

MASTER THESIS

#AD: THE EFFECTS OF AN INFLUENCER, COMMENT AND PRODUCT COMBINATION ON BRAND IMAGE

Yessie Bijen

COMMUNICATION SCIENCE MASTER MARKETING COMMUNICATIONS

EXAMINATION COMMITTEE Dr. M. Galetzka Prof. Dr. A.Th. Pruyn

DOCUMENT NUMBER 01 - S1765922

#AD:

The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image

University of Twente

Master Thesis Yessie Bijen – S1765922 Master specialization: Marketing Communications 1st supervisor: Dr. M. Galetzka 2nd supervisor: Prof. Dr. A.Th. Pruyn

#AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image. April, 2017

2

Abstract

This study is designed to fill explanatory gaps on influencer marketing that have been underexplored when considering its effectiveness. The main study employed a 2x2x2 between-subjects design, in the form of an online questionnaire (N=240), to measure the effects of the combination of influencer (micro-macro), product (match-mismatch) and comment (positive-negative) type on attitude towards the brand, brand trust and purchase intention. The key findings of the study is that the perceived connectedness towards a micro influencer is less likely to be influenced by a product match/mismatch or negative comments than the connectedness towards a macro influencer. The explanation for this finding was that the micro influencer is considered to be trustworthy and therefore part of an individual's in-group. Furthermore the study reveals that a moderate mismatch in product and influencer in combination with negative comments can lead to a more positive evaluation of a brand than a match in product and influencer. This study explores the effectiveness of micro and macro influencers in influencer marketing by integrating theories of social identity, match-up hypothesis and the elaboration likelihood model. The author recommends that managers focus on micro influencers to endorse their products rather than macro influencers as micro influencers are seen as more trustworthy.

Keywords: Influencer marketing, product match – mismatch, match-up hypothesis, E-WOM

Prologue

I would like to take this section of the thesis to express my feelings of the past 1,5 years doing the master of Marketing Communications at the University of Twente. Applying for this master is a decision that I will never regret. I have enjoyed this master so much and can't believe it is already over. As I started with this master I had already made up my mind about the topic that I was going to explore for my master thesis. Influencer marketing is a subject that I have found interesting since the beginning of the fashion bloggers era. Having had a fashion blog myself I had already experienced how influencer marketing works and wanted to dig deeper into the topic. I have enjoyed writing this thesis a lot and hope that you will have as much fun reading it, and of course that you might learn a thing or two on influencer marketing and how to properly use it.

Completing this thesis would not have been possible without the help of a few people. I would like to thank my first supervisor dr. Miriam Galetzka for all her feedback and her positive energy. I have enjoyed our meetings and have always felt supported in my decisions on the topic. I would also like to thank my second supervisor, Prof dr. Ad Pruyn for his constructive feedback. Although it might have seemed like I wasn't always happy with the feedback given, I do certainly believe that my thesis has improved because of the feedback you gave, so thank you!

Furthermore I would like to thank my study friends for the fun time at the University and all those days sitting in the library together, working on our thesis. To my family and boyfriend, thank you for always believing in me and supporting me in everything.

And dad, to you, I would like to dedicate this Master degree. I'm sure you're proud smiling down.

Yessie Bijen April, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT	3
PROLOGUE	4
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 THE KIM KARDASHIAN – DUCHESNAY CASE	7
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	10
2.1 INFLUENCER MARKETING	10
2.2 IDENTIFYING THE TYPE OF INFLUENCERS	11
2.3 Product match - mismatch	14
2.4 Positive and negative comments	16
2.5 MEDIATING VARIABLE	18
2.6 COVARIATES	19
2.7 RESEARCH MODEL	20
3. METHOD	21
3.1 Experimental design	21
3.2 Preliminary study	21
3.3 MAIN RESEARCH	25
3.4 PROCEDURE	29
3.5 MEASUREMENT	29
3.6 PARTICIPANTS	34
4. RESULTS	34
4.1 MANIPULATION CHECKS	34
4.2 Hypothesis testing	36
4.2.1 MAIN AND INTERACTION EFFECTS	36
4.2.2 COVARIATES	38
4.2.3 MEDIATING VARIABLES SOURCE CREDIBILITY AND INFLUENCER CHARACTERISTICS	38
5. DISCUSSION	41
5.1 THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS	41
5.3 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SUGGESTIONS	44
5.2 MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS	44
5.5 Conclusion	46
6. REFERENCES	47
7. APPENDIXES	51
A: PRETEST INFLUENCERS, PRODUCTS AND COMMENTS	51
B: ONLINE SURVEY CONDUCTED WITH QUALTRICS	53
C: OVERVIEW OF DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF PARTICIPANTS	59
D: THE BLOKKER – SARAH JESSICA PARKER CASE	61

1. Introduction

A new era in marketing communications has risen. With the emergence of Social Media and the Internet as a whole, companies have found themselves in a position where traditional marketing strategies were not enough to reach and influence the desired audience anymore. Marketers nowadays need to acknowledge the changing marketing context and the role that the Internet and social media have in this new landscape. In the age of social media and the Internet the message for marketers is that surviving in the era of the empowered customer requires a combination of less traditional massmarketing tactics and a better understanding of the role of technology and the engagement of consumers with the Internet and social media (Constantinides, 2014). Consumers nowadays search for the information they want on products or brands on the Internet or on social media and also share their experiences online with others. This shift in searching information and communication online has led to the empowerment of the consumer.

As consumers became more tech-savvy, marketers have adapted a digital media strategy (Stephen, 2015). Marketers are increasing their use of digital marketing channels tremendously over the years. One of these digital marketing tactics used by marketers is influencer marketing. As influencer marketing is a rather new term, there is not one specific definition for it. However according to online sources, influencer marketing appears to be a form of marketing in which the focus is placed on specific key individuals, rather than the target market as a whole. With influencer marketing one identifies individuals that have influence over potential buyers of products, and orients marketing activities around these individuals, also called influencers (Wikipedia; Marketingschool.org; Tapinfluence, 2016). Influencer marketing goes hand in hand with social media marketing and content marketing. When making use of an influencer campaign, influencers are expected to spread the word through their personal social media channels. Most influencer campaigns therefore have a content component as well, as there is content that needs to be spread. The content spread by the influencer can be provided by the brand or can be made by the influencer his or herself (Tapinfluence, 2016).

Many marketers consider influencer marketing to be a new and innovative marketing tactic to reach consumers. However, it can be stated that influencer marketing is no more than word-of-mouth-marketing in the digital atmosphere (EContent, 2016). The principle of word-of-mouth marketing is telling a friend about a specific product or service, and them telling another friend, and so on.

Looking at influencer marketing, this is exactly what influencers are doing on a digital level; telling their fan base about a certain product which they are endorsing. However a remarkable difference between word-of-mouth marketing and influencer marketing is that influencers can potentially reach thousands of loyal fans with one single post, making influencers very interesting for brands and organizations to work with. But the use of influencers does not come without risks. Using influencers simply because of their reach, without doing proper research, can actually backfire. A recent case where influencer marketing went wrong is the Kim Kardashian – Duchesney case. This case can be seen as an example of a mismatch in influencer and product.

1.1 The Kim Kardashian – Duchesnay case

In August 2015, Duchesnay approached celebrity star and influencer Kim Kardashian, who was pregnant at the time, to promote their morning-sickness medicine Diciegis on her social media accounts. Kim Kardashian has a following of 82.4 million users on Instagram and 47.9 million users on twitter, and is therefore considered to be an influencer on these channels. Kim Kardashian is best known for her reality series with her family 'Keeping up with the Kardashians'. Besides the reality series she has build her own empire around the Kardashian name with an own clothing line, an app and a video game. The reality star is known for her extreme lifestyle where she often likes to provoke and shock with her choice of clothing, or the lack thereof. When Kim Kardashian collaborated with Duchesnay to promote the medicine Diciegis, the brand had expected to raise more brand awareness. As Kim Kardashian was pregnant at the time, the star seemed to be a good fit for the promotion of the morning sickness drug Diciegis. Using Kim Kardashian did raise brand awareness, but it also raised tons of questions and led to many negative comments online. As Kim Kardashian posted a picture of herself holding the medicine on her social media channels Facebook, Twitter and Instagram, the post backfired (Ahran, 2015).

The post of Kim Kardashian received so much negativity that it got picked up by the media, resulting in news articles on several gossip sites and newspapers. The post also landed at the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) office. As a reaction to the post of Kim Kardashian, the FDA sent a warning letter to Duchesnay for misbranding and failing to mention the medication's array of potential side effects. Duchesnay was requested to 'cease misbranding' of the drug immediately or to pull the drug off the market. In addition Kim Kardashian was ordered to rectify her post (Ahran, 2015). What should have been a simple promotional post for the company, turned quickly into a branding fiasco, showing that using an influencer in marketing is not as simple as it may

7

seem. Duchesnay should have done proper research before initiating the collaboration with the Kardashian, instead of solely looking at the reach of the influencer.

