012	1	0,012	0,237	0,627	0,001	0,237	0,077
Anon_1	**0,452**	**1**	**0,452**	**8,679**	**0,004**	**0,042**	**8,679**	**0,834**
Anon_2	0,012	1	0,012	0,234	0,629	0,001	0,234	0,077
Anon_3	0,082	1	0,082	1,572	0,211	0,008	1,572	0,239
Anon_4	**0,289**	**1**	**0,289**	**5,548**	**0,019**	**0,027**	**5,548**	**0,650**
Sex	0,055	1	0,055	1,048	0,307	0,005	1,048	0,175
Age	**0,194**	**1**	**0,194**	**3,727**	**0,055**	**0,018**	**3,727**	**0,485**
Education	0,003	1	0,003	0,049	0,824	0,000	0,049	0,056
Employment	2,245E-06	1	2,245E-06	0,000	0,995	0,000	0,000	0,050
Income	0,000	1	0,000	0,009	0,923	0,000	0,009	0,051
Product Visibility (B)	**0,665**	**1**	**0,665**	**12,760**	**0,000**	**0,061**	**12,760**	**0,945**
Individualism	**0,327**	**1**	**0,327**	**6,282**	**0,013**	**0,031**	**6,282**	**0,703**
ProductVisibility (B) * Individualism	0,004	1	0,004	0,068	0,794	0,000	0,068	0,058
Error	10,317	198	0,052					
Total	217,899	216						
Corrected Total	12,847	215						

Interaction is also controlled as well even though it is not hypothesized. ANCOVA results suggest that there is no significant interaction between product visibility and national culture.

Table 3: Parameter Estimates

Parameter	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power[b]
Intercept	1,270	0,148	8,604	0,000	0,272	8,604	1,000
Familiarity	-0,014	0,025	-0,566	0,572	0,002	0,566	0,087
Knowledge	0,004	0,025	0,158	0,875	0,000	0,158	0,053
Attitude	-0,035	0,026	-1,331	0,185	0,009	1,331	0,263
NoC	-0,001	0,004	-0,238	0,812	0,000	0,238	0,056
LoM	-0,007	0,014	-0,487	0,627	0,001	0,487	0,077
Anon_1	**0,158**	**0,054**	**2,946**	**0,004**	**0,042**	**2,946**	**0,834**
Anon_2	0,026	0,054	0,484	0,629	0,001	0,484	0,077
Anon_3	0,052	0,042	1,254	0,211	0,008	1,254	0,239
Anon_4	**-0,096**	**0,041**	**-2,355**	**0,019**	**0,027**	**2,355**	**0,650**
Sex	-0,039	0,038	-1,024	0,307	0,005	1,024	0,175
Age	**-0,035**	**0,018**	**-1,930**	**0,055**	**0,018**	**1,930**	**0,485**
Education	-0,003	0,013	-0,222	0,824	0,000	0,222	0,056
Employment	-7,068E-05	0,011	-0,007	0,995	0,000	0,007	0,050
Income	0,001	0,006	0,097	0,923	0,000	0,097	0,051
[ProductVisibilityB=0]	-0,138	0,050	-2,770	0,006	0,037	2,770	0,787
[ProductVisibilityB=1]	0[a]						
[Individualism=0]	-0,118	0,052	-2,270	0,024	0,025	2,270	0,617
[Individualism=1]	0[a]						
[ProductVisibilityB=0] * [Individualism=0]	0,017	0,065	0,261	0,794	0,000	0,261	0,058
[ProductVisibilityB=0] * [Individualism=1]	0[a]						
[ProductVisibilityB=1] * [Individualism=0]	0[a]						
[ProductVisibilityB=1] * [Individualism=1]	0[a]						

Among the control variables, anonymity, the existence of a reputation system and age proved to be significant. Anonymity has a positive coefficient ($\beta = 0.158$, $F(1198) = 8.679$, $p = 0.004$), suggesting that members generate relatively more brand-oriented content when anonymous compared to the community. One possible explanation is that members of the online brand community censor themselves when using their real identities for various reasons.

The presence of a formal reputation system has a negative coefficient ($\beta = -0.096$, $F(1.198) = 5.548$, $p = 0.019$), suggesting that members generate more community-oriented content when the community has a formal reputation compared to the brand. the content has a reputation system. Community ranks are likely to provide additional incentives for members to view the community as an important stakeholder. Additionally, these ranks give the owners some sort of authority over other followers of lower rank.

