

## Who “Likes” You...and Why? A typology of Facebook Fans

Elaine Wallace \*

Senior Lecturer in Marketing  
J.E. Cairnes School of Business & Economics  
National University of Ireland Galway  
Ireland  
Tel Int code: + 353 91 492603  
Fax Int code: + 353 91 494560  
Email: elaine.wallace@nuigalway.ie

Isabel Buil

Senior Lecturer in Marketing  
Department of Marketing Management  
University of Zaragoza  
Spain  
Tel Int code: + 34 976 761 000  
Email: ibuil@unizar.es

Leslie de Chernatony

Honorary Professor of Brand Marketing  
Aston Business School, Birmingham, UK  
Email: dechernatony@btinternet.com

Michael Hogan

School of Psychology  
National University of Ireland, Galway  
Ireland  
Email: michael.hogan@nuigalway.ie

(\* = Author for correspondence)

*Paper accepted for publication in Journal of Advertising Research*

## MANAGEMENT SLANT

Targeting strategies and brand communications can be enhanced by pragmatically studying four key segments of Facebook Fans:

- **“Fan” -atics** have strong loyalty and brand love. “Fan”-atics help spread WOM due to their numerous Facebook friends. Facebook “shares” may encourage “likes” from “Fan”-atics.
- **Self-Expressives** “like” to impress others. They may be influenced by messages about brands’ social desirability.
- Incentives for “liking” may not be effective for all Fans types: **Utilitarians** who “like” for incentives have lower loyalty and brand love and also offer less WOM than other Fans.
- **Authentics**, with strong brand loyalty and brand love, are less active on Facebook, although they have strong social ties. This group is best reached on Facebook through their friendship networks.

## ABSTRACT

Although many managers recognize that Facebook Fans represent a marketing opportunity, there has been little research into the natures of different Fan types. This study explores a typology of Fans, drawn from a sample of 438 individuals who “like” brands on Facebook. Fans’ brand loyalty, brand love, use of self-expressive brands, and word of mouth (WOM) for “liked” brands were used to suggest four Fan types: the “Fan”-atic, the Utilitarian, the Self-Expressive and the Authentic. The results of this exploratory study highlight the value of cluster analysis as a strategy for identifying different Fan types and provide insights to prompt further research into Facebook Fan types.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the financial support of the Research Development Initiative, Strand 2 (Ref: RCS 258) from the Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences, the I+D+I project (Ref: ECO2009-08283) from the Government of Spain, and the project GENERES (Ref: S-09) from the Government of Aragon and the European Social Fund.

## INTRODUCTION

Attracting Facebook Fans potentially is a valuable marketing-communications strategy (Hollis, 2011). Indeed, some commentators have noted that some managers are “obsessed” by the “value-of-a-Fan” metric (Lapointe, 2012, p. 286). Although some research has focused on Fan behavior (for example counting the number of “likes”), much less is known about the profile of audiences reached (Lipsman *et al.*, 2012).

Although there exists a multitude of blogs, Websites and articles offering advice about increasing the number of “likes” on Facebook, few, if any, offer insights about *why* consumers might become Fans of brands. As one marketing-research columnist observed, “to truly understand the predictive value of a Fan, we need to acknowledge that not all Fans are created equal... what causes people to become Fans in the first place?” (Lapointe, 2012, p. 286).

Little is also known about the complex relationship between Facebook Fans and their “liked” brands (Nelson-Field, Riebe, and Sharp, 2012). Addressing these gaps, this study suggests exploratory insights into Facebook Fans as it investigates a possible typology of Fans characterized by their brand loyalty, brand love, WOM, and their use of self-expressive brands (See Table 1).

To the authors’ knowledge, no other study has explored a Facebook-Fan typology characterized by brand relationships and informed by Fans personality traits, social networks, and their reasons for “liking”. Using data from a survey of 438 Facebook “likers,” the authors describe four Fan types based on a cluster analysis of survey respondents responses.

As this study is the first of its kind, and because cluster analysis is an exploratory tool, this paper suggests directions for further research to build on the initial findings and to test their generalizability.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### How Facebook “Likes” Enhance Marketing Communications

The Facebook “like” button offers a straightforward tool to engage consumers in the co-creation of marketing communications. Advertisers proactively can create Facebook Fan pages and encourage Facebook members to become a Fan by clicking a “like” button on their Fan pages. By clicking “like,” Fans receive updates from the brand in their Facebook news feed.

Facebook has stated that people who click a Facebook “like” button are more engaged, active and connected than the average Facebook user (Facebook, 2010). Millward Brown’s BrandZ data found that Fans spend nearly five times the amount of money on their “liked” brand than non-Fans (Hollis, 2011). Fans also have 2.4 times the number of friends of a typical Facebook user and click on 5.3 times more links to external sites than typical users (Facebook, 2010). The “like” button, therefore, offers a way for companies to attract Fans well connected on their social networks, enhancing the breadth of the brand message (Nelson-Field *et al.*, 2012).

For marketing managers concerned with measuring the return on investment (ROI) of their social media investment, the number of “likes” on a Fan page provides a social-media metric, and can be considered a proxy measure of WOM (Hoffman and Fodor, 2010) and brand engagement (Hollis, 2011). The number of Fans is not, however, a surrogate performance metric (Hollis, 2011); ratings of a Fan page, for instance, may not correlate with the number of “likes” for that page.

Many companies have reported that they are driven by a desire to optimize the number of “likes” or friends for their brand, and advice abounds to increase the page “likes”. Yet organizations do not fully understand whether “likers” are engaged with the brand. Some companies on Facebook, for instance, emulate the success of sites such as Groupon, where consumers can cash in on deals but only if they get a target number of friends to join their site. It is questionable, however, whether this type of marketing communications strategy is effective if the consumer only “likes” the brand to attain financial gain, rather than due to any true liking for the brand (Wong, 2010).

Other companies are using an approach called “like-gating” to increase their Fan base. “Like-gating” is a strategy whereby companies provide exclusive content on a brand page limited to those who “like” the Facebook page. This incentive may encourage prospective customers to “like” a brand page, but, again, the relationship between encouraging “likes” in this way and behavior in relation to the brand is unknown.

In sum, the correlation between “brand-engaged” and “Fan” is unclear. Indeed, for instance, consumers who have not identified themselves as Fans still may have great loyalty for their brand, and some Fans might not really be engaged in the product or service at all (Lapointe, 2012). The buying distribution of a brand’s Facebook Fan base is “opposite to that of the typical population of category buyers” and, therefore, it may be difficult to draw inferences about typical consumers from Fan behavior (Nelson-Field *et al.*, 2012, p. 267). Consequently, managers seeking to optimize Facebook’s potential as a medium for their brand message need further insights into Fans and their brand relationships.

Although each Facebook Fan may be unique, there have been recent attempts to provide a Fan classification:

- **Categorizing Fans by pattern of behavior** (Parker, 2012): “Potential customers,” people who “like” a product/service and are willing to act quickly when content catches their interest; “friends/employees,” who “like” to support a business; “sweepstakers” who “like” to win a giveaway offered by the brand site; “happy campers” who “like” in order to interact with the brand site on a regular basis, and “fairweather friends” who “like” but equally would leave negative feedback if the brand does something they do not approve of.

Such types were derived from speculative observation of Fans across Facebook brand sites, rather than drawing insights from the Fans themselves (for example, through surveys of Fans’ attitudes).

- **Investigating Fans’ levels of interaction with the brand’s Facebook page** (Douma, 2008): Fans were described either as “enthusiasts” who “want the equivalent of a Facebook bumper sticker on their profile” as they want the world to know they “like” the brand; “advocates” who regularly participate with the brand page through

comments and feedback; or “influencers” —*i.e.*, active in content creation and are critical Fans of the Facebook page.

Such typologies are based on drawing inferences from Facebook observations, however, rather than analyzing Fans’ attitudes or exploring the complex relationship between Fans and their “liked” brands.