However, it is not clear if the mismatch between Kim Kardashian and the product was the reason for the outburst, or if the post received that many attention due to the all the negativity it received. What would have been the reaction of the public if this post was sent by a less known influencer, or a so-called micro influencer? Can we state with certainty that the mismatch caused the negative outburst? And would the impact of this post be different if there had only been positive reactions to it instead of negative? Or was it the combination of factors that resulted in this branding fiasco? These questions form the foundation for a study on the mismatch/match between a product and influencer on the image of organizations and the influencer in question. Furthermore it raises questions about the importance of comments on social media in regard to the brand trust and attitude formed towards the given brand. It is especially interesting to study if a mismatch in combination with the negative comments, as in the case of Kim Kardashian and Diciegis, have a negative effect on attitude, brand trust and purchase intention.

As Influencer marketing is a relative new term in marketing communications, a significant gap can be found in research on this subject, as research on influencer marketing is mainly focused on why influencer marketing should be implemented by organizations, and not on the effects it can have on a brand.

In the following study a literature review was conducted on the effects of productinfluencer match-mismatch on brand image, and the effects of positive and negative comments on these collaborations. Influencer marketing was discussed, as well as theories on the match between brands and influencers and the role of positive and negative comments. Also, the difference in influencers, specifically micro and macro influencers, and their reach was discussed. It was expected that a micro influencer would generate less negativity than a macro influencer like Kim Kardashian.

Furthermore a method was introduced to study the effects on influencer and brand image in case of a match-mismatch between product and influencer and the influence that comments have on the match-mismatch. The results of the experiment led to recommendations for organizations on improving their influencer marketing strategies. The variables that are discussed in the theoretical framework are the type of influencer (micro-macro), the product (match-mismatch) and the comments (positivenegative). It was important to take these variables into account as the combination between the type of influencer, the product and the comments on the post were expected to have an effect on the way followers perceive the collaboration between a #AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image.

brand and the influencer. The outcome of the experiment was to measure the effects on attitude towards the brand, purchase intention and brand trust. In order to be able to study these effects, the following research question was formulated:

RQ1: To what extent does the combination of influencer type, product type and comment type influence the attitude, purchase intention and trust towards the brand?

Before continuing with the literature review of the study a social media analysis was conducted by means of the online social media-monitoring tool Coosto. The analysis, conducted by the researcher, was of great important to reinstate the necessity of research on the combination of a match/mismatch between product and influencer, and the comments given on these collaborations. For all the results of this analysis, see Apendix D. Coosto is only able to navigate through Dutch social media channels; therefore the use of a Dutch case was essential. The collaboration between Blokker and Sarah Jessica Parker was used as an example to illustrate the impact that a mismatch can have online. As the work environment of influencers is mainly focused on social media this analysis is a strategic addition to the study.

The analysis of the Blokker and Sarah Jessica Parker collaboration shows that the perception of consumers on the collaboration plays an important role in the evaluation of a brand. Blokker has received a lot of negative reactions on the collaboration with Sarah Jessica Parker. One of the reasons for the negativity was the perceived mismatch between the brand and the influencer. One of the trending topics on the collaboration between Sarah Jessica Parker and Blokker was literally named 'mismatch', see appendix D. After reading the comments and articles on this collaboration it became clear that many consumers were convinced that Sarah Jessica Parker was not the right fit for the Dutch household brand Blokker. Apart from the mismatch, the articles and comments given on the collaboration also made clear that consumers were furious with Blokker as they had layed off 800 employees due to their financial situation, but somehow did find the financial means needed to start a new omnichannel strategy with Sarah Jessica Parker. The conversation on the mismatch between Sarah Jessica Parker and the Blokker mostly took place on Twitter, where several articles were retweeted by many Twitter-users to express their opinion on the collaboration. Taking the data resulting from the Coosto analysis into account it can be said that consumers do not believe in the fit of the celebrity/influencer Sarah Jessica Parker and the Blokker. This perception led to a lot of negativity being spread online which could have affected Blokker negatively.

9

The Coosto analysis shows that a mismatch in product and influencer, especially when combined with negative comments, should be studied to be able to estimate what the damage to a brand image could be. As mentioned before, all the results of the analysis can be found in Appendix D.

2. Theoretical framework

According to Zenith Optimedia's report 'Advertising Expenditure Forecasts' of 2015, the Internet will be the biggest advertising medium in 12 key markets by 2017, which together represent 28% of global adspend. Although traditional television adspend is currently larger than Internet adspend, according to this report Internet advertising globally is expected to surpass television ad by 2020. The Internet already dominates adspend in Australia, Denmark, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the UK since 2014. This change in marketing communication strategies has made influencer marketing an important focus for marketers. In the following chapter influencer marketing will be discussed. Furthermore the type of influencers will be discussed, as well as theories on product match/mismatch and on positive and negative comments.

2.1 Influencer marketing

Influencer marketing is a form of virtual word of mouth marketing (Woods, 2016). With influencer marketing, marketers connect influential people on social media to brands. The success of influencer marketing comes from the fact that people tend to trust friends and peers more than brand communication itself. In a survey on Global Trust in Advertising done by Nielsen in 2015, it was concluded that 83% of consumers believe recommendations of friends and family over any form of advertising.

According to Chen and Xie (2008), consumer-created information is often more likely to be credible than when information comes from an organization itself. This has to do with the fact that consumer created content is positively related to the trustworthiness of the person recommending it. Influencers are considered to be knowledgeable and trustworthy individuals that could potentially lead others to accept recommendations, make purchase decisions and select transaction partners in ecommerce (Liu et al., 2015), therefore the principles of WOM apply to influencer marketing as well.

With consumers using social media and the Internet as the prominent source for information seeking, social media influencers are increasingly rising (Booth & Matic, 2010; Woods, 2016).

By using influencers in marketing communications, marketers have the opportunity to reach more consumers and to increase their response rate (Liu et al., 2015; Booth & Matic, 2010). Recent studies have acknowledged the fact that social influence exists and affects the diffusion process (Probst, Grosswiele & Pfleger, 2014). However, although influencers exist, the influence they have differs amongst groups. Aral & Walker (2012) concluded that users exert most influence on other users of the same age and that influential users cluster on social networks. Being able to identify the correct influencers for a brand can be of essence for the failure or success of an influencer campaign.

2.2 Identifying the type of influencers

Influencers come in all forms. An influencer can be a CEO of a company, a blogger, a celebrity, an industry expert or a 'normal' individual with a large number of followers on social media (Lui et al., 2015). Marketing managers seem to have embraced the idea of influencers and the effects they have on brand awareness. However, in science the idea of influential individuals catalyzing the diffusion of opinions and behaviors in society is not fully supported. Aral and Walker (2012) state that theories have indicated that susceptibility and not influence is the key trait to social contagions. However little empirical evidence exists to adjudicate these claims. To study these claims Aral and Walker conducted a randomized experiment to measure influence and susceptibility that influence the product adoption decision of a representative sample of 1.3 million Facebook users. Aral and Walker found that the influentials and susceptibles theories both play a role in the peer-to-peer diffusion of a product. Combining studies of influence with studies of susceptibility would therefore improve the understanding of the diffusion of behavioral contagions, making it easier to identify influencers.

Furthermore the study of Aral and Walker suggests that in contrast to taking an individualistic view on influence, one has to look at the joint of the distribution of influence, the susceptibility and the likelihood of spontaneous adoption in the local network around individuals all together, to be able to determine their importance to the adoption of certain behaviors (Aral & Walker, 2012).

As the competition in WOM marketing has become fierce, and social networks are now the most important marketing channels, identifying effective influencers is vital to increase the efficiency of social network-based marketing (Lui et al., 2015). Based on the social identity theory, Lui et al. (2015) developed a research framework to identify effective influencers by combining review information and the trust relationships of users in social networks. The social identity theory suggests that individuals in a social network divide their social world into two groups: in-groups and out-groups. The ingroup refers to a social group where an individual regards him/herself to as a member. In social networks, social identity occurs through interaction with other users in the personal network, as well as in online social groups. Therefore social trust is considered to be an important concept. Social trust is related to the role of groups in providing members with information about their social identities. There is a significant relationship between trust and the willingness to accept a certain decision when a strong identity-relevant tie exists between an individual and a group. As influencers are seen as trustworthy, novel information producers, this individual is considered to be the strong identity relevant tie between groups.

Another proposed method to identify influencers is the method developed by Eirinaki, Monga & Sundaram (2012). Eirinaki et al. (2012), propose to identify influencers by selecting and combining a set of profile-based characteristics representing popularity and activity. Probst et al. (2014) state that the identification of influential people is getting easier due to the usage of network data of Online Social Networks (OSN). Social media channels, which fall under OSN allow for an analysis of the diffusion process, taking into account additional information such as detailed demographic data, personal interests, the level of activity of the influencers (comments and likes), and the content and sentiment of communication. However the practical approaches for the identification of influential users in OSN are not there yet and further research is needed (Prost et al., 2014). However, marketers have found a way to put theory in practice. By segmenting influencers into groups based on their popularity and profile characteristics, marketers are using the model Eirinaki et al. (2012) proposed. The two groups of influencers that can be identified using the principle of profile-based characteristics representing popularity and activity are the micro and macro influencers.