Age has a negative coefficient (β=-0.035, F(1.198)= 3.727, p=0.055), suggesting that older members generate more community-oriented content, while younger members generate more brand-oriented content. One possible explanation is that younger members see the community as a source of brand-related information, while older members are more interested in the socializing aspects.

4. Conclusions and Discussion

Although content generation is a hot topic in the literature, earlier studies frequently pretended that user-generated content was a monolith and was interested mostly in the number of posts. However, community members generate brand-oriented content as well as community-oriented content to reach different audiences (Soylemez, 2021a). According to Carvalho and Fernandes (2018), both types of content contribute directly or indirectly to brand value, so striking the right balance between them is crucial for the growth of online communities. To fully benefit from their communities, brands should develop a deeper understanding of what motivates the generation of each content type.

This article investigated the effects of product visibility and cultural orientation on the relative generation of brand-oriented content and community-oriented content. Based on equity theory, it is argued that members of more visible product communities generate more brand-oriented content than they generate community-oriented content and members of less visible product communities generate more community-oriented content than they generate brand-oriented content. The experiment results confirmed this hypothesis. Regarding the national culture, it is asserted that individualistic members of online brand communities generate more brand-oriented content than they generate community-oriented content and collectivistic community members generate more community-oriented content than they generate brand-oriented content. The study's findings supported this theory as well.

4.1. Theoretical Implications

Researchers in marketing are anticipated to benefit from this study in a number of ways. The goal of this study is to add to the work of Soylemez (2021a) and Soylemez (2021b), who categorize user-generated content according to the target audience. Based on the equity theory, this study argued that participants prioritize generating certain types of content to maintain fairness. Although equity theory is rarely used in research on online brand communities (Kamboj & Rahman 2017), the theory has certain explanatory power to describe behavioral differences among community members.

National culture has been studied in the context of online brand communities, but the findings are far from conclusive, and studies have mainly focused on the impact of culture on member participation in online brand communities in the first place (Gallagher and Savage, 2013). Beyond that, this study demonstrates how national culture affects the way that participants interact with online brand communities. Exchange fairness for collectivist members depends on other members' approval and appreciation. They give back to the community in the form of community-oriented

content because they gain a lot from other members' acknowledgment. The community is merely a means for individualistic members to learn new skills and forge enduring bonds with brands. The value of brand-oriented content is used by these participants to compensate brands fairly.

The study also suggests that brand-related interactions between participants and online brand communities may supplement such interactions in the real world. Members of more visible product communities are more eager to participate in co-creation activities and skill development while satisfying their need for provoking envy in real-life. Members of less visible product communities, on the other hand, favor more social interactions that are not possible for them in real life.

4.2. Managerial Implications

In several ways, marketing professionals are expected to benefit from this research. First and foremost, this study benefits marketing professionals operating in global markets. In different countries, businesses might have different expectations for online brand communities. In some nations, businesses may view them as a valuable strategic resource for undertaking various co-creation projects that energize the business and help with product development. If this is the case, the brand must take action by organizing events that are open only to community members, providing member-only discounts, and giving them first access to new products. Brands may notice that individualist members are already inclined to interact with the community in that way under the co-creation scenario. Brands can still offer incentives to these consumers, but they also have the option to forgo spending extra money and just let the natural tendencies take their course. "My Starbucks Idea" is a well-known example of this tactic. Starbucks used incentives to encourage US customers to submit ideas, and as a result, they received about 200,000 submissions, of which about 300 were actually implemented, such as new flavors and free Wi-Fi in the store. However, in order to reverse their inclinations, companies must work twice as hard on collectivistic countries. Some businesses, meanwhile, envision their online brand communities as casual gathering places where fans can socialize and offer solutions to issues that the community members face. If so, the brand shall take part in activities like planning social events for the community or using various gamification tools. Brands may believe that in the socialization scenario, collectivist members already have a propensity for interacting with the community and there is no need for additional expenditures. Yet, brands can still incentive these members to amplify their natural tendencies. However, brands must work harder on individualistic members to buck their inclinations. This tactic can be seen in Apple's "Lounge.". If an Apple community member generates certain amount of content that other community members marked as "helpful" or "solved my problem", he or she is invited to the "Lounge". In the "Lounge", they are entitled to receive exclusive Apple news and mingle with other Lounge members. Apple benefits from lower customer service costs and increased brand loyalty by encouraging users of the online brand community to respond to and answer questions from other users.