- **Consumers’ motivations for engaging in brand content on social media** (Muntinga, Moorman, and Smit, 2011): Extending beyond Facebook “likes,” this study presented a broader typology of consumers’ online brand-related activities (Cobra), including consuming (*e.g.*, reading reviews), contributing (*e.g.*, rating brands) and creating (*e.g.*, uploading video). Descriptions of motivations for Cobra included personal identity, social interaction, and entertainment.

Quantitatively, differences were investigated across consumers in relation to their engagement with brands online.

Further insights into Facebook Fans, their attitudes about the brand “liked,” and their reasons for “liking” could contribute to more effective marketing communications strategies. The current research seeks to answer the question:

Can an analysis of Facebook Fans inform a typology that enhances our understanding of the connection between a Fan and their brand?

Rather than make inferences about Fans from observations of Facebook sites, the current paper explores whether a typology of Fans emerges from their survey responses on measures of:

- brand relationships: “Liking” self-expressive brands, brand love, brand loyalty and word-of-mouth (WOM);
- reasons for “liking” brands: Their social network structure—tie strength and homophily;
- personality characteristics: Self-monitoring, opinion leadership/seeking, self-esteem and materialism).

## **Characteristics of Facebook Fans**

The following section outlines the characteristics used to construct an exploratory Facebook-Fan typology.

Although numerous characteristics arguably could be used to construct a typology, a notable gap in the literature exists in understanding how Fans might vary in their relationships with the brands they “like”. Are certain types of Fans more brand loyal? Do different types of Fans offer WOM? The literature suggests characteristics that could describe and cluster Facebook Fan types. Previous research has cautioned that Facebook “likes” are inconsistent with actual brand consumption and called for further exploration of the relationship between Facebook Fanship and brand loyalty and WOM (Nelson-Field *et al.*, 2012).

As the authors believe that there has been little research on Facebook Fans’ brand relationships to inform the typology, the broader consumer brand relationship literature is informative. For example, studies of brand relationships explore brand loyalty and the influence of self-congruity on brand affect (Mazodier and Merunka, 2012), the relationship

between the brand and the self-image (Albert, Merunka, and Valette-Florence, 2008), and the relationship between self-concept connections and brand attachment (Swaminathan, Page, and Gurhan-Canli, 2007).

Common to these studies are the variables “**self-expressive brands**,” “**brand loyalty**,” “**brand love**,” and “**WOM**”. These four variables, therefore, appear particularly helpful in describing and clustering Fan types (See Table 1).

**TABLE 1**  
**Characteristics for Constructing a Facebook-Fan Typology**

Construct	Rationale	Literature
Fan’s relationship with brand “liked”	Brand relationships and brand attitudes may explain different Fan types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Self-expressive brands</b> support self-construction (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006)</li> <li>• <b>Brand loyalty:</b> to what extent are “likes” proxy measures of brand consumption? (Hoffman and Fodor, 2010)</li> <li>• <b>Brand love</b> incorporates passion and desire to use the brand (Batra <i>et al.</i>, 2011)</li> <li>• <b>Worth of mouth:</b> “likes” are proxy measure of WOM (Hoffman and Fodor, 2010)</li> </ul>

- **Self-expressive brands** express a desired inner, or “true” self, or a desired social self (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). Facebook is a self-expressive medium (Schau and Gilly, 2003), and brands have self-expressive function (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006) on the social network. As recent characterizations of Fans have suggested that “liking” provides an opportunity to display brand choices to others (Douma, 2008), the self-expressive nature of brands “liked” may help delineate a Fan typology.
- **Brand loyalty** is defined as “the strength of the relationship between an individual’s relative attitude and repeat patronage” (Dick and Basu, 1994, p. 99). Recent research has investigated the nature of loyalty on social networks. Much of this work is within the context of motivations for participation in online brand communities (e.g. Sung *et al.*, 2010). Little is known, however, about the brand loyalty of Facebook Fans. Therefore, an understanding of Fans’ brand loyalty may be informative in exploring Fan clusters.
- **Brand love** is a multi-faceted consumer-brand relationship that incorporates passion, self-brand integration, positive emotional connection, and consumers’ long-term attachment to the brand (Batra, Ahuvia, and Bagozzi, 2011). Brand love also is positively associated with greater brand loyalty and higher levels of WOM (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). This construct, therefore, is relevant for inclusion in an exploration of brand Fan types on Facebook.
- Finally, **WOM** “arises and is constrained by consumers’ interactions with others,” and social networks facilitate such information flows (Brown and Reingen, 1987, p. 351). On social networks, Facebook “likes” are advocated as a proxy measure of WOM (Hoffman and Fodor, 2010). Furthermore, among bloggers on social networks, motivations for offering WOM extend beyond altruism, as individuals are also

influenced by personality and communal involvement with the network (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010). Therefore, a measure of WOM for “liked” brands is informative in understanding Facebook Fan types.

### Characteristics of an Exploratory Facebook-Fan Typology

Fans’ relationship with “liked” brands may be informed by their reasons for “liking” the brand (Douma, 2008; Lapointe, 2012; Parker, 2012; Wong, 2010), by the Fans’ network structure (Brown and Reingen, 1987; McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook, 2011), and by their personality traits (Douma, 2008; Kozinets *et al.*, 2010; Schau and Gilly, 2003) (See Table 2).

**TABLE 2**  
**Characteristics Informing an Exploratory Facebook Fan Typology**

Construct	Rationale	Literature
Fan’s reasons for “liking”	Self-reported reasons for “liking” may inform Fan types	Extant reasons provided by practitioners include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Remaining informed</b> (Parker, 2012)</li> <li>• <b>Self-construction</b> (Douma, 2008)</li> <li>• <b>Incentives</b> (Wong, 2010)</li> </ul>
Fan’s network structure	The relational structure of the social network may influence Fans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Social tie</b>: those with stronger social ties have greater influence on others, and greater credibility (Brown and Reingen, 1987)</li> <li>• <b>Homophily</b>: this construct refers to similarity on the network (McPherson <i>et al.</i>, 2011)</li> </ul>
Fan’s personality traits	Fans’ “liking” may be informed by their need for self-presentation on the Facebook social network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Self-monitoring</b>: High self-monitors may be guided by social appropriateness cues to receive validation from others (Hong <i>et al.</i>, 2012), which may influence their “likes”</li> <li>• <b>Opinion leaders and seekers</b>: these individuals are identifiable through the flow of information. Those with a large number of social ties have greater influence if communication flows from them; they affect market size if communication flows to them (Goldenberg <i>et al.</i>, 2009)</li> <li>• <b>Materialism</b>: materialistic individuals value items that can be seen in public (Richins, 1994). As “likes” appear in profile news feeds, Fans may select brands that are outside of material reality, to impress others (Schau and Gilly, 2003)</li> <li>• <b>Self-esteem</b>: consumers may be motivated to “like” brands that offer positive presentation and enhance self-esteem (Malär <i>et al.</i>, 2011)</li> </ul>

- The **reasons for “liking”** a brand are included to inform a typology of Facebook Fans. Fans “like” brands for numerous reasons. For example, “likes” keep Fans informed about brand developments (Parker, 2012). By appearing in a Fans’ news feed, the brand enhances the Fan’s social network and supports their online self-construction (Douma, 2008). Some Fans also “like” to avail themselves of incentives (Lapointe, 2012; Wong, 2010).

- The **structure of the consumer’s Facebook network**, their social-tie strength and homophily, are also explored. On social networks, each individual is a “node” connected to other “nodes,” and the connections between these nodes are called “social ties” (Newman, 2010). Tie strength is characterized by the amount of time spent communicating between ties, the emotional intensity of the interaction, the frequency of the interaction, and the reciprocity of the communication (Granovetter, 1973).

**Social-tie strength** is a source of influence on the social network, as strong ties influence the flow of brand information within a group and are perceived to have more influence by the group, as well as greater credibility as information sources (Brown and Reingen, 1987).

In addition, **homophily** is the principle that two people who connect in a social tie are alike with respect to attributes such as beliefs or status (McPherson *et al.*, 2011). Facebook Fans also may be connected to others who share the same values, a phenomenon that is more prevalent among younger “nodes,” or newer friend connections (Bramoullé *et al.*, 2012). More generally, measures of perceived similarity—and of connectivity between individuals on a social network—may influence Fans’ brand relationships, and their “liking” behavior.