Marketers define micro influencers as any individual with less than 100.000 followers on its social media channels. An influencer can be any celebrity, youtuber, instagrammer, snapchatter or blogger with a follower-base of highly engaged, extremely attentive social media users (Weareanthology.co.nz; Mediakix.com, 2016). A macro influencer would be any celebrity, youtuber, instagrammer, snapchatter or blogger having over 100,000 followers on its social media. Although marketers have found a way to define profiles based on their popularity and activity, it is important to address the fact that there has not been any scientific research done in social sciences on the topic of micro or macro influencers.

An explanation for this can be that the terms micro and macro influencers are rather new in influencer marketing. Marketers are currently exploring these dimensions of influencer marketing as the search to finding the right influencer for the right organization continues to be the hardest part of influencer marketing.

As macro influencers have a larger reach than micro influencer, marketers usually prefer to work with macro influencers instead of micro influencers. However, recent studies have shown the journey of decreasing engagement rates alongside increasing follower counts (Weareanthology.co.nz, 2016). A study undertaken by Markerly (2016) with a sample size of 2 million social accounts shows that when the amount of followers increases, the engagement with the influencer decreases. The average like rate for accounts with less than a 1,000 followers is currently over 8%. Social media users with a follower base of 1,000 – 10,000 have an average like rate of 4.04%. For social media accounts with an audience of 10,000 – 100,000, the average like rate staggers to as little as 2.37%. Those defined as macro influencers, having a follower base between 100,000 and 1 million have an average like rate of 1.75%.

According to Weareanthology (2016) the decrease in likes could be explained as follows. The following of such popular social media accounts is comprised of fans, rather than friends, who can only be briefly influenced. Hypothetically speaking, taking the social identity theory that Lui et al. (2015) proposed into account, these influencers could be seen as not being part of the in-group anymore, making them less relatable and trustworthy. A micro influencer however is still considered to be a part of the in-group, being the strong identity tie connecting the product or brand with the followers. Therefore micro influencers would be considered trustworthier than macro influencers, and respectively more effective. Concluding, the information above has led to several hypotheses. The hypotheses go as follows:

H1a: Micro influencers have a more positive effect on attitude towards the brand compared to macro influencers.

H1b: Micro influencers have a more positive effect on purchase intention than macro influencers.

H1c: Micro influencers have a more positive effect on brand trust than macro influencers.

2.3 Product match – mismatch

Before the term influencer marketing was introduced, collaborations between influencers and product were already happening. WOM marketing and sponsorship marketing amongst others are used as an instrument to build, enhance or change the corporate and brand image. Marketers use sponsorships as an alternative means to reach their target audience (Paliwal, 2014). The fit between an influencer, otherwise called endorser, and product has been researched under the product match-up hypothesis. The match-up hypothesis suggests that the higher the perceived fit between the celebrity's image and the endorsed brand, the more persuasive the celebrity and the advertisement will be (McCormick, 2016). However, theories on what influences a product-endorser match is still inconsistent. McCormick (2016) elaborates on the inconsistency, stating that some theories have concluded credibility to impact a significant match, while others have concluded that the physical appearance of the endorser influences a positive match.

Another theory researching the match between product and endorser is the associative propositional evaluation theory (APE) by Gawronski & Bodenhausen (2006). According to the APE model the associations that will be activated in response to an object depends on the preexisting structure of associations in the memory and the overall set of input stimuli. This theory suggests that the evaluation of a product depends on more factors than the influencer associated with the product. Example of factors that could influence the evaluation of a product could be one's previous experience with the brand, or maybe even with the product, one's relationship to the influencer and one's environment to name a few.

Another research done by Meyer-Levy and Tybout (1989) concludes that the level of congruity between a product and a general product category, which can be a brand or influencer, could influence the nature of information processing and the product evaluation. Where a match between product and influencer can lead to a more positive evaluation of the product, a mismatch can have the opposite effect. However, the meaning transfer model of McCracken (1989) suggests that due to a natural match between influencer and product in terms of cultural meanings and images some endorsements work better than others. The various symbolic meanings that a consumer associates with an influencer are transferred to the product that is being endorsed, and then from the product to the consumer through purchase and consumption (Choi & Rifon, 2016).

This means that in case of a mismatch, the wrong symbolic meaning could be transferred to the product, leading to a less positive evaluation of the endorsed product. To conclude, several theories have been explored regarding the product match/mismatch, whereby hypothetically speaking, it could be stated that a product match between endorser and product can lead to better results in advertising. The following hypotheses are derived from the mentioned theories:

H2a: A product match has a more positive effect on attitude towards the brand than a product mismatch.

H2b: A product match has a more positive effect on purchase intention than a product mismatch.

H2c: A product has a more positive effect on brand trust than a product mismatch.

Taking into consideration the variable influencer, an interaction hypothesis is formulated. Because micro influencers are seen as being trustworthier than macro influencers, according to the social identity theory, they are considered to be part of the in-group. Whenever a micro influencer promotes a product that does not match with his or her own social image, and therefore is perceived to be incongruent, it can be argued that this mismatch would have a greater negative impact, than when a macro influencer, who is not a part of the in-group, promotes a product that does not match its social image. The fact that members of the in-group are perceived as being trustworthier leads to having stronger expectations from these individuals as opposed to out-group members. Therefore the interaction hypothesis formulated goes as follows:

H3a: A mismatch in product - micro influencer has a more negative effect on attitude towards the brand as compared to a mismatch in product - macro influencer.

H3b: A mismatch in product – micro influencer has a more negative effect on purchase intention as compared to a mismatch in product – macro influencer.

H3c: A mismatch in product – micro influencer has a more negative effect on brand trust as compared to a mismatch in product – macro influencer.

2.4 Positive and negative comments

Over the past years, social media use has experienced an enormous increase, becoming a prominent source of information. Online reviews have become an important form of electronic word of mouth (E-WOM) that help consumers in their decision making process (Yan et al., 2016). Comments underneath a post on social media are a form of E-WOM. During the purchasing process consumers want product attribute-value information and recommendations from various sources. Online reviews vary in the valence of success or failure of the product, leading to positive or negative reviews. Positively valenced communication is likely to be characterized as being pleasant, vivid or novel descriptions of experiences, whereas negatively valenced communication is likely to include private complaining, unpleasant or denigrating product descriptions (Anderson, 1998 as cited in Sparks & Browning, 2011).

A study conducted by Ye, Law and Gu (2009) using hotel data reported that positive online reviews contribute significantly to an increase in hotel bookings. However, further research implies that negative information tends to be over emphasized and is more influential in forming impressions. Predominantly negative reviews will be given more weighting than positive reviews (Sparks & Browning, 2011). Online consumer reviews have the capability of influencing the decision-making process of consumers, due to conformity (Lee, Park & Han, 2008). According to Burnkrant and Consineau, as cited in Lee, Park & Han (2008), conformity can be defined as the tendency of opinions to establish a group norm and the tendency of individuals to comply with the group norm. Group characteristics such as group size and the proportion of people that have already acted can influence conformity. Also, the majority of the group influences individuals.

Studies have shown that the proportion of opinions from others may be critical for consumers' choice (Lee et al., 2008). Lee et al. (2008) suggest that the proportion of negative online consumer reviews could be an important factor for consumers who are considering buying a new product. In the minds of consumers, an increase of just one negative online consumer review increases the riskiness of the product and decreases the desire for the product. Furthermore Lee et al. (2008) suggests that when taking the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) into consideration, the involvement with the product explains the degree of negative change in attitude towards a product.

The ELM theory defines two routes for information processing: the central route and the peripheral route. The central route emphasizes high relevance of the message to an individual, while the peripheral route occurs when the message receiver is unable or unwilling to engage in much thought about the message (Yan et al., 2016). Consumers engaging in the central route are usually high-involvement consumers. These consumers have a higher degree of negative change in attitude towards a product than low-involvement consumers (Lee et al., 2008). Patrali (2001) agrees with the findings of Lee et al. (2008), explaining that the inferences consumers draw are contingent upon the receptivity to the WOM information. Furthermore, according to Patrali (2001), the stronger an individuals' feelings or confidence in his or her choice prior to exposure to WOM information, the more the feelings will dominate the interpretation and use of that information.

Another study by Liu, Xiao, Lim & Tan (2016) suggests that online reviews are manifested in two forms, quantitative (like/dislike or five-star rating), also known as numerical rating, and qualitative (comments or written reviews), also known as opinionated review. Liu et al. (2016) explains that numerical ratings are seen as a concise indicator of an individual's attitude towards a product, whereas opinionated reviews supply contextual information and reasoning behind one individuals' opinion. Opinionated reviews require additional effort to process, and leave room for subjective interpretation. Nonetheless, opinionated reviews are often regarded as trustworthy (Liu et al., 2016). With this background information in mind, a hypothesis has been formulated. The formulated hypotheses are the following:

H4a: Negative comments have a more negative effect on attitude towards the brand compared to positive comments.

H4b: Negative comments have a more negative effect on purchase intention compared to positive comments.