Second, this study aids marketing departments in comprehending the relation between product visibility and the relative generation of different content types. Brands can use a variety of online

strategies depending on their product visibility. For instance, when a brand of more visible products begins to develop its online community, the brand already knows that community members are inclined to generate community-oriented content. The brand shall engage in activities like planning social events for the community if the brand's expectations of the online brand community are to increase brand loyalty through community ties. Famous for its offline communities, Harley Davidson utilized online "Harley Owner Groups" (HOGs) as a tool for this purpose. A brotherhood of riders with a common ethos has come to define Harley Davidson over the past 40 years (Fournier and Lee, 2009). They bring their strategic positioning on the Internet as online brand communities grow. HOG members can connect with one another, invite one another to private sales, and take part in group riding events in addition to exchanging opinions and sharing photos. Customers are encouraged by Harley Davidson to get involved in community organizations, start charitable causes, and attend local, regional, national, and international events. Members are also urged to dress similarly while attending these events in order to foster community ties. New Harley-Davidson owners can hone their skills at regional chapters, which also offer training programs for both novice and expert riders. By making members feel like a vital part of a larger whole, these initiatives hope to foster a strong sense of belonging. In a similar vein, when a brand of less visible product starts to develop its own online community, it is aware that the community members are already predisposed to generate more brand-oriented content. A company should exert more effort to promote community-oriented content if it views the brand community as a place for fans to gather informally or to receive "free customer service.". "Lego Ideas" is a good illustration of this strategy. Community members can review designs, vote for their favorites, give feedback, and submit their own ideas on the Lego Ideas website. Lego uses these product ideas and pays a commission to the submitter.

Third, similar choices can be made in situations involving brand extensions. When a brand with less visible products decides to offer more visible products, they are aware that community members are more concerned with impressing their peers than with brand-related matters like new product development or the brand's most recent public relations initiatives. As a result, it is recommended to develop distinct brand communities for each segment and apply the aforementioned tactics to get the desired effects.

4.3. Limitations and Further Studies

This research has several drawbacks that need to be addressed by future research. The first drawback is the using experimental design over actual data. Finding communities of the same product category of the same brand in two different countries is quite a difficult task. Although every effort has been made to replicate actual brand communities, future studies should replicate our findings with real data.

Future studies shall consider expanding this study by using equity theory to examine the impact of members' experiences with other communities. While this study examined how members seek to maintain fairness within a specific community, equity theory also posits that individuals seek

to maintain fairness with their peers outside the community. It would also be interesting for future research to explore whether the findings of this study are applicable to offline brand communities. While online and offline brand communities have some key differences, it's possible that similar dynamics are observed in real-life discussions in offline brand communities. In face-to-face communication, some members tend to talk more about the brand and latest products, while others prefer to engage in social networking, depending on the brand/product and contextual factors.

Future research could also extend this study by examining community-level factors such as community orientation. Anti-brand communities where members gather to disparage certain brands or product categories are also worth exploring. These brand communities can have different dynamics. Further research can also strengthen this study by examining the effects of individual factors such as personality traits or other product classifications such as goods versus services, search vs. experience vs. credence, prevention vs promotion products, and different stages of the product life cycle.

Financial Support

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press.

Ahuvia, A. C. (2002). Individualism/collectivism and cultures of happiness: A theoretical conjecture on the relationship between consumption, culture and subjective well-being at the national level. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*(1), 23-36.

Amin, K. (2019). *The Influence of Culture on Social eWord-of-Mouth and Re-purchase Intentions through Brand Community Participation and Identification* (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Leo University). Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/openview/b07445ff5b9eaa4eaa667ff7b54382d6/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y#

Andersen, P. H. (2005). Relationship marketing and brand involvement of professionals through web-enhanced brand communities: The case of Coloplast. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *34*(3), 285-297.

Berger, J., & Schwartz, E. M. (2011). What drives immediate and ongoing word of mouth?. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *48*(5), 869-880.