Understanding Fans’ perceived social-tie strength and network homophily is therefore informative in understanding Fan types.

- **Personality traits of Fans** also may inform a typology of Facebook Fans. Related studies, such as those exploring motives for user-generated content (*e.g.*, Christodoulides, Jevons, and Bonhomme, 2012), find a positive relationship between self-concept and online co-creation.

Facebook pages present an environment for impression management (Mehdizadeh, 2010; Schau and Gilly, 2003), offering users an opportunity to present a “hoped-for possible self,” where they can make identity statements which they would not make offline (Mehdizadeh, 2010, p. 358), for example through the brands they “like”.

Traits that could influence consumers’ desire for self-presentation—self-monitoring, opinion leadership and/or opinion-seeking, materialism, and self-esteem, for instance—therefore are helpful in understanding Facebook Fan types.

**Self-monitoring** is the “self-observation and self-control guided by situational cues to social appropriateness” (Snyder, 1974, p. 526). Related Facebook research on self-presentation found that consumers’ “packaging” of themselves on Facebook was not successful without validation from others (Hong *et al.*, 2012). Cognizant of others’ observations and judgments, consumers’ susceptibility to social appropriateness may influence their Facebook behaviors, including their “likes”.

Related to social comparison is the extent to which individuals believe they are **opinion leaders** and/or **opinion seekers**. A person with a large number of ties is a “social hub”. The value of such hubs as influencers or followers in the adoption



process depends on whether communication flows out or into those nodes (Goldenberg *et al.*, 2009).

When a node has a greater number of “out-degrees” (*i.e.*, information flowing from the individual), they have a greater influence on others’ adoption of marketing messages. By contrast, when the hub is a follower (that is, information flows in to the individual from their network), they influence market size (Goldenberg *et al.*, 2009).

To further consider the relationship of influence in a Fan typology, it is helpful to explore Fans’ attitudes about their opinion leadership and/or opinion seeking.

**Materialism** is a value system that suggests possessions and their acquisition leads to happiness (Richins, 1987). Those higher in materialism tend to value items that can be displayed in public (Richins, 1987). Therefore, materialism may inform a profile of the Facebook Fan, who may “like” a brand to demonstrate possession or interaction with goods (Douma, 2008).

Finally, **self-esteem** may inform a typology of Facebook Fans. Self-esteem is a person’s overall self-evaluation of worth (Rosenberg, 1965). If consumers have low self-esteem, their “ideal” and “actual” selves are not congruent, and they may become Fans of status-enhancing brands (Malär *et al.*, 2011). When preferred or positive self-presentation leads to relationship formation, this may enhance self-esteem (Gonzales and Hancock, 2011).

## RESEARCH DESIGN

This research explored a potential typology of Facebook Fans, based on their attitudes about their brand “liked” and informed by their own traits. Respondents were not issued with a list of brands, rather they focused on brands they had “liked”. The current study defines a “Fan” as “a user who has stated an affinity for a brand by ‘liking’ that brand” (Lipsman *et al.*, 2012), and does not encompass friends of Fans or non-Fans.

### Survey Design, Data Collection and Sample

The authors of the current study emphasized that their work in this instance is exploratory research that seeks to develop a typology for replication in further study. Therefore, the sample does not encompass all Facebook users. Rather, it focuses on the important category of student Facebook users.

Facebook Fans’ attitudes were elicited through a Web-based survey distributed to students at an Irish University. Notably, 100 percent of students in this study were regular Facebook users. A student demographic was considered appropriate for an exploratory study in this context, as recent research on Facebook Fans has shown that Fan age skews significantly younger than a typical customer (Lipsman *et al.*, 2012).

Following a pre-test and pilot test, 438 students were surveyed using the SurveyMonkey online survey-hosting site. The survey was distributed via an email link through the University’s Student Union in March 2012. To encourage responses, an iPad 2 was offered as an incentive for participation. Responses were screened through two questions:

- “Do you have a Facebook account that you have accessed since March 1st?”
- “Have you selected a brand you “like” on Facebook in the past year?”

Respondents were then advised to complete the questionnaire thinking about a brand they “like” (in case of several brands, they were asked to answer the questions thinking about the brand they “like” that comes to mind first). The top three product categories for brands “liked” were:

- **fashion** (with brands such as Topshop and Abercrombie & Fitch),
- **cosmetics/haircare** (with brands such as MAC and GHD), and
- **music** (with brands such as Lady Gaga and Florence & the Machine) (See Table 3).

**TABLE 3**  
**Profile of survey respondents (demographics and Facebook use)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>N = 438*</b>
Gender	63.2% = Female 36.8% = Male
Age	Mean = 21.2 years SD = 4.088
Nationality	93.1% = Irish 6.9% = Other
Level of education	87.7% = Undergraduate Student 7.8% = Masters student 3.7% = Doctoral student
Has a Facebook account, accessed in past month	100% = “Yes”
“Likes” a brand on Facebook	100% = “Yes”
How long have they “liked” this brand to date?	Mean = 9 months SD = 8.112
How likely are they to “like” this brand by the end of 2012?	59.4% = “Extremely likely” 19.4% = “Likely” 13% = “Don’t know yet” 3.2% = “Unlikely” 5% = “Not at all likely”
Number of Facebook friends	Mean = 472 friends SD = 243
How long do they spend on Facebook on a typical day?	Mean = 2.4 hours SD = 1.6

\* Due to rounding, some figures do not add to 100%. SD = Standard Deviation from the Mean.

## Measures

This study elicited Facebook Fan attitudes and explores whether a typology of Fans might be identified from those attitudes. The study, therefore, explores consumers’ brand attitudes in relation to (See Appendix I for scale items):

- **the self-expressive nature of the brand “liked”;**
- **brand loyalty;**
- **brand love;**
- **WOM for the brand “liked”.**

Self-expressive brand, brand love and WOM were measured using scales from Carroll and Ahuvia (2006). In these cases, 5-point Likert scales were used (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). The self-expressive brand scale included four measures of inner self-expression and four measures of social self-expression. The brand love scale consisted of 10 items and the WOM scale consisted of eight items. Finally, brand loyalty was measured using three items from Yoo, Donthu, and Lee (2000). Participants responded using a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree).

Furthermore, this study added Fan's reasons for "liking," Fans' network structure, personality traits, and demographic variables to inform the cluster solution (See Appendix III for scale items).

Reasons for "liking" brands were elicited from a review of the existing literature and through discussions with students participating in the pretest and pilot tests. Eleven reasons were presented. Respondents indicated their level of agreement on 5-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree).

Consumers' network structure was explored using the measures provided by Granovetter (1973). For social-tie strength, participants responded to four statements. Attitude homophily and status homophily were measured using four items, respectively. In all measures, responses were indicated on 7-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree).

Self-monitoring was measured using the 13-item ATSCI scale developed by Lennox and Wolfe (1984). Participants responded to the 13 statements on 5-point Likert scales (1= always false; 5= always true).

Opinion leader/seeker was measured using the scale developed by Flynn, Goldsmith, and Eastman (1996). The scale contains 12 items with six measuring "Opinion Leadership" and six measuring "Opinion Seeking". As the scale requires the consideration of a specific product, this research chose "fashion" for the population in the study, as they are fashion-brand conscious (Bakewell, Mitchell, and Rothwell, 2006). Moreover, as the study was considering the self-expressive nature of the Web (Schau and Gilly, 2003), it was relevant to consider a self-expressive product for this measure. Consistent with Flynn et al. (1996), items were scored on 7-point scales (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree).

Materialism was measured with the six-item scale developed in the seminal research by Richins (1987). The items were scored on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree).

Finally, self-esteem was measured using the scale developed by Rosenberg (1965). The scale comprises 10 items. Consistent with Rosenberg (1965) each item was presented as a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree).

### **Scale validation**

Exploratory analyses were conducted to assess the reliability, dimensionality, and validity of the variables used to develop the typology of Facebook Fans, using SPSS 20 (Hair *et al.*, 2006).