H4c: Negative comments have a more negative effect on brand trust compared to positive comments.

Taking into consideration the match up hypothesis, whereby it is stated that a match between product and influencer can lead to a more positive evaluation of the product than a mismatch between product and influencer, and whereby a mismatch may provoke more negative comments than a match between product and influencer, the following hypotheses can be formulated for the interaction between comments and product match/mismatch:

#AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image. 17 April, 2017 **H5a:** Negative comments on a product mismatch have a more negative effect on attitude towards the brand compared to negative comments on a product match.

H5b: Negative comments on a product mismatch have a more negative effect on purchase intention compared to negative comments on a product match.

H5c: Negative comments on a product mismatch have a more negative effect on brand trust compared to negative comments on a product match.

Furthermore, as micro influencers are perceived to be trustworthier than macro influencers, positive comments are expected to have more impact on attitude and brand trust when seen underneath a product post of a micro influencer. Therefore the following hypotheses are formulated:

H6a: Positive comments on a product – micro influencer mismatch have a more positive effect on attitude towards the brand as compared to positive comments on a product – macro influencer mismatch.

H6b: Positive comments on a product – micro influencer mismatch have a more positive effect on brand trust than a product – macro influencer mismatch.

H6c: Positive comments on a product – micro influencer mismatch have a more positive effect on purchase intention than a product – macro influencer mismatch.

2.5 Mediating variable

After analyzing the variables for the study it has become clear there may be a mediating variable between the independent and dependent variables. The mediating variable source credibility could have an effect on the strength between the influencer and the dependent variables attitude, trust and purchase intention. The source credibility will also have an effect on the strength between the product and the dependent variables, as the source credibility is expected to add to the belief whether a product is a match or a mismatch with the influencer. The source credibility theory states that people are more likely to be persuaded when the source presents itself as credible.

To measure source credibility the measurement scale of Ohanian (1990) will be used. This scale measures attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertise. It is expected that the mediator source credibility will have influence on the dependent variables, therefore the following hypothesis is formulated:

H7a: The effect of influencer micro/macro on attitute towards the brand, purchase intention and brand trust is mediated by source credibility.

H7b: The effect of product match/mismatch on attitude towards the brand, purchase intention and brand trust is mediated by source credibility.

H7c: The effect of positive/negative comments on attitude towards the brand, purchase intention and brand trust is mediated by source credibility.

Furthermore an influencer evaluation will be performed as mediating variable to explain the effects that a micro/macro influencer have on the perceived similarity, connectedness towards influencer, authenticity and integrity of the influencer. This is important to analyze as the social identity theory suggests that individuals considered to be part of the in-group are trustworthier and more relatable than individuals that are part of the out-group (Lui et al, 2015). With the dimensions of similarity, connectedness towards the influencer, authenticity and integrity, it can be determined whether a micro influencer is perceived as trustworthier and more relatable than a macro influencer.

The influencer evaluation was measured by means of a new scale that was developed for the purpose of this study. The items of the four dimensions of the influencer evaluation were based on previous studies; similarity (Peetz, 2012), connectedness towards influencer (Lee & Robbins, 1995), authenticity (Bruhn, Schoenmüller, Schäfer, & Heinrich, 2012) and integrity (Craig & Gustafson, 1998). It was expected that participants that felt close to the influencer would have a more positive attitude and a higher purchase intention, as well as more trust in the brand shown.

2.6 Covariates

The covariates of involvement with product, involvement with fashion and involvement with fashion influencers were taken into account as possible explanatory predictors of the outcome of the study. It was expected that involvement would have a direct effect on the dependent variables. The involvement with the product was measured with the measurement scale of Zaichkowsky (1985).

2.7 Research Model

The research model in Figure 5 is conducted to give a visual representation of the study. The independent variables that are manipulated are the 1. The influencer (micro vs. macro), 2. Product (match vs. mismatch), and 3. The comments (positive vs. negative). The dependent variables that are being measured are attitude the towards brand, brand trust and purchase intention. The mediator source credibility will be taken into account when measuring the effects of the influencer, product match/mismatch and comments on attitude towards the brand, brand trust and purchase intention. Next to source credibility, the influencer evaluation was taken into account to measure the effect that the independent variables have on the perceived similarity, connectedness towards influencer, authenticity and integrity of the influencer. The covariates of involvement with the product, fashion and fashion influencer are also taken into account. In Figure 5 an overview can be found of the research model.



Figure 5: Research model

3. Method

This chapter discusses the research methodology employed to test the several research hypotheses that were formulated to address the research questions of the study. For the purpose of this study two separate studies were conducted. A preliminary study was conducted, followed by the main research. This section will start with a short explanation of the preliminary study, which has been conducted to identify the right stimulus material for the main research. Subsequently the research design will be explained as well as the procedure and participants of the study. Furthermore the measurements will be elaborated upon and the scores of the reliability analysis for the constructs will be given.

3.1 Experimental design

The experiment was a 2 (influencer: micro vs. macro; between subjects) x 2 (product: match vs. mismatch; between subjects) x 2 (comment: negative vs. positive; between subjects) design, which resulted in 8 different conditions. For every condition, a level of the independent variables (influencer, product, comment) were used. An overview of the conditions can be found in Table 1.

	Influencer - Product type			
		Macro		Micro
Comments	Match	Mismatch	Match	Mismatch
Positive	1	2	3	4
Negative	5	6	7	8

Table 1. An overview of the different research conditions for the study.

3.2 Preliminary study

To be able to determine the correct stimulus materials for the main research, a short preliminary study was conducted to determine the right manipulations for the independent variables of influencer, product and comments. The fashion industry is known for its use of influencers; therefore it has been chosen as the industry the influencers in this study were active in. A study done by the Fashion and Beauty monitor concluded that influencer budgets in the fashion and beauty industry would increase in 2016 with 59% (Fashion Monitor, 2016), making this an interesting industry to study.

For the pretest a total of 18 women filled out an online survey to determine the correct manipulations for the stimulus materials. The sample consisted of highly educated women in the age group of 18-34. The respondents of the pretest answered questions regarding influencers and products to be able to determine the micro and macro influencer and the match or mismatch product.

The influencer

To be able to ensure that participants would recognize the difference between a micro influencer and a macro influencer extremes were used in the individuals chosen as influencers for the preliminary study. For the study, the number of followers of the influencers was used as the indicator for the determination of a micro or macro influencer. According to several practical studies that have been conducted, influencers with less than 100,000 followers were considered to be micro influencers. Influencers with more than 100,000 followers on their social media channels were considered to be macro influencers (Mediakix.com, 2016).

To make sure that there was a clear distinction between the micro influencer and the macro influencer, accounts were chosen with a large difference in the number of followers. For the preliminary study 5 influencers were chosen to represent the micro influencers and 5 influencers were chosen to represent the macro condition. Examples of the Instagram profiles of the preliminary study can be found in Appendix A. The influencers in the preliminary study are all Dutch influencers in the fashion industry that collaborate with brands on a regularly basis.

As the study will take place in a social media environment, in particular on Instagram, the Instagram profiles of these influencers were presented to the respondents. The Instagram profile of the presented influencer shows the number of followers, followees and a short biography of the influencer. These Instagram profiles were not manipulated. The following questions are examples of questions that were asked to determine the influencer's importance and whether she was considered to be a micro or a macro influencer: 'do you know this person', 'based on the number of followers of this account, do you consider her to be important on Instagram?' and 'How much influence do you consider her to have on Instagram?' The respondents were asked to answer the questions on a five-point Likert scale from (1) definitely yes to (5) definitely no. The scores were recoded to 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest score.

Out of the ten influencers, the influencer with the highest score in the macro condition was chosen for the main research. The influencer with the highest score in the micro condition was chosen to be the micro influencer. The score of the influencer was based on five questions that were asked to respondents regarding their perceived influence and the perceived social status of the influencer. The social status indicates whether the influencer is perceived to be very influential or not. Based on the outcome of the preliminary study the following influencers were chosen: For the macro condition Negin Mirsalehi (M=3.42, SD=.57) had been chosen as the influencer that will be used in the main research. The influencer chosen for the micro condition was Nicol Huisman (M=2.85, SD=.50).

However, to make sure that both conditions were as equal as possible, it was decided upon to change the name of the micro and macro influencer into one fictional name: Vera de Leeuw. To keep the conditions as equally as possible, the Instagram profile in both conditions was the same. However, the followers, followees and likes underneath the Instagram post were changed to match either the micro or macro condition. An overview of the total mean score of the questions asked to determine who was the most influential influencer can be found in Table 4. From the table it can be concluded that Negin Mirsalehi was perceived as the most influential macro influencer and Nicol Huisman was perceived as the most influential micro influencer.

N = 18	Nr of followers	Μ	SD
Micro influencer			
Anna Nooshin	285.000	3.37	.50
Yara Michels	133.000	2.85	.57
Negin Mirsalehi	3.500.000	3.42	.57
Lizzy van der Ligt	229.000	2.77	.84
Linda Tol	285.000	2.95	.82
Macro influencer			
Nicol Huisman	44.300	2.85	.50
Vivian Hoorn	51.200	2.58	.63
LovelybyLucy	43.200	2.57	.73
Mixtfashion	42.000	2.71	.63
Daphisticated	59.500	2.76	.82

Table 4. An overview of the total mean score of the questions asked to measure the perceived influence of the influencer.