Brandt, V. S. (1974). Skiing cross-culturally. *Current Anthropology*, *15*(1), 64-66.

Carvalho, A., & Fernandes, T. (2018). Understanding customer brand engagement with virtual social communities: A comprehensive model of drivers, outcomes and moderators. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *26*(1-2), 23-37.

Cheng, Y. H., Huang, M. C. J., Chuang, S. C., & Ju, Y. R. (2015). Burger or yogurt? Indulgent consumption in impression management contexts. *International Journal of Psychology*, *50*(5), 345-353.

Cheung, C. M., Chiu, P. Y., & Lee, M. K. (2011). Online social networks: Why do students use facebook?. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *27*(4), 1337-1343.

Chuang, S. C., Cheng, Y. H., & Hsu, C. T. (2012). The influence of suggestions of reference groups in the compromise effect. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *33*(3), 554-565.

Cialdini, R. B., Wosinska, W., Barrett, D. W., Butner, J., & Gornik-Durose, M. (1999). Compliance with a request in two cultures: The differential influence of social proof and commitment/consistency on collectivists and individualists. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*(10), 1242-1253.

Cova, B. (1997). Community and consumption: Towards a definition of the "linking value" of product or services. *European Journal of Marketing*. 31 (3-4), 297-316.

Cova, B., & Pace, S. (2006). Brand community of convenience products: new forms of customer empowerment– the case "my Nutella The Community". *European Journal of Marketing*. 40 (9/10), 1087-1105.

Cummins, S., Peltier, J. W., Schibrowsky, J. A., & Nill, A. (2014). Consumer behavior in the online context. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*. 8(3), 169-202.

Dye, R. (2000). The buzz on buzz. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*(6), 139-146.

Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34(4), 565-581.

Earley, P. C., Gibson, C. B., & Chen, C. C. (1999). "How did I do?" versus "How did we do?" Cultural contrasts of performance feedback use and self-efficacy. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *30*(5), 594-619.

Fournier, S., & Lee, L. (2009). Getting brand communities right. *Harvard Business Review*, *87*(4), 105-111.

Gallagher, S. E., & Savage, T. (2013). Cross-cultural analysis in online community research: A literature review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(3), 1028-1038.

Gefen, D., & Straub, D. W. (2004). Consumer trust in B2C e-Commerce and the importance of social presence: experiments in e-Products and e-Services. *Omega*, *32*(6), 407-424.

Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M., & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology. 58*, 479-514.

Gensler, S., Völckner, F., Liu-Thompkins, Y., & Wiertz, C. (2013). Managing brands in the social media environment. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *27*(4), 242-256.

Gong, T. (2017). Customer brand engagement behavior in online brand communities. *Journal of Services Marketing*. 32(3), 286-299.

Graeff, T. R. (1996). Image congruence effects on product evaluations: The role of self-monitoring and public/ private consumption. *Psychology & Marketing*, *13*(5), 481-499.

Gvili, Y., & Levy, S. (2021). Consumer engagement in sharing brand-related information on social commerce: The roles of culture and experience. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, *27*(1), 53-68.

Haikel-Elsabeh, M., Zhao, Z., Ivens, B., & Brem, A. (2019). When is brand content shared on Facebook? A field study on online Word-of-Mouth. *International Journal of Market Research*, *61*(3), 287-301.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). Sage.

Hofstede Insights (2022), *Country Comparisons*, Retrieved from: https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/turkey,the-usa/

Hollebeek, L. D. (2018). Individual-level cultural consumer engagement styles: Conceptualization, propositions and implications. *International Marketing Review*. 35(1),42-71.

Hughes, M. (2005). Buzzmarketing: Get people to talk about your stuff. Penguin.

Hui, C. H., Triandis, H. C., & Yee, C. (1991). Cultural differences in reward allocation: Is collectivism the explanation?. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *30*(2), 145-157.

Itani, O. S., El Haddad, R., & Kalra, A. (2020). Exploring the role of extrovert-introvert customers' personality prototype as a driver of customer engagement: does relationship duration matter?. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *53*, 101980.

Jiao, Y., Ertz, M., Jo, M. S., & Sarigollu, E. (2018). Social value, content value, and brand equity in social media brand communities: A comparison of Chinese and US consumers. *International Marketing Review*. *35*(1), 18-41.