First, principal components analysis using the varimax rotation was employed to examine the structure of the constructs self-expressive brand, brand loyalty, brand love, and WOM. Results suggested deleting two items from the brand love measure and three items from the WOM measure due to cross-loadings.

After this, all constructs provided a single factor structure. The explained variance was

- 78.5 percent for self-expressive brand (inner self)
- 77 percent for self-expressive brand (social self)
- 73.3 percent for brand loyalty
- 69 percent for brand love
- 63.3 percent for WOM.

Reliability for all scales was assured as Cronbach's alpha measures were greater than 0.7 for each of the factors (See Appendix I). Appendix II presents descriptive statistics and correlations for these variables.

The variables used to further inform the resulting Fan types—*i.e.*, Fans' reasons for "liking" as well as Fans' network structure and personality traits—also were subjected to exploratory factor analyses. Reasons for "liking" resulted in a three-factor structure. After deleting one item due to low communalities, the remaining factor structure accounted for 63.1 percent of the variance explained. For consistency with extant literature the factors were named as "Genuine Interest," "Image Creation" and "Incentive".

Social-tie strength was extracted as one-dimensional. As expected, the proposed homophily construct provided a two-factor structure: attitude and status homophily. The explained variance exceeded 60 percent for social-tie strength and each attitude and status homophily. Items of the opinion-leader and opinion-seeker scale loaded on two different factors. After deleting three items from both dimensions, the resulting factor structure accounted for 78.4 percent of the variance explained.

Results suggested deleting seven items of the self-monitoring measure, two of the materialism scale and two items from the self-esteem construct due to low communalities or cross-loadings. The remaining items of each scale grouped into a single factor. The explained variance was 58 percent for self-monitoring, 66.3 percent for materialism, and 61 percent for self-esteem.

Again, Cronbach's alpha for all the factors was above 0.70 (See Appendix III), with only one exception: Cronbach's alpha for "Image creation" reasons for liking was 0.582, a value considered satisfactory in exploratory research (Hair *et al.*, 2006).

### **Cluster analysis**

Following the validation process, cluster analysis was used to identify homogenous groups. Cluster analysis is well suited to this exploratory research as it is an exploratory multivariate statistical procedure that creates a classification by forming groups or "clusters" of similar entities (Aldenderfer and Blashfield, 1984, p. 7). A single composite measure was calculated to form the clustering variables. A two-stage cluster analysis was adopted using SPSS 20.

First, a hierarchical procedure—Ward's method (Ward, 1963)—measured the distance between cases using squared Euclidean distances. The authors explored a three- and four-

cluster solution by analyzing the dendograms and the distances at which each cluster was formed, as well as cluster profiles and practical judgment based on theoretical foundations (Hair *et al.*, 2006). These indicators suggested that a four-cluster solution was most acceptable. A K-means cluster analysis then was performed for the four-cluster solution.

The starting centers for the analysis were the initial centroids of the four clusters. The solution provided the greatest contrast between the groups (Hair *et al.*, 2006). A discriminant analysis was subsequently performed to confirm the existence of groups and to check the robustness of the cluster solution.

The clustering characteristics were the independent variables and the cluster memberships were the dependent variables. The solution showed that 98.6 percent of original groups' participants were correctly classified, further supporting the four-cluster solution.

## FINDINGS

### Composition of the Clusters

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tested for differences across the four clusters. Post-hoc multiple comparison tests using Tukey's HSD for equal variances and Games-Howell for unequal variances investigated significant group differences among cluster means (See Table 4). The variables used to inform the exploratory typology of Facebook Fans provide a more detailed profile of each cluster (See Tables 5 and 6).

**TABLE 4**  
**Clusters, ANOVA, and Post-Hoc Analyses**

Dimensions	Cluster 1 <i>"Fan"-atics</i>	Cluster 2 <i>Utilitarians</i>	Cluster 3 <i>Self-Expressives</i>	Cluster 4 <i>Authentics</i>	F-Value	Post-hoc tests <sup>c</sup>
"Likes" self-expressive brand- Inner Self <sup>a</sup>	Highest (3.86)	Lowest (1.48)	High (3.02)	Low (2.24)	240.62 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 3-4
"Likes" self-expressive brand- Social Self <sup>a</sup>	Highest (3.86)	Lowest (1.63)	High (3.23)	Low (2.03)	240.10 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 3-4
Brand Loyalty <sup>b</sup>	Highest (5.96)	Lowest (2.96)	Medium (4.06)	High (5.74)	189.05 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 2-3, 2-4, 3-4
Brand Love <sup>a</sup>	Highest (4.54)	Lowest (2.72)	Medium (3.37)	High (3.96)	187.60 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 3-4
Word of Mouth <sup>a</sup>	Highest (3.56)	Lowest (1.6)	High (2.50)	Medium (2.25)	121.70 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4
No. of Cases %	100 23%	89 20%	165 38%	84 19%		

Note: N=438; <sup>\*\*</sup> p<.05; <sup>a</sup> 5-point scale; <sup>b</sup> 7-point scale; <sup>c</sup> Indicate significant differences (p<.05) between the clusters.

**Table 5. Composition Of Clusters – “Reasons for Liking”, Social Network, and Personal Traits**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Cluster 1 “Fan”-atics</b>	<b>Cluster 2 Utilitarians</b>	<b>Cluster 3 Self- Expressives</b>	<b>Cluster 4 Authentics</b>	<b>F- Value</b>	<b>Post-hoc tests<sup>c</sup></b>
Reason: <sup>a</sup>	Highest (4.15)	Lowest (3.32)	Medium (3.58)	High (3.75)	18.53 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-4
Reason: Image Creation <sup>a</sup>	Highest (3.72)	Lowest (2.63)	High (3.13)	Low (2.78)	45.15 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 3-4
Reason: Incentive <sup>a</sup>	Medium (2.18)	Medium (2.15)	Medium (2.20)	Low (1.86)	2.86 <sup>**</sup>	3-4
Social-Tie Strength <sup>b</sup>	Highest (3.58)	Medium (3.21)	Medium (3.26)	High (3.51)	1.76	-
Homophily – Attitude <sup>b</sup>	High (3.78)	Medium (3.44)	High (3.74)	Highest (3.83)	1.69	-
Homophily – Status <sup>b</sup>	Highest (4.41)	High (4.23)	High (4.35)	High (4.20)	0.53	-
Self-Monitoring <sup>a</sup>	Highest (3.21)	Medium (3.01)	High (3.18)	Low (2.87)	3.59 <sup>**</sup>	3-4
Opinion Leader <sup>b</sup>	Highest (4.44)	Low (3.24)	Medium (3.77)	Low (3.25)	15.48 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 3-4
Opinion Seeker <sup>b</sup>	Highest (4.80)	Lowest (3.65)	Medium (4.39)	Medium (4.19)	10.31 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 2-3
Materialism <sup>b</sup>	Highest (5.33)	Lowest (4.06)	Medium (4.70)	Low (4.58)	13.85 <sup>**</sup>	1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3
Self-Esteem <sup>a</sup>	Highest (3.90)	Medium (3.78)	Medium (3.71)	High (3.83)	1.66	-

Note: <sup>\*\*</sup> p<.05; <sup>a</sup> 5-point scale; <sup>b</sup> 7-point scale; <sup>c</sup> Indicate significant differences (p<.05) between the clusters.