The product

To be able to determine whether the product is a match or mismatch with the given influencer, products were chosen based on their perceived suitability in relation to a fashion influencer. For the match condition fashion/beauty products were chosen. To represent the mismatch condition, several electronic products were chosen. There were 4 fashion/beauty products chosen for the match condition and 4 electronic products for the mismatch condition. An example of the stimulus material of the preliminary study can be found in Appendix A. Dutch online shoppers spend between \notin 100 and \notin 500 online in one purchase (CBS, 2016), therefore the products that were chosen to

#AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image. 23 April, 2017 represent both conditions were in this price range. There were four questions asked to rate the fit of the product in relation to a fashion influencer. Examples of the questions asked are the following: 'are you familiar with this product?', 'how would you rate this product in relation to a fashion influencer?' and 'would you consider buying this product if a fashion influencer recommends it?'. The respondents were asked to answer the question on a five-point Likert scale from (1) definitely yes to (5) definitely no. The scores were recoded tot 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest. A familiarity question was asked to make sure that participants of the main research knew the product that was being presented. With the results of the preliminary study it was concluded that the Samsung wireless speaker (M= 2.30, SD = .85) would be the best product for the mismatch condition. This product was rated as the least fitting product in relation to a fashion influencer. For the match condition the Michael Kors sunglasses (M = 3.62, SD= .85) were chosen, as this product was seen as the best fit for a fashion influencer. However, the mismatch product was changed from Samsung wireless speaker to Sony wireless speaker. This was done to condition on the name. Samsung is expected to influence the results because of the strong brand name. Sony is a more neutral brand name; therefore the product name is changed to Sony wireless speaker. As there is a large difference in products chosen, an item on involvement with the product was added to the study as a covariate. An overview of the total mean of the products on their perceived match or mismatch is given in Table 5.

The table shows that the Michael Kors sunglasses had the highest mean in the match condition. The Samsung wireless speaker has the lowest mean in the mismatch condition.

N = 18	Price	М	SD
Match product			
Michael Kors Watch	€189	3.47	.79
Chi pro ceramic blow dryer	€162	3.31	.76
Michael Kors sunglasses	€163	3.62	.85
Philips Lumea hair removal device	€177	3.03	.75
Mismatch Product			
Samsung Galaxy Tab	€157	2.91	.67
Sony Smart watch	€151	2.82	.80
De'Longhi Espresso machine	€161	2.70	.80
Samsung wireless speaker	€174	2.30	.85

Table 5. An overview of the total mean scores of the products on their perceived match or mismatch.

The comments

For the comment condition, the manipulation of the stimuli was the sentiment of the comments under the given post of the influencer. Comments for the main study were framed negatively or positively. A comment can be framed negatively by using negative words or sentences when addressing the influencer or product. The same can be done for positive framing. 6 Out of the 18 women of the preliminary study were asked to come up with one positive and one negative comment for the match product and the mismatch product. The comments should be realistic and in Instagram language. An overview of the comments can be found in Appendix A. Eventually 8 positive and 8 negative comments were chosen to represent the stimuli of the main research. The comments chosen were a mix of product-related comments and influencer-related comments. The positive comments were matched to the negative comments and were kept as standardized as possible to match both conditions.

3.3 Main research

After performing the preliminary study it was determined what stimulus material would be used for the main study. The 2 x 2 x 2 between subjects design resulted in 8 conditions. To visualize the conditions the stimulus materials were developed. For the independent variable influencer visuals were created to match the micro influencer, and visuals for the macro influencer. As for the product condition, visual stimuli were created for the product match and mismatch condition as well as for the comment condition. The final stimulus material resulted in the development of 4 influencer profiles, 4 different Instagram posts and 4 different comment posts. The stimulus material created for the main research can be found on the following page in Figure 6,7 and 8.

. ***** KPN NL 😤 16:28 @ 1 76% vera_deleeuw ... < 3,5 mln 214.000 2.069 Volgend . Vera De Leeuw Creative type - Fashion stylist from Amsterdam Represented by N.C.L Representation info@veradeleeuw.nl ncl-representation.com/styling/vera-de-leeuw Gevolgd door stylescrapbook, rowanmarli, lizzyvdligt en nog 34 anderen VERTALING BEKUKEN Q 6 (+)0 2

Macro influencer Match product

Macro influencer Mismatch product

.

16:28

vera_deleeuw

3,5 mln

Volgend

2.069

Creative type - Fashion stylist from Amsterdam Represented by N.C.L Representation

ncl-representation.com/styling/vera-de-leeuw

Gevelgd door stylescrapbook, rewanmarli, lizzyvdligt en nog

(+)

0

2

@ 1 76% =

214.000

....

.

+++>> KPN NL 🗢

Vera De Leeuw

VERTALING BEKIJKEN

info@veradeleeuw.nl

Q

<

Micro influencer Match product

.

16:28

vera_deleeuw

Creative type - Fashion stylist from Amsterdam

ncl-representation.com/styling/vera-de-leeuw

Gevolgd door stylescrapbook, rowanmarlii, lizzyvdligt en nog 34 anderen

(+)

0

2

Represented by N.C.L Representation

2.069 40,5.000

Volgend

@ 1 76%

602

....

*

****** KPN NI 😤

Vera De Leeuw

VERTALING BEKUKEN

info@veradeleeuw.nl

Q

6

<

Micro influencer Mismatch product



Figure 6. An overview of the micro and macro influencer profiles for the match and mismatch product.

6



Macro Instagram post Match product

Macro Instagram post Mismatch product Micro Instagram post Match product

Micro Instagram post Mismatch product

16:28

@ 1 76%

2

++++>> KPN NL 😤

QQA

6

· 663 vind-ik-leuks

Alle 12 reacties bekijken

Q

vera_deleeuw New in #sonywirelessspeaker

(+)

 \odot

vera deleeuw

R



Figure 7. An overview of the macro and micro Instagram posts for the match and mismatch product.



Positive comments Mismatch product

Negative comments Mismatch product

Positive comments Match product



Figure 8. An overview of the positive and negative comments for the match and mismatch product.

Negative comments Match product

3.4 Procedure

The main study was performed in the form of an online survey by means of online software survey tool Qualtrics. Instagram was chosen as the medium of communication because of its visually engaging nature and its closeness to influencers. According to a study conducted by Rhythm One in 2015, Instagram is the best performing channel for social action, with an average rate of 3.2% engagement, which is far above all the other social networks, which have an engagement rate of 1.5% (Rhythm One, 2015).

In the introduction of the survey a short explanation about the study was given. Participants were told that they would see a profile of a fashion instagrammer and would have to answer some questions regarding the profile and products that were displayed. In the survey the word influencer was not used. Instead, fashion instagrammer was used as the term for influencer. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

3.5 Measurement

Participants of the questionnaire were asked to answer questions regarding their attitude towards the brand, purchase intention and brand trust. Before any stimulus material was shown, participants received a set of questions on involvement. Source credibility and the influencer evaluation were measured after the stimulus material was shown.

Attitude towards the brand

Attitude was measured with 5 items based on Spears and Singh (2004). Examples of the items are 'unappealing – appealing' and 'unpleasant – pleasant'. Items were measured on a bipolar 7-point scale. The question asked to participants was 'what do you think about the brand? (Michael Kors or Sony).' A reliability analysis was computed to test the reliability of the construct. The reliability of attitude was high with a Cronbach's Alpha of (α = .96).

Purchase Intention

Purchase intention was measured with 5 items based on Spears and Singh (2004). Examples of the items are 'Definitely do not intend to buy – definitely intend to buy' and 'I would probably not buy it – I would probably buy it'. Items were measured on a bipolar 7-point scale. The question asked to participants was 'would you consider buying this product? (Michael Kors sunglasses or Sony wireless speaker).' A reliability

analysis was computed to measure the reliability of the construct. The reliability of purchase intention was high with a Cronbach's Alpha of (α = .96).

Brand trust

Trust was measured with 7 items based on Lau & lee (1999) and McKnight, Choudhury & Kacmar (2002) on a 7-point Likert scale. Examples of the items are 'I consider the brand (Michael Kors or Sony) to be sincere' and 'I consider the brand (Michael Kors or Sony) to be genuine' (1= strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree). A reliability analysis was computed to measure the reliability of the construct. The reliability of trust was high with a Cronbach's Alpha's of (α = .86). An overview of the constructs can be found in Table 8. The table shows that the total items of the 3 constructs of the dependent variables.