Kamboj, S., & Rahman, Z. (2017). Understanding customer participation in online brand communities: Literature review and future research agenda. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*. *20*(3), 306-334.

Kusumasondjaja, S., Shanka, T., & Marchegiani, C. (2012). Credibility of online reviews and initial trust: The roles of reviewer's identity and review valence. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *18*(3), 185-195.

Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagitcibasi, C., & Yoon, G. (1994). Individualism and collectivism: Theoretical and methodological issues. *Newbury Park, CA: Sage.*

Kitirattarkarn, G. P., Araujo, T., & Neijens, P. (2020). Cultural differences in motivation for consumers' online brand-related activities on Facebook. *Communications*, *45*(1), 53-73.

Kozinets, R. V., De Valck, K., Wojnicki, A. C., & Wilner, S. J. (2010). Networked narratives: Understanding word-of-mouth marketing in online communities. *Journal of Marketing*, *74*(2), 71-89.

Laroche, M., Habibi, M. R., Richard, M. O., & Sankaranarayanan, R. (2012). The effects of social media based brand communities on brand community markers, value creation practices, brand trust and brand loyalty. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *28*(5), 1755-1767.

Lee, K. M. (2004). Presence, explicated. *Communication Theory*, *14*(1), 27-50.

Lee, E. J., & Shin, S. Y. (2014). When do consumers buy online product reviews? Effects of review quality, product type, and reviewer's photo. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *31*, 356-366.

Leonhardt, J. M., Pezzuti, T., & Namkoong, J. E. (2020). We're not so different: Collectivism increases perceived homophily, trust, and seeking user-generated product information. *Journal of Business Research*, *112*, 160-169.

Leung, K. (1997), "Negotiation and reward allocations across cultures", Earley, P.C. and Erez, M. (Eds.), *New Perspectives on International Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Lexington Press, San Francisco, California.640-675.

Luo, C., Wu, J., Shi, Y., & Xu, Y. (2014). The effects of individualism–collectivism cultural orientation on eWOM information. *International Journal of Information Management*, *34*(4), 446-456.

Madupu, V., & Cooley, D. O. (2010a). Antecedents and consequences of online brand community participation: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Internet Commerce*, *9*(2), 127-147.

Madupu, V., & Cooley, D. O. (2010b). Cross-cultural differences in online brand communities: An exploratory study of Indian and American online brand communities. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, *22*(4), 363-375.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224.

Mead, M. (1967), *Cooperation and Competition among Primitive People*, Beacon, Boston.

Muniz, A. M., & O'guinn, T. C. (2001). Brand community. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *27*(4), 412-432.

Nedungadi, P. (1990). Recall and consumer consideration sets: Influencing choice without altering brand evaluations. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *17*(3), 263-276.

Nov, O., Naaman, M., & Ye, C. (2010). Analysis of participation in an online photo-sharing community: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *61*(3), 555-566.

Okazaki, S., & Taylor, C. R. (2013). Social media and international advertising: theoretical challenges and future directions. *International Marketing Review*. 30(1), 56-71.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(1), 3-72.

Pezzuti, T., & Leonhardt, J. M. (2021). How collectivistic values affect online word-of-mouth. *International Journal of Market Research*, *63*(4), 436-453.

Resnick, P., & Zeckhauser, R. (2002). Trust among strangers in Internet transactions: Empirical analysis of eBay's reputation system. In *The Economics of the Internet and E-commerce*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. 127-157

Sánchez-Franco, M. J., Martínez-López, F. J., & Martín-Velicia, F. A. (2009). Exploring the impact of individualism and uncertainty avoidance in Web-based electronic learning: An empirical analysis in European higher education. *Computers & Education*, *52*(3), 588-598.

Schlenker, B. R. (1980). *Impression Management* . Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. 79-80.

Schulze, C., Schöler, L., & Skiera, B. (2014). Not all fun and games: Viral marketing for utilitarian products. *Journal of Marketing*, *78*(1), 1-19.

Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *21*(2), 139-157.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values.

Kim, U. E., Triandis, H. C., Kâğitçibaşi, Ç. E., Choi, S. C. E., & Yoon, G. E. (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. Sage Publications, Inc., 85-119.