**Table 6. Composition of Clusters – Demographics**

Demographic Variable	Cluster 1 “Fan”-atics		Cluster 2 Utilitarians		Cluster 3 Self-Expressives		Cluster 4 Authentics		$\chi^2$
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
<b>Gender</b>									
Male	32	32%	36	<b>40.4%</b>	67	<b>40.6%</b>	26	31.3%	3.59
Female	68	<b>68%</b>	53	59.6%	98	59.4%	57	<b>68.7%</b>	
<b>Age</b>									
17-18 years	14	14%	14	<b>15.7%</b>	20	12.1%	7	8.5%	18.43
19 years	25	25%	16	18.0%	46	<b>27.9%</b>	13	15.9%	
20 years	22	22%	21	23.6%	34	20.6%	20	<b>24.4%</b>	
21 years	20	20%	9	10.1%	27	16.4%	18	<b>22.0%</b>	
22-30 years	19	19%	25	<b>28.1%</b>	32	19.4%	20	24.4%	
31-48 years	0	0%	4	4.5%	6	3.6%	4	<b>4.9%</b>	
Mean (SD)	20.44 (2.23)		21.53 (4.09)		21.14 (4.70)		21.83 (4.42)		
<b>No. FB Friends</b>									
1-200	13	13%	14	15.7%	11	6.7%	16	<b>19.0%</b>	17.15**
201-400	35	35%	38	<b>42.7%</b>	54	32.9%	24	28.6%	
401-600	26	26%	24	27.0%	49	<b>29.9%</b>	24	28.6%	
601-1500	26	26%	13	14.6%	50	<b>30.5%</b>	20	23.8%	
Mean (SD)	465.42 (243.91)		414.16 (231.42)		512.59 (228.67)		461.9 (271.3)		
<b>Time on FB</b>									
0-1 hour	20	21.5%	31	<b>40.3%</b>	52	35.9%	22	31.4%	9.64
2-3 hours	54	<b>58.1%</b>	30	39%	64	44.1%	36	51.4%	
4 or more hours	19	20.4%	16	<b>20.8%</b>	29	20%	12	17.1%	
Mean (SD)	2.74 (1.48)		2.31 (1.53)		2.67 (2.08)		2.52 (2.06)		

Note: \*\*  $p < .05$ ; Some columns by demographic variable do not sum to 100 per cent due to rounding; FB = Facebook.

The following section describes the Fan profile of each cluster. Cluster analysis provides a classification of groups; the authors do not assert that these groups are descriptive of the Facebook Fan in general, nor are they prescriptive. The results of this analysis, however, provide insights into potential cluster types and form a helpful basis for future research to test the prevalence of these types.

### Cluster Profiles

- **“Fan”-atics: Highly Engaged on Facebook and Offline**  
Results show that “Fan”-atics have greater loyalty and love for the brands they “like”—and they generate more WOM about those brands—than other groups. They also are most likely to “like” a brand to create an impression among Facebook friends and they also have the highest levels of self-monitoring. It therefore is possible that they use the brand as a form of impression management, cognizant of the observations of others on the network (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010).

This group also is concerned with status. Its members are most likely to view Facebook friends as having the same status as they do, and they are the most materialistic group—a finding consistent with previous literature suggesting a positive relationship between materialism and brand loyalty (Podoshen and Andrzejewski, 2010).

For this group, “liking” a brand is also a demonstration of genuine brand interest. These Fans seek to find out more about the brand, but recognize, too, that the brand creates a positive impression on their Facebook page.

“Fan”-atics tend to be female, and are engaged with Facebook, spending two to three hours every day on the network. They have a slightly lower-than-average number of Facebook friends (for this study), with most of this group listing between 200 and 400 friends. “Fan”-atics have stronger social ties than others, which could suggest they interact more frequently with a closer group of friends. They are an upbeat group, with higher self-esteem, and they tend to view themselves as opinion leaders and seekers.

Results of the current study suggest that Facebook is invaluable to this group, as:

- a source of information;
  - a means to connect to a social group;
  - a tool for creating a desired image.
- **Utilitarians:** “Liking” Brands to Gain Incentives—No Real Brand Connection  
The second group has the least positive attitudes about brands “liked” on Facebook. They also are least likely to consider the brand “liked” to be self-expressive. Instead, they admit they are more inclined to “like” a brand to gain incentives.

This study, therefore, considers this group of Fans to be “utilitarian” as they are responding to incentives and “liking” the brand mainly while incentives are offered. The brand offers little self-expressive value for this group.

In contrast with other groups, the Utilitarian cluster has lower brand loyalty and lower brand love, and they offer the least WOM for their brand. It is possible that such Fans “like” the brand for incentives, while, at the same time, offering negative comments about it to friends. Although interested in incentives, members of this group also consider themselves to be least materialistic, and they are the group least interested in eliciting the opinions of others, or offering opinions to others. A brand, therefore, may hold little value as a tool for creating an online identity for Utilitarians.

Utilitarians have a medium level of self-monitoring, which suggests they adapt behavior according to situational cues of appropriateness (Snyder, 1974). This self-monitoring behavior, however, may be exhibited offline, as they are the group least concerned about creating an image on Facebook through “liking” brands. It is also possible that this group uses other aspects of their Facebook profile—other than brands—to project a desired self.

Utilitarians are most likely to be male. Fans in this cluster claim they have between 200 and 400 Facebook friends, but most of this group spend less than one hour per day on Facebook. Facebook plays a less important role for this Fan type than for others.

- **Self-Expressives:** “Liking” Brands to Make an Impression on Others  
Self-Expressives “like” brands that tend to be self-expressive, reflecting the social self, in particular, but they have lower brand loyalty and brand love than “Fan”-atics. Self-Expressives, however, offer more WOM than most other groups. WOM arising from an altruistic need to help others is distinguished from WOM designed to create



an impression among others on a social network (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010). It, therefore, is possible that the function of WOM for this group is to create an impression.

Self-Expressives are high in self-monitoring and they have lower self-esteem than other clusters, which may explain their choice of self-expressive brands. Moreover, although they claim that they “like” due to a genuine interest in the brand, their main reason for becoming a Fan is image creation. For these Fans, who are concerned about opinions of others, the brand may play a symbolic role, allowing them to create an ideal self on Facebook.

This group has the highest number of Facebook friends, with almost half boasting between 600 and 1,500 friends. The age profile of this cluster is slightly younger than others. The majority of individuals in this group spend two to three hours each day on Facebook.

According to the findings of the current study, Facebook plays an important role for this group in creating a desired social image, and “liking” brands is a means to achieve this. The online brand association, however, does not reflect offline reality, as many Self-Expressives do not exhibit real attachment to the brand “liked”, for example, through what would be expected as high levels of brand loyalty or brand love.

- **Authentics: Unconcerned with Image—But “Likes” Are Genuine**  
Authentics Fans express a positive relationship with the brand “liked”, as they have high levels of brand loyalty and brand love, and offer WOM in support of their preference.

They are not concerned, however, with “liking” self-expressive brands, in particular with “liking” those brands that would express a social self. It is possible that the brands they “like” on Facebook reflect their true offline brand relationships. Further, their materialism scores are low, and they are less concerned with adapting behavior to suit the opinions of others, as their self-monitoring is the lowest of all groups. And they do not consider themselves as opinion leaders, rather they seek the opinions of others. They do exhibit high levels of self-esteem, so this confidence permits them to seek the advice of others.

Authentics “like” brands because they genuinely like them, rather than just to create an impression or gain an incentive, and this is reflected in their high scores for brand loyalty and brand love. These consumers have an authentic liking for the brand, online and offline.

Authentics are mainly female. This group has the smallest percentage of young respondents (17-19 years), and the largest group of older students (31-48 years). Although this cluster is most likely to have the lowest number of Facebook friends (1-200), they have strong social ties, and they have higher attitudinal homophily than other clusters.

This cluster, therefore, connects more frequently—and with greater intimacy—with Facebook friends than do other groups, and Authentics believe that their Facebook friends tend to think like they do. For these Fans, Facebook is an online extension of

their offline social group, and their “likes” on Facebook reflect their brand relationships in an offline environment.

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This exploratory study provides insights into “liking” on Facebook by examining Fans’ attitudes about their “liked” brands. As this study prepares a foundation for future studies, it does not investigate a range of brand-related activity; rather, it provides perspective in relation to a brand related behavior, Facebook “liking”, which has received much attention in the recent literature.

Although exploratory, the results suggest four Facebook Fan types, which warrant further testing among other samples and across cultures. In this foundation study, the emergent typology illustrates how consumers’ Facebook habits, social network structure, traits and motivations for “liking” inform each Fan cluster (See Figure 1).