	Brand X = Michael Kors/Sony N=240	
Constructs dependent variables	Items	Total α
Attitude towards the brand		
	Unappealing - appealing	
	Bad - good	
	Unpleasant - pleasant	.96
	Unfavorable - favorable	
Purchase Intention	Unlikable - likable	
	Never - definitely	
	Definitely do not intend - definitely intend	
	Very low purchase interest - very high purchase interest	.96
	Would definitely not buy - would definitely buy	
	Would probably not buy - would probably buy	
Brand trust		
	I consider brand X to be sincere	
	I consider brand X to be genuine	
	I consider brand X to be knowledgeable	.86
	The brand X keeps their promises	
	I feel secure when I use products from brand X	
	I believe brand X would act in my best interest	
Table 8. An overv	I believe that brand X does not take advantage of consumers iew of the dependent variables constructs and their Cronbach's Alpha's.	

Source credibility

.

The mediator source credibility was measured with 15 items based on Ohanian (1990). The 15 items were subdivided into 3 dimensions: attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertise. Examples of items of attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertise are 'unattractive – attractive', 'dishonest – honest' and 'not an expert – expert'. A reliability analysis was computed to measure the reliability of the construct. The reliability of source credibility was measured for each separate dimension. Items were measured on a bipolar 7-point scale. The reliability of attractiveness was high with a Cronbach's Alpha of (α = .86). Trustworthiness and Expertise had a high reliability as well, the Cronbach's Alpha's were (α = .90) and (α = .93). An overview of the construct and the Cronbach's Alpha's can be found in Table 9. The table gives an overview of the total set of items that measured source credibility.

	N=240	
Construct mediator source credibility	Items	Total α
Attractiveness	Unattractive - attractive	
	Not classy - calssy	
	Ugly - beautiful	.86
	Plain - elegant	
	Not sexy - sexy	
	Undependable - dependable	
Trustworthiness	Dishonest - honest	
	Unreliable - reliable	.90
	Insincere - sincere	
	Untrustworthy - trustworthy	
	Not an expert - expert	
Expertise	Inexperienced - experienced	
	Unknowledgeable - knowledgeable	.93
	Unqualified - qualified	
	Unskilled - skilled	L 1114

Table 9. An overview of the Cronbach's Alpha's construct for the mediator source credibility.

Influencer evaluation

For the purpose of this study a new scale was developed to be able to measure the opinion of participants on the specific influencers. The scale consisted of four dimensions analyzing participants' perceived similarity to the influencer, connectedness to influencer, perceived authenticity and integrity of the influencer. The items were measured on 7-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). The four dimensions will be discussed separately.

Similarity

The set measuring the perceived comparability of the respondent to the influencer consisted of 4 items with statements like 'I can identify with the instagrammer' and 'the instagrammer and I are in a similar stage of life'. When conducting the Cronbach's Alpha the reliability of this set turned out to be (α = .87), which is high.

Connectedness towards influencer

Connectedness to the influencer was measured with a set of three items. The items consisted of statements like 'I feel distant to the instagrammer' and 'the Instagrammer feels close to me'. The Cronbach's Alpha for this set was also high (α = .82).

Authenticity

The set measuring the authenticity of the influencer consisted of 4 items with statements like 'the instagrammer stays true to herself' and 'the instagrammer makes a genuine impression'. The Cronbach's Alpha for the authenticity dimension was (α = .77).

Integrity

The final dimension measured the perceived integrity of the influencer. This set consisted of 6 items. The items consisted of statements like 'the instagrammer would not lie to me' and 'the instagrammer is paid to promote this'. The reliability of this set was ($\alpha = .74$). An overview of the Cronbach's Alpha's of each dimension of the influencer evaluation and the total items resulting in the influencer evaluation can be found in Table 10.

	N=240	
Construct dimensions of influencer evaluation	Items	Total α
Similarity	I can identify with the instagrammer	
	The instagrammer and I are similar	.87
	The instagrammer and I have similar viewpoints	
Connectedness	The Instagrammer feels close to me	
	I feel distant from the instagrammer	.82
	I feel disconnected from the instagrammer	
Authenticity	The instagrammer stands out between other instagrammers	
	The Instagrammer stays true to herself	
	The Instagrammer makes a genuine impression	.77
	The instagrammer is unique	
Integrity	The instagrammer would not lie to me	
	The instagrammer can be trusted	
	The instagrammer is hypocrite	
	The instagrammer acts out of self interest	.74
	The instagrammer is commercial	
	The instagrammer is paid to promote this product	

Table 10. An overview of the Cronbach's Alpa's of the four dimensions of the influencer evaluation.

Involvement

In the research model, involvement has been taken as a covariate. Involvement was measured at the beginning of the questionnaire, before the stimulus materials were shown. For the measurement of involvement with the subject and fashion influencer, two items of the involvement measurement scale of Zaichkowsky (1985) were used. The items used were unimportant - important, uninteresting - interesting. Instead of the third Zaichowsky item 'unattractive – attractive', the item of boring – exciting was added to the scale, as it did not make sense to let participants rate fashion or fashion instagrammers based on its or their attractiveness. The set of three items for the measurement of fashion resulted in a reliability of (α = .86). For the measurement of involvement with the fashion influencer the same three items were used, when performing the reliability analysis for this set, the Cronbach's Alpha appeared to be (α = .90). For involvement with the product a set of four items were used. The items were unimportant - important, uninteresting - interesting, irrelevant - relevant and useless useful. This set of items again appeared to have a high reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha for the measurement of involvement with the product was (α = .91). Table 11 shows the total set of items measuring involvement.

	Product = sunglasses/wireless speaker N=240		
Construct covariates involvement	Items	Total α	
Involvement fashion	Uninteresting - interesting		
	Boring - exciting	.86	
	Uninteresting - interesting		
Involvement fashion influencers	Boring - exciting	.90	
	Unimportant - important		
	Uninteresting - interesting		
Involvement product	Irrelevant - relevant	.91	
	Useless - useful		

Table 11. An overview of the Cronbach's Alpha's of the constructs of the covariate involvement.

3.6 Participants

For the proposed study, women in between the ages of 18 and 65 were asked to fill out the survey. The total sample consisted of 285 women, but after deleting partial responses and extremes, there were 240 respondents left. For the study, women of the University of Twente were approached as well as women within the researchers' own social environment to participate in the survey. This resulted in a sample of highly educated women (74.2%) between 18 and 34 years of age. The mean age of the total sample was 26.01 years (SD=5.63). According to a study conducted by Statista on Instagram users, the biggest user groups of Instagram in terms of age are the age groups 18-24 (22.9%) and 25-34 (25.6%) (Statista, 2015), indicating that the sample of this survey is representative for the Instagram environment which was used as the setting for the study. In Appendix C an overview is given per condition of the different age groups, educational level and Instagram information. The table shows that there are no large differences between groups in terms of age, level of education or Instagram use.

4. Results

4.1 Manipulation checks

In the pretest of the study the independent variables manipulated for the stimulus material were partly validated. However for the main research, the stimulus materials were adapted, therefore a manipulation check was needed. The Manipulation checks were performed for the independent variables influencer (micro-macro), product (match-mismatch) and comments (positive-negative).

Influencer

The 240 observations were used in a between subject manipulation check to determine whether there was a significant difference between the influencers shown in the Instagram post. The influencer shown could be a micro or a macro influencer. To check for the difference in influencer, respondents were asked whether the number of followers of the influencer were perceived as allot. The independent samples t-test indicates that the difference was significant (t (238)= -4.221, p < .001). Nevertheless, the mean of the conditions were quite close to each other. The micro condition had a mean of 5.35 (SD=1.24), whereas the macro condition had a mean of 5.97 (SD=1.06). This could indicate that due to the number of followers of the micro condition, respondents might have perceived the micro influencer as more of a macro instead of a micro.

Product

To be able to determine whether the products were seen as the specific match and mismatch conditions, an item asking respondents if they believe the product shown fits the influencer was added to the questionnaire. The mismatch condition resulted in a mean of 4.05 (SD=1.47). The mean of the match condition was 5.15 (SD=1.22). The independent samples t-test shows that the difference found between both was significant (t (238)= -6.331, p< .001). The mean shows that respondents were less certain about the mismatch condition than the match condition, showing that the manipulation was successful.

Comments

To check whether the respondents of the survey recognized the comments as being negative or positive an item was added to the questionnaire asking participants if they agree with the statement 'I believe that these comments are positive' or 'I believe that these comments are negative'. The mean for the negative comment condition was 5.90 (SD (1.36). The mean for the positive comment condition was 6.03 (SD=0.778). The independent samples t-test indicates that there was a significant difference in the conditions (t (238)=26.450, p< .001). The mean of the conditions indicate that respondents did experience the comments as being negative or positive, indicating that the manipulation was successful.

4.2 Hypothesis testing

In this subsection the results of the hypotheses formulated in the first section of this study will be discussed. First the main and interaction effects on the dependent variables will be analyzed. Subsequently the covariates will be discussed as well as the mediating effect of source credibility. Table 12 represents the means and standard deviations of the different conditions. The table shows that purchase intention and attitude towards the brand were higher when dealing with a micro influencer. It also shows that the mismatch product scored higher on brand trust, attitude towards the brand scored scored higher on brand trust, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention than the match product. Positive comments scored slightly higher on brand trust, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention than the match product.