Sernovitz, A., Kawaski, G., & Godin, S. (2006). *Word of mouth marketing*. Dearborn Trade, A Kaplan Professional Company.

Shweder, R. A., Le Vine, R. A., LeVine, R. A., & Economiste, R. A. L. (Eds.). (1984). *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self and emotion*. Cambridge University Press.

Simon, F., & Tossan, V. (2018). Does brand-consumer social sharing matter? A relational framework of customer engagement to brand-hosted social media. *Journal of Business Research*, *85*, 175-184.

Song, J. H., & Zinkhan, G. M. (2008). Determinants of perceived web site interactivity. *Journal of Marketing*, *72*(2), 99-113.

Song, M., Wang, N., Zhang, X., & Qiao, L. (2017). Factors motivating customers' SNS brand page behaviors: A comparison between China and Korea. *Pacific Asia Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *9*(4), 3.

Soylemez, K. C. (2021a). Impact of individual and brand level factors in generation of different user-generated content. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 38(4), 457-466.

Soylemez, K. C. (2021b). 4W of user-generated content: why who we are and where we post influence what we post. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing.*15(3), 386-400

Teichmann, K., Stokburger-Sauer, N. E., Plank, A., & Strobl, A. (2015). Motivational drivers of content contribution to company-versus consumer-hosted online communities. *Psychology & Marketing*, *32*(3), 341-355.

Tirunillai, S., & Tellis, G. J. (2012). Does chatter really matter? Dynamics of user-generated content and stock performance. *Marketing Science*, *31*(2), 198-215.

Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The Analysis of Subjective Culture*, Wiley, New York.

Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-cultural research*, *27*(3-4), 155-180.

Triandis, H. C. (2004). The many dimensions of culture. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *18*(1), 88-93.

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(1), 118-128.

Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*(1), 133-160.

Triandis, H. C., Brislin, R., & Hui, C. H. (1988). Cross-cultural training across the individualism-collectivism divide. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *12*(3), 269-289.

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C. H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*(5), 1006-1020

Tsai, W. H. S., & Men, L. R. (2017). Consumer engagement with brands on social network sites: A cross-cultural comparison of China and the USA. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, *23*(1), 2-21.

Walsham, G. (2001). *Making a world of difference: IT in a global context*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc..

Wang, C. L. (2021). New frontiers and future directions in interactive marketing: inaugural Editorial. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*.15(1), 1-9.

Srull, T. K. (1981). Category accessibility: Some theoretical and empirical issues concerning the processing of social stimulus information. In *The Ontario symposium on personality and social psychology: Social cognition*.16(4), 348-361.

Xu-Priour, D. L., Truong, Y., & Klink, R. R. (2014). The effects of collectivism and polychronic time orientation on online social interaction and shopping behavior: A comparative study between China and France. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *88*, 265-275.

Yamaguchi, S., Kuhlman, D. M., & Sugimori, S. (1995). Personality correlates of allocentric tendencies in individualist and collectivist cultures. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *26*(6), 658-672.

Resume

Kemal Cem SOYLEMEZ (Ph.D.), is an independent scholar and currently works at Yarin DNS as market development specialist. He holds a Ph.D. in Marketing from Old Dominion University. His research interests focus on the areas of online consumer behavior. His research has appeared in Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing Journal of Consumer Marketing, Adam Academy Journal of Social Sciences. He is currently a reviewer in Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing.

Appendix

A: Post Types
Brand-oriented content
Give feedback on how the brand can improve its products.
Complain about an issue you had with a product.
Offer ideas on new products that the brand can develop.
Community-Oriented Content
Answer other users' questions about a product

Welcome a new user to the community
Offer tips on how to best use a product

B: Product Visibility

Different products are consumed under different situations. Some products such as cars and shoes are consumed more publicly. For example, other people can easily see you driving your car in town or parking in front of the office. Meanwhile, the same thing cannot be said for some other products such as anti-virus software and personal grooming products. These products tend to be consumed more privately, often without the presence of others.

Do you consider X as privately consumed product or publicly consumed product?

(1=Privately Consumed Product, 7=Publicly Consumed Product)

C : Nomenclature

NoC: Number of Communities
LoM: Length of Membership
Anon_1: Users have anonymity.
Anon_2: Users can use alias/nicknames.
Anon_3: Users have a profile picture
Anon_4: The community has a formal reputation system.