FAN-ATICS	SELF-EXPRESSIVES	UTILITARIANS	AUTHENTICS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brand is self-expressive</li> <li>• Highest brand loyalty</li> <li>• Highest brand love</li> <li>• Highest WOM</li> <li>• High number of Facebook friends</li> <li>• Highest self-monitoring</li> <li>• Highest materialism</li> <li>• Claims highest self-esteem</li> <li>• Opinion leader and opinion seeker</li> <li>• 'Likes' due to genuine interest and to create image</li> <li>• 'Like' for incentive although no the primary motivation for 'Liking'</li> <li>• Mainly females</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brand is self-expressive</li> <li>• Medium brand loyalty</li> <li>• Medium brand love</li> <li>• High WOM</li> <li>• Highest number of Facebook friends</li> <li>• High self-monitoring</li> <li>• Medium materialism</li> <li>• Medium self-esteem</li> <li>• Medium opinion leader and opinion seeker</li> <li>• 'Likes' mainly to create image</li> <li>• Mainly males</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brand is not self-expressive</li> <li>• Lowest brand loyalty</li> <li>• Lowest brand love</li> <li>• Lowest WOM</li> <li>• Average number of Facebook friends</li> <li>• Medium self-monitoring</li> <li>• Lowest materialism</li> <li>• Medium self-esteem</li> <li>• Least likely to be opinion leader and opinion seeker</li> <li>• 'Likes' only to gain incentives</li> <li>• Mainly males</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brand is not self-expressive</li> <li>• High brand loyalty</li> <li>• High brand love</li> <li>• Medium WOM</li> <li>• Lower number of Facebook friends</li> <li>• Lowest self-monitoring</li> <li>• Low materialism</li> <li>• High self-esteem</li> <li>• Low opinion leadership and medium opinion seeking</li> <li>• 'Likes' only because of genuine interest</li> <li>• Mainly females</li> </ul>

**FIGURE 1: Fan Typology**

This study offers insights into consumers’ relationships with Facebook and brands. For example, in relation to the Self-Expressives Fan group, young males in the current study are highly expressive, choosing to “like” brands to impress others, but also to offer high levels of WOM, without any brand loyalty or brand love. This finding supports the perspective of a previous finding that suggested that WOM was not always due to altruism, but can also serve the self-expressive function to impress others on a social network (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010). The

Self-Expressives group offers WOM while remaining unsure whether they will remain a Fan, or recommend the brand to others. Instead, they talk about the brand to create an impression.

Consistent with yet another study (Nelson-Field *et al.*, 2012), the results of the current research suggest a disconnection between brand Fans online and offline brand relationships. For instance, Authentic Fans, who shy away from “liking” self-expressive brands online, may have high brand loyalty and brand love offline. Conversely, consumers who “like” self-expressive brands and enjoy talking about the brand to others on Facebook, may have little brand loyalty or brand love for that brand.

This implies that managers planning to assess the health of their brand using “likes” as a proxy measure for engagement may benefit from triangulating “like” metrics with other brand metrics (See Lapointe, 2012 for a similar argument).

This research distinguishes between Fans based on their reasons for “liking”. The challenge marketing managers face is that consumers infrequently regard the brands they buy as being different from other brands in the categories (Romaniuk, 2013). And although there may only be a marginal gain from using “likes” to leverage change, it could make a small contribution. As one marketing-research columnist asserted, “correlations between Fans and brand engagement vary based on their motivation for becoming a Fan in the first place” (Lapointe, 2012, p. 287).

Findings indicate that, when consumers in student groups are genuine Fans with high levels of loyalty and love for the brand, they are not influenced by incentives to “like”. Conversely, in this study, those Fans that respond to incentives have mixed levels of brand loyalty and brand love.

Similar findings have been reported in the psychology literature, where results suggest that extrinsic rewards or incentives can reduce intrinsically driven behaviors. For example, children became less motivated to draw and engaged in less spontaneous drawing if they expected to be rewarded for the drawing activity (Lepper, Greene, and Nisbett, 1973). A second study of smokers found that those who were rewarded for efforts to quit do better at first, but after three months fared worse than those who were offered no rewards (Curry, Wagner, and Grothaus, 1990).

From the perspective of the marketing literature, the finding of this exploratory study in relation to incentives is consistent with Ehrenberg’s research on sales promotions. The Dirichlet model suggests that “tactical marketing” such as sales promotions have an effect on buying, increasing the propensity of buyers to purchase a brand during the promotion. After the promotion, however, the consumers’ probability of purchasing that brand reverts to its steady propensity (Sharp *et al.*, 2012, p. 206).

In the same way, it would seem that Fans who “like” brands for incentives do not change their levels of loyalty to the brand as a result. In this study, incentives were the least likely reason for any of the Fan types to “like” a brand. Even as marketing managers may continue to offer incentives to encourage “likes”, future research should measure brand response of different Fan groups who “like” *following* receipt of the incentive.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

In summary, the current study provides a foundation exploration into whether it was possible to categorize Facebook Fans who “like” brands, based on their attitudes in relation to brands and their own personal and social characteristics.

The findings suggest four Fan types:

- “Fan”-atics
- Self-Expressives
- Utilitarians
- Authentics.

The authors are unaware of another Fan typology based on an empirical analysis of Fans’ personal and social characteristics and brand relationships. The findings of the current study add weight to the idea that there is a disconnection between “likes” and brand consumption (Nelson-Field *et al.*, 2012) and also offer a perspective in relation to why Fans may “like”, yet not buy.

The authors view this study as a starting point for further research, including possible validation of clusters through replication studies with other samples (Aldenderfer and Blashfield, 1984).

## **DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Cluster solutions replicated across a series of datasets would offer more knowledge about the generalizability of the findings from this study.

This study was conducted with a sample of 438 Facebook student users. Although this is a useful starting point, given the popularity of Facebook among students, the sample used to identify Fan clusters in the current study limits the generalizability of the study findings.

Some studies have suggested that students represent one of the largest cohorts of the Facebook population (Mack *et al.*, 2007), and all of the students in the sample were Facebook users. However, it is recommended that follow-up larger-scale studies test the robustness of the clusters and profiles identified among a broader profile of consumers, spanning all ages.

Another limitation is that the study focused on an Irish student sample. It is recommended that further research with cross-cultural samples be undertaken to provide a basis for comparisons, and to contribute additional insights into Fan types.

As cluster analysis is an exploratory approach, employing other quantitative and experimental methods will be necessary to provide managers with reliable and valid suggestions for optimal use of Facebook. For example, experimental work could identify how Facebook messages influence different groups identified in the context of a cluster analysis of Fan types, including the influence of incentives on WOM and sustained patterns of “liking” across different Fan types.

The relationship between self-expression and WOM could be clarified by further research. This study found that Fans who “liked” certain brands for self-expressive reasons were likely to engage in WOM but expressed little brand love or brand loyalty. WOM in this context had,

therefore, a self-expressive function. While this finding supports a previous study (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010), further research is needed to investigate different motivations for WOM.

The current paper is limited to Facebook “likes”, where the “like” relates to consumers becoming Fans of a brand’s page. It did not consider other forms of “like” such as “liking” a friend’s picture or comment on their news feed. In addition, actions such as posting photographs, posting comments on others’ news feeds, or providing links to content were outside the scope of this study. New work could explore the broader range of user-generated content on Facebook, and consider whether this typology informs a broader typology of Facebook members.

The study did not consider the possibility that Fans may un-“like” brands. Further research could explore the nature of Facebook Fan typologies that include those who have un-“liked” a brand, and compare the results with the current study to determine whether insights can be gained in relation to customer defection.

For instance, this study identified Utilitarians, who were motivated by incentives. It would be helpful to managers to identify the relationship between motivation for “liking” and the timeframe within which Fans continued to “like” the brand. In addition to experimental work, multidimensional longitudinal research could be helpful to investigate the factors contributing to the longevity of a “like”.