Independent variables			Bra Tru	ind ist	Atti towards	tude the brand	Purc Inter	hase ntion
		Ν	М	SD	М	SD	М	SD
Influencer	Micro	119	4.44	.83	4.92	1.07	3.08	1.41
innuencei	Macro	121	4.42	.90	4.74	1.21	2.89	1.50
	Total	240	4.43	.87	4.83	1.15	2.98	1.45
Product	Mismatch	116	4.68	.76	5.02	.94	3.11	1.31
	Match	124	4.19	.90	4.65	1.29	2.86	1.57
	Total	240	4.43	.87	4.83	1.15	2.98	1.45
Commonte	Negative	125	4.36	.90	4.83	1.11	2.95	1.43
Comments	Positive	115	4.50	.82	4.83	1.18	3.02	1.48
	Total	240	4.43	.87	4.83	1.15	2.98	1.45

Table 12. The means and St. Deviations per condition.

4.2.1 Main and interaction effects

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (Wilks' Lambda) was performed to determine if there was a significant effect of the independent variables on the dependent variables attitude towards brand, purchase intention and brand trust. There was no main effect of the influencer on attitude towards the brand (F (1,232)= 2.011, p = .157), purchase intention (F (1,232)= 1.151, p= .284) or brand trust (F (1,232)= .257, p= .612) therefore the hypotheses H1a, H1b and H1c were not supported. There were significant main effects found for the product. The product has a significant effect on brand trust (F (1, 232)= 20.025, p < .001) and on attitude towards the brand (F (1,232)= 7.142, p= .008). The product mismatch scored higher on attitude towards the brand and on brand trust than the product match, as can been seen in Table 12. There was no significant effect found on purchase intention (F (1,232)= 1.758, p = .186). Hypotheses H2a and H2c were supported, H2b was not supported.

#AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image. 36 April, 2017 The comments had no significant main effects on attitude (F (1, 232)= .046, p= .830), trust (F (1,232)= .652, p = .420) and purchase intention (F (1, 232) = .045, p= .832) leading to H4a, H4b and H4c not being supported. There was no interaction effect found between influencer and product, therefore H3a, H3b and H3c were not supported. There was no interaction effect found between product and comments, however it is important to state that there is a marginal effect visible between product type and comment type on brand trust (F (1, 232)= 3.351, p= .068), nevertheless, the effect remains non-significant. In Table 13 an overview can be found of the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables.

Effect		F	df	р
Influencer:	Attitude	2.011	1	.157
Micro - Macro	Purchase intention	1.151	1	.284
	Trust	.257	1	.612
Product:	Attitude	7.142	1	.008
Match - Mismatch	Purchase intention	1.758	1	.186
	Trust	20.025	1	.000
Comment:	Attitude	.046	1	.830
Positive - Negative	Purchase intention	.045	1	.832
	Trust	.652	1	.420
Influencer * Product	Attitude	.870	1	.352
	Purchase intention	.025	1	.873
	Trust	.050	1	.420
Influencer * comment	Attitude	.619	1	.432
	Purchase intention	.015	1	.902
	Trust	.426	1	.515
Product * comment	Attitude	.005	1	.943
	Purchase intention	.341	1	.560
	Trust	3.351	1	.068
Influencer * product * comment	Attitude	.003	1	.953
	Purchase intention	.072	1	.788
	Trust	.006	1	.941

Table 13. Test of Between-Subjects effects of independent variables.

The hypotheses stated for the interaction of product and comments (H5a, H5b and H5c) were not supported. H6a, H6b and H6c were also not supported, as there were no main effects from the influencer found.

4.2.2 Covariates

For the performed study covariates were taken into account that could influence the effects on the dependent variables of attitude, purchase intention and brand trust. To measure the effects of the covariates on the dependent variables the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (Wilks' Lambda) was performed once more. Involvement with the product has, as expected, a significant effect on the three dependent variables. Involvement with fashion only has a significant influence on purchase intention. Involvement with a fashion influencer has a significant effect on purchase intention and on attitude towards the brand, however not on brand trust. See Table 14 for the effects of involvement.

Effect		F	df	р
Involvement Product	Attitude	31.670	1	.000
	Purchase intention	8.772	1	.003
	Trust	8.463	1	.000
Involvement Fashion	Attitude	1.619	1	.209
	Purchase intention	3.759	1	.054
	Trust	.277	1	.599
Involvement Fashion Influencer	Attitude	7.042	1	.009
	Purchase intention	17.972	1	.000
	Trust	3.376	1	.067

Table 14. Test Between-Subjects Effects of covariates.

4.2.3 Mediating variables source credibility and influencer characteristics

To determine whether the mediator source credibility had an impact on the dependent variables, a mediation analysis was conducted by means of a regression analysis. For a mediator to be active four conditions must be met (Baron & Kenny, 1986). A linear regression analysis was conducted to determine if the mediator source credibility had any effect. The analysis was only conducted for the independent variable product on brand trust, as this was the only main effect found in the study. The regression analysis shows that there is a direct effect of product on brand trust (t= -4.588, p< .001). However there was no significant correlation between product and the mediator source credibility (t=1.834, p= .068), indicating that there is no effect of the mediator in place. There was however a significant effect of the mediator source credibility on brand trust (t= 6.570, p< .001). This indicates that although there is no mediation in place, source credibility does affect brand trust. The hypotheses H7a, H7b and H7c were not supported.



The effects of the influencer evaluation were measured as well to determine if the independent variables influencer, product and comment have an effect on the four dimensions of the influencer evaluation. An ANOVA was performed. The results of the test show that the influencer has a significant effect on the dimension similarity of the influencer evaluation (F (1, 232)= 9.507, p= .002). The independent variable comment has a significant effect on the dimensions connectedness towards the influencer (F (1,232)= 4.902, p= .028) and on integrity (F (1,232)= 3.883, p= .050). The product has a significant effect on the dimension connectedness towards the influencer (F (1,232)= 6.450, p= .012). There were some significant interaction effects found between the independent variables on the influencer evaluation. The interaction between influencer and comments has a significant effect on the connectedness towards the influencer (F (1,232)= 4.763, p= .030). The nature of the interaction is illustrated in Figure 10.



Figure 10. Interaction effect Influencer type and comment type on connectedness towards the influencer.

Simple effects analyses were used to further investigate the nature of the interaction between influencer and comments on connectedness towards the influencer. These analyses indicated that comment type has a significant effect on connectedness towards the influencer when dealing with a macro influencer (F (1,232) = 5.829, p = .050). The comment type does not have a significant effect on connectedness towards the influencer when dealing with a micro influencer (F (1,232) = .012, p= .895). This indicates that respondents were influenced in their perceived connectedness towards the influencer by the comments given underneath the post when dealing with a macro influencer.

Next to the interaction between influencer and comments, there was a significant interaction effect found between influencer and product on the connectedness towards the influencer (F (1,232)= 5.213, p= .023). The nature of the interaction is illustrated in Figure 11.



Figure 11. Interaction effect between influencer and product type on connectedness towards the influencer.

Simple effects analyses were conducted to further investigate the nature of the interaction between the influencer and the product on connectedness towards the influencer. These analyses show that the product has a significant effect on connectedness towards the influencer when dealing with a macro influencer (F (1,232) = 8.786, p = .016). The product does not have a significant effect on connectedness towards the influencer when dealing with a micro influencer (F (1,232)=.012, p=.888). This indicates that respondents were influenced in their perceived connectedness towards the influencer by the product when dealing with a macro influencer, and not when dealing with a micro influencer.

Furthermore there was a significant interaction effect found between comments and product on connectedness towards the influencer (F (1,232)= 9.094, p= .003). The nature of the interaction is illustrated in Figure 12.



Figure 12. Interaction effect between comment and product type on connectedness towards the influencer.

Simple effects analyses were conducted to further investigate the nature of the interaction between comments and product on connectedness towards the influencer. These analyses show that comments have a significant effect on connectedness towards the influencer when dealing with a match product (F (1,232) = 11.839, p = .006). The comments do not have a significant effect on connectedness towards the influencer when dealing with a mismatch product (F (1,232) = .346, p= .424). This indicates that respondents were influenced in their perceived connectedness towards the influencer when dealing with a match product and not when dealing with a mismatch product.

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical Implications

Previous research conducted on influencer marketing has been focused on the effectiveness of influencer marketing as an innovative marketing tool. However in this study the focus was placed on the importance of having the right match between product and influencer to maximize the effects of influencer marketing. The current study was designed to investigate the effects of the combination of influencer, being a micro or macro influencer, product match or mismatch and negative or positive comments on attitude, trust and purchase intention. The study integrated several studies on influencer marketing (Woods, 2016; Chen and Xie, 2008; Lui et al., 2015;

Booth & Matic, 2010) and on type of influencers (Aral & Walker, 2012; Lui et al., 2015; Monga & Sundaram, 2012; Eirinaki et al., 2012; Probst et al., 2014) which lead to the hypothesis that micro influencers are perceived to have a greater positive influence on attitude, trust and purchase intention than macro influencers. The results of the study showed that there was no significant effect of the influencer on the dependent variables attitude towards the brand, purchase intention and brand trust. An explanation here fore could be that the difference between the micro and macro influencer was not big enough. Participants did recognize the difference, but could still have perceived the micro influencer more as a macro due to number of followers of her profile. The micro and macro conditions were based on what a marketers' perception is of many followers. However, the perception of consumers on what is 'many' can be very different. Also, it is important to state that although marketers have set a required number of followers needed for individuals to be considered as macro influencers, it is still not clear what the starting point, in terms of number of followers, should be to be considered a micro influencer. Where some marketers consider individuals with 1.000 followers on social media to influential enough to be called a micro influencer, others believe the minimum number of followers for a micro influencer status should be 10.000. Further research would be needed to come up with a clear definition of a micro and macro influencer. Because the effects were not significant H1a to H1c were rejected.