In this study, differences between genders are suggested across the clusters, but the research had a female respondent bias. It would seem that women dominate the “Fan”-atic and Authentic group, which are the clusters with the strongest brand loyalty and brand love. By contrast, the Utilitarians who “like” brands for incentives, and the Self-Expressives who “like” brands for self-expressive reasons, are mainly male. For these two types of Fans, “liking” the brand offers value, but there is little evidence of a real brand relationship, in terms of brand loyalty or brand love. Further research could investigate whether there are gender differences between Fans, their reasons for becoming Fans, and the relationships between their “likes” and their offline brand relationships.

Findings from this study also indicate that extrinsic rewards for “liking” brands may have differential outcomes for brands, and thus exploring intrinsic motivation toward the brand may help to differentiate between “likers”. Future research could investigate whether those who are intrinsically motivated to “like” a brand (with or without incentives) have a greater propensity to offer positive WOM, have greater brand loyalty and brand love, than those who receive extrinsic rewards (such as incentives) but who are not intrinsically motivated.

Future research also is needed to examine factors that sustain intrinsic motivation in this context. The role of the social network in diffusing marketing messages through “likes” could be investigated. Results of the current study suggest that differences in social-tie strength, the role of the brand as an expressive function, and the relationship between “like” and WOM help to inform the Fan typology.

The results of the current study suggest that there are Fans who “like” to construct an identity, but it is not clear how the action of “liking” diffuses across their social network. For example, could “Fan”-atics spread “liking” among their active social networks more effectively than Utilitarians or Self-Expressives? To what extent are their opinion leading and opinion seeking

views influential in diffusing brand messages? Future research is needed to investigate these and related questions.

Finally, future research could examine the relationships between the characteristics of different Fan types and their offline brand relationships. For example, a quantitative study could investigate the role of social network structures and personal traits as antecedents of offline brand loyalty, love, and WOM.

In conclusion, Facebook Fans are potential assets for firms. This study provides a starting point for further research seeking to understand Fans' attitudes and motives for "liking". The four-cluster typology presented invites replication to explore the prevalence of Fan clusters and to provide further insights for theory and practice.

## Appendix I

### Cluster Variables: Final Measurement Scales

Constructs/ Measures	Range of factor loadings	Cronbach's alpha
<b>Self-expressive brand (inner self)</b>	.85-.90	.908
This brand symbolizes the kind of person I am inside		
This brand reflects my personality		
This brand is an extension of my inner self		
This brand mirrors the real me		
<b>Self-expressive brand (social self)</b>	.83-.92	.898
This brand contributes to my image		
This brand adds to the social 'role' I play		
This brand has a positive impact on what others think of me		
This brand improves the way society views me		
<b>Brand loyalty</b>	.78-.90	.809
I consider myself to be loyal to this brand		
This brand would be my first choice when considering this type of product		
I will not buy other brands of this type of product if this brand is available at the store		
<b>Brand love</b>	.79-.86	.935
This is a wonderful brand		
This brand makes me feel good		
This brand is Fantastic!		
This brand makes me very happy		
I love this brand!		
This brand is a pure delight		
I am passionate about this brand		
I am very attached to this brand		
<b>Worth of mouth</b>	.74-.86	.853
I click "like" on Facebook for this brand in order to 'talk up' this brand to my friends		
I click "like" on Facebook for this brand as it enhances my Facebook profile		
I click "like" on Facebook for this brand to spread the good word about this brand		
I give this brand a lot of positive word of mouth online		
I recommend this brand to friends and family on Facebook		

## Appendix II

### Cluster Variables: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Constructs	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4
<b>1. Self-expressive brand (inner self)<sup>a</sup></b>	2.75	1.05				
<b>2. Self-expressive brand (social self)<sup>a</sup></b>	2.81	1.07	.685			
<b>3. Brand loyalty<sup>b</sup></b>	4.59	1.53	.360	.296		
<b>4. Brand love<sup>a</sup></b>	3.61	.84	.485	.409	.624	
<b>5. Worth of mouth<sup>a</sup></b>	2.51	.97	.526	.490	.398	.478

Note: <sup>a</sup> 5-point scale; <sup>b</sup> 7-point scale.

### Appendix III

#### Variables Used to Profile the Clusters: Final Measurement Scales

Constructs/ Measures	Mean	SD	Range of factor loadings	Cronbach's alpha
<b>Reasons for Liking: Genuine Interest<sup>a</sup></b> I really want to know more about this brand Having updates from this brand on my news feed keeps me up to date The news feeds from the brand I "like" are useful to me in the short term	3.69	.84	.77-.86	.792
<b>Reasons for Liking: Image creation<sup>a</sup></b> My friends like the brand "Like"ing this brand shows off my taste to other people Having updates from this brand on my news feed makes my Facebook page look good	3.09	.80	.68-.78	.582
<b>Reasons for Liking: Incentive<sup>a</sup></b> I received a discount for clicking "like" My friend asked me to "like" the brand I entered a competition by clicking "like" There was a campaign to reach a target number of "likes"	2.12	.93	.71-.86	.778
<b>Social ties<sup>b</sup></b> Most of my Facebook friends... are people I interact with every day ... are true friends, rather than acquaintances ... are people I like to spend time with away from Facebook ... are so close to me it is hard to imagine life without them	3.37	1.39	.78-.89	.861
<b>Attitude homophily<sup>b</sup></b> Most of my Facebook friends... are mainly like me ... are quite similar to me ... think like me ... behave like me	3.7	1.27	.69-.90	.875
<b>Status homophily<sup>b</sup></b> Most of my Facebook friends... have the same social status as me ... are from the same social class as me ... are culturally similar to me ... have an economic situation like mine	4.31	1.29	.70-.86	.823
<b>Self-monitoring<sup>a</sup></b> At parties I usually try to behave in a manner that makes me fit in. When I am uncertain how to act in social situations, I look to the behavior of others for cues I try to pay attention to the reactions of others to my behavior to avoid being out of place It's important for me to fit into the group I'm with My behavior often depends on how I feel others wish me to behave If I am the least bit uncertain as to how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues	3.09	.83	.68-.81	.852
<b>Opinion leader<sup>b</sup></b> People that I know pick fashion based on what I have told them I can often persuade others to buy the fashion that I like I often influence people's opinions about fashion	3.71	1.47	.87-.90	.874
<b>Opinion seeker<sup>b</sup></b> When I consider buying fashion, I ask other people for advice I like to get others' opinions before I buy fashion I feel more comfortable buying fashion when I have gotten other people's opinions about it	4.30	1.49	.78-.90	.835
<b>Materialism<sup>b</sup></b> It is important to me to have really nice things I would like to be rich enough to buy anything I want I'd be happier if I could afford to buy more things It sometimes bothers me quite a bit that I can't afford to buy all the things I want	4.69	1.43	.75-.87	.829



<b>Constructs/ Measures</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range of factor loadings</b>	<b>Cronbach's alpha</b>
<b>Self-esteem<sup>a</sup></b>	3.79	.70	.71-.85	.907
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself				
I feel that I have a number of good qualities				
I am able to do things as well as most people				
I feel that I have much to be proud of				
I feel that I am a person of worth				
I have a lot of respect for myself				
All in all, I am inclined to think I am a success				
I take a positive attitude toward myself				

Note: <sup>a</sup> 5-point scale; <sup>b</sup> 7-point scale.

## REFERENCES

- ALBERT, N., D. MERUNKA, and P. VALETTE-FLORENCE. "When Consumers Love their Brands: Exploring the Concept and Its Dimensions." *Journal of Business Research* 61, 10 (2008): 1062-1075.
- ALDENDERFER, M. S., and R. K. BLASHFIELD. *Cluster Analysis* (Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 07-044). Beverly Hills CA: Sage, 1984.
- BAKEWELL, C., V. W. MITCHELL, and M. ROTHWELL. "UK Generation Y Fashion Consciousness." *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management* 10, 2 (2006): 169-180.
- BATRA, R., A. AHUVIA, and R. P. BAGOZZI. "Brand Love." *Journal of Marketing* 76, 2 (2012): 1-16.
- BRAMOULLÉ, J., S. CURRARINI, M. JACKSON, P. PIN, and B. W. ROGERS. "Homophily and Long-Run Integration in Social Networks." *Journal of Economic Theory* 147, 5 (2012): 1754-1786.
- BROWN, J., and P. H. REINGEN. "Social Ties and Word-of-Mouth Referral Behavior." *Journal of Consumer Research* 14, 3 (1987): 350-362.
- CARROLL, B. A., and A. C. AHUVIA. "Some Antecedents and Outcomes of Brand Love." *Marketing Letters* 17 (2006): 79-89.
- CHRISTODOULIDES, G., C. JEVONS, and J. BONHOMME. "Memo to Marketers: Quantitative Evidence for Change. How User-Generated Content really Affects Brands." *Journal of Advertising Research* 52, 1 (2012): 53-64.
- CURRY, S., E. H. WAGNER, and L. C. GROTHAUS. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation for Smoking Cessation." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 58, 3 (1990): 310-316.
- DICK, A. S., and K. BASU. "Customer Loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual Framework." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 22, 2 (1994): 99-113.
- DOUMA, C. "Best Practices for Facebook Fan Pages: User Types." *Socialmediatoday* 2008: [URL: <http://socialmediatoday.com/index.php?q=SMC/49304>], accessed on July 16, 2013.
- FACEBOOK. "The Value of a Liker." 2010: [URL: [http://www.facebook.com/note.php?note\\_id=150630338305797](http://www.facebook.com/note.php?note_id=150630338305797)], accessed on July 16, 2013.
- FLYNN, L. R., R. E. GOLDSMITH, and J. K. EASTMAN. "Opinion Leaders and Opinion Seekers: Two New Measurement Scales." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 24, 2 (1996): 134-147.
- GOLDENBERG, J., S. HAN, D. R. LEHMANN, and J. W. HONG. "The Role of Hubs in the Adoption Process." *Journal of Marketing* 73, 2 (2009): 1-13.
- GONZALES, A., and J. T. HANCOCK. "Mirror, Mirror on my Facebook Wall: Effects of Exposure to Facebook on Self-Esteem." *CyberPsychology, Behavior and Social Networking*

14, 1/2 (2011): 79-83.

GRANOVETTER, M. S. "The Strength of Weak Ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78, 6 (1973): 1360-1380.

HAIR, J. F. JR, W. C. BLACK, B. J. BABIN, R. E. ANDERSON, and R. L. TATHAM. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc, 2006.

HOFFMAN, D., and M. FODOR. "Can you Measure the ROI of your Social Media Marketing?" *MIT Sloan Management Review* 52, 1 (2010): 41-49.

HOLLIS, N. "The Value of a Social Media Fan," *Millward Brown* 2011: [URL: <http://www.millwardbrown.com/global/blog/Post/2011-04-04/The-value-of-a-social-media-Fan.aspx>], accessed on July 16, 2013.

HONG, S., E. TANDOC, E. A. KIM, B. KIM, and K. WISE. "The Real You? The Rise of Visual Cues and Comment Congruence in Perceptions of Social Attractiveness from Facebook Profiles." *CyberPsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 15, 7 (2012): 339-344.

KOZINETS, R., K. DE VALCK, A. C. WOJNICKI, and S. J. S. WILNER. "Networked Narratives: Understanding Word-of-Mouth Marketing in Online Communities." *Journal of Marketing* 74, March (2010): 71-89.

LAPOINTE, P. "Measuring Facebook's Impact on Marketing. The Proverbial Hits the Fan." *Journal of Advertising Research* 52, 3 (2012): 286-287.

LEPPER, M. R., D. GREENE, and R. E. NISBETT. "Undermining Children's Interest with Extrinsic Reward. A Test of the 'Overjustification' Hypothesis." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 28, 1 (1973): 129-137.

LENNOX, R. D., and R. N. WOLFE. "Revision of the Self-Monitoring Scale." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 46 (1984): 1349-1364.

LIPSMAN, A., G. MUDD, M. RICH, and S. BRUICH. "The Power of "Like" How Brands Reach (and Influence) Fans through Social-Media Marketing." *Journal of Advertising Research* 52, 1 (2012): 40-52.

MACK, D., A. BEHLER, B. ROBERTS, and E. RIMLAND. "Reaching Students with Facebook: Data and Best Practices." *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship* 8, 2 (2007). [URL: [http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v08n02/mack\\_d01.html](http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v08n02/mack_d01.html)], accessed on July 16, 2013.

MALÄR, L., H. KROHMER, W. D. HOYER, and B. NYFFENEGGER. "Emotional Brand Attachment and Brand Personality: The Relative Importance of the Actual and the Ideal Self." *Journal of Marketing* 75, July (2011): 35-52.

MAZODIER, M., and D. MERUNKA. "Achieving Brand Loyalty through Sponsorship: The Role of Fit and Self-Congruity." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 40, 6 (2012): 807-820.

MCPHERSON, M., L. SMITH-LOVIN, and J. M. COOK. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social

- Networks.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, 1 (2001): 415-444.
- MEHDIZADEH, S. “Self-Presentation 2.0: Narcissism and Self-Esteem on Facebook.” *CyberPsychology, Behaviour and Social Networking* 13, 4 (2010): 357-364.
- MUNTINGA, D. G., M. MOORMAN, and E. G. SMIT. “Introducing COBRA: Exploring Motivations for Brand-Related Social Media Use.” *International Journal of Advertising* 30, 1 (2011): 13-46.
- NELSON-FIELD, K., E. RIEBE, and B. SHARP. “What’s not to “Like”? Can a Facebook Fan Base Give a Brand the Advertising Reach it Needs?” *Journal of Advertising Research* 52, 2 (2012): 262-269.
- NEWMAN, M. *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- PARKER, S. “The 5 Types of Facebook Fans and How to Keep Them.” *Socialmedia Today*, 2012: [URL:<http://socialmediatoday.com/node/547773>], accessed on July 16, 2013.
- PODOSHEN, J., and S. ANDRZEJEWSKI. “An Examination of the Relationship between Materialism, Conspicuous Consumption and Brand Loyalty.” *Journal of Marketing Theory & Practice* 20, 3 (2012): 319-334.
- RICHINS, M. L. “Media, Materialism and Human Happiness.” In *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14, Melanie Wallendorf and Paul Anderson, eds. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 1987, 352-356.
- RICHINS, M. L. “Special Possessions and the Expression of Material Values.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 21, December (1994): 522-533.
- ROSENBERG, M. *Society and the Adolescent Self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- ROMANIUK, J. “What’s (Brand) Love Got to Do with It?” *International Journal of Market Research* 55, 2 (2013): 185-186.
- SCHAU, H. J., and M. C. GILLY. “We are what we Post? Self-Presentation in Personal Web Space.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 30, 3 (2003): 385-404.
- SHARP, B., M. WRIGHT, J. DAWES, C. DREISNER, L. MEYER-WAARDEN, L. STOCCHI, and P. STERN. “It’s a Dirichlet World: Modeling Individuals’ Loyalties Reveals How Brands Compete, Grow, and Decline.” *Journal of Advertising Research* 52, 2 (2012): 203-213.
- SNYDER, M. “The Self-monitoring of Expressive Behaviour.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 30 (1974): 546-537.
- SUNG, Y., Y. KIM, O. KWON, and J. MOON. “An Explorative Study of Korean Consumer Participation in Virtual Brand Communities in Social Network Sites.” *Journal of Global Marketing* 23, 5 (2010): 430-445.
- SWAMINATHAN, V., K. L. PAGE, and Z. GURHAN-CANLI. “‘My’ Brand or ‘Our’ Brand: The Effects of Brand Relationship Dimensions and Self-Construal on Brand Evaluations.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 34, 2 (2007): 248-259.

WARD, J. H., JR. "Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function." *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58 (1963): 236–244.

WONG, E. "Dangling Incentives on Facebook." *Adweek*, October 22, 2010: [URL: <http://www.adweek.com/news/advertising-branding/dangling-incentives-facebook-103612#1>], accessed on July 16, 2013.

YOO, B., N. DONTU, and S. LEE. "An Examination of Selected Marketing Mix Elements and Brand Equity." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 28, 2 (2000): 195-211.