Furthermore the study also integrated studies on the fit between an endorser and a product (Paliwal, 2014; McCormick, 2016; Chang & Ko, 2016; Meyer-Levy and Tybout, 1989). According to these theories a match between product and endorser would lead to a more positive evaluation of the product. The theories on endorser – product match led to the hypothesis that a product match would have a greater positive influence on attitude towards the brand, brand trust and purchase intention than a product mismatch. The outcome of the study however revealed some interesting results. The product mismatch scored higher on attitude towards the brand, brand trust and purchase intention than the product match. According to Mandler, (1982) (as cited in Meyer-Levy and Tybout, 1989) 'the level of congruity between a product and a more general product category schema may influence the nature of information processing and so product evaluations. Findings from a study conducted by Fiske and Pavelchak (1986) suggest that evaluations for matches are based on the product category schema affect, whereas for a mismatch there is more elaborate processing needed, whereby affect comes from adding up the affects associated with the product's specific attributes. Products that are moderately incongruent with their associated category schemas are expected to stimulate processing that leads to a more favorable evaluation relative to products that are either congruent or extremely incongruent'. In other words, the congruity between the product and the category schema, in this study the influencer, can affect the product evaluations. Products that are considered to be a moderate mismatch with relation to the influencer can lead to a more favorable evaluation than products that are considered to be a complete match or a complete mismatch with relation to the influencer. In this study, the Sony Wireless Speaker was considered to be a complete mismatch product. However, participants could have considered the product to be a moderate mismatch instead of the supposed complete mismatch, explaining why the mismatch was evaluated more positively than the match product. As the effect of the product match/mismatch was significant, H2a and H2c were supported, however instead of the mismatch having a more negative influence on attitude towards the brand and brand trust, it was the other way around.

Subsequently the role of comments was also taken into account. Studies on the importance of E-WOM (Yan et al., 2016) positive and negative reviews (Sparks and Browning, 2011; Lee et al., 2008) and the effect of negative online consumer reviews on consumer behavior (Lee et al., 2008) led to the hypothesis that negative comments are perceived to have a greater negative effect on attitude towards the brand, purchase intention and brand trust. There were no main effects or interaction effects found of the comments, therefore H4a to H5c were not supported.

An interesting outcome of the study however was the role of the dependent variables on the influencer characteristics. An interaction effect was found between the influencer and comments on connectedness towards the influencer, whereby it was concluded that when dealing with negative comments, the macro influencer was significantly affected, and the micro influencer was not. The connectedness towards the influencer resulted in the same mean for the positive and negative comment variable when dealing with a micro influencer. Taking the social identity theory into consideration it can be said that the results of this were the opposite of what was expected. According to the social identity theory individuals have more expectations of members of the in-group as they are considered to be trustworthy (Lui et al., 2015). However the results of this study show that the micro influencer, who is considered to be part of the in-group, was not affected by the comments in their connectedness towards the influencer.

An explanation for this effect could be that because the micro influencer is considered to be a member of the in-group, and thus trustworthy, participants are less receptive to comments given, as they have already formed a clear opinion on this influencer. A macro influencer is someone who is considered to be a part of the out-group and is therefore judged more heavily than the micro influencer, resulting in the difference of mean scores when taking the positive or negative comments into account.

5.3 Limitations and future suggestions

Several limitations of this study must be addressed. First, although there was a pretest conducted to determine the micro and macro influencer used for the study, the difference between the both could have not been large enough, which led to the effects of the influencer not being significant. It is also important to state that based on an image of a fictional character it is hard for participants to form an attitude. Although using a fictional character would confirm the internal validity of the study, it might have had an effect on the external validity of the study. Therefore it is necessary to replicate the study with a clearer distinction between a macro and micro influencer with the use of existing influencers to further confirm the internal validity of the results. Second, actual product brands were utilized to enhance the external validity of the study. However by using actual product brands it is hard to control on existing attitudes towards the brand, which could have influenced the results. However, for future research the use of actual brands is advisable as it might be easier for participants to answer statements regarding attitude, trust and purchase intention.

Third, the sampling frame of young women may have limited the generalizability of the results, although it was considered suitable for the research environment of Instagram. Replicating the study with a broader sampling frame on various social media environment contexts might increase the generalizability of the findings. Last, this study did not measure sharing intention. Practical studies have indicated that an increase in followers affects engagement rates with the influencer. It would be interesting to study the actual effects of an increase in followers on engagement with the influencer and eventually on attitude, brand trust and purchase intention.

5.2 Managerial implications

The results of the current study have several managerial implications. Influencer marketing is becoming an important marketing tool for many marketers. Before indulging in this strategy there are several aspects that have to be taken into consideration.

Although it was not significant in this study, the results did indicate that the micro influencer did have a more positive influence on brand trust, attitude towards the brand and purchase intention, meaning that it is interesting for marketers to focus on micro influencers instead of macro influencers when considering to make use of influencer marketing. The results of the influencer type on the connectedness towards the influencer did show that the connectedness towards a micro influencer is less likely to be influenced by negative or positive comments and by the product shown. This indicates that micro influencers are considered to be trustworthier and have a closer connection to consumers than macro influencers, which can lead to more positive evaluations, regardless of the product or comments that are given, thus making them a safer choice for marketers to collaborate with. However, as with every digital marketing strategy, marketers have to take into account the ever-changing landscape of social media. The social media platform that is considered to be important today may not be so tomorrow. This has an effect on the influencers one targets to work with. Having an individual with a lot of followers on the wrong platform would not benefit ones brand.

Furthermore the product that is related to the influencer does not necessarily have to be a product that completely matches with the influencers' identity to have a positive evaluation of the product. Having a moderate mismatch product would intrigue consumers more which could lead to more curiosity and therefore a more positive evaluation of the brand (Meyer-Levy & Tybout, 1989). However it is still important that the product used in relation to the influencer is not a complete mismatch. As can be seen in the previously mentioned cases of Kim Kardashian with the Diciegis medicine and Sarah Jessica Parker with Blokker, a complete mismatch could have a negative impact on the brand.

Last, the results of the study lead to the conclusion that negative comments do not necessarily have a negative impact on a brand. It is important for marketers to keep track of what is said of their brand and how it is positioned online, but negativity online does not directly imply that the brand will suffer from it. However it is important to take into consideration the type of consumers the brand mostly deals with. When dealing with high-involvement consumers, negativity can have a far more negative influence on the evaluation of the product, than when dealing with low-involvement consumers. Marketers should acknowledge this difference and act on it.

5.5 Conclusion

A few studies have been conducted on celebrity endorsement and the importance of a match with the product. However, for influencer marketing, little research has been done on the effects of a product and influencer match. In this respect, the current study sheds light on the importance of a match or mismatch and the role of negative comments. Although influencer marketing has been proven to be effective, the difference between a micro and macro influencer is underexplored. Further research on the difference and especially the starting point of both micro and macro influencers is needed to help marketers find the right influencers for their brand.

6. References

Ahran I., 2015. *Why is Kim Kardashian talking about pyridoxine hydrochloride on Instagram?* Retrieved from: <u>http://fusion.net/story/191049/kim-kardashian-morning-sickness-drug-instagram/</u>

Al-Oufi, S., Kim, H-N., El Saddik, A. (2012). *A group trust metric for identifying people of trust in online social networks*. Expert Systems with Applications 39 (2012) 13173-13181.

Aral, S., & Walker, D. (2012). *Identifying influential and susceptible members of social networks*. Science, 337(6092), 337-341.

Arnaud (2015). The State of Influencer Engagement in 2015. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.launchmetrics.com/resources/blog/state-influencer-engagement</u>

Blokker Holding, 2016. Actrice Sarah Jessica Parker hoofdrol in nieuwe campagne Blokker. Retrieved from: <u>http://nieuws.blokkerholding.nl/actrice-sarah-jessica-parker-hoofdrol-in-nieuwe-campagne-blokker</u>

Booth, N. & Matic, J. (2010). *Mapping and Leveraging Influencers in Social Media to Shape Corporate Brand Perceptions.* Proceedings of the Conference on Corporate Communication 2010.

Bruhn, M., Schoenmüller, V., Schäfer, D., & Heinrich, D. (2012). Brand Authenticity: Towards a Deeper Understanding of Its Conceptualization and Measurement Brand Authenticity: Towards a Deeper Understanding of Its Conceptualization and Measurement. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *40*(40), 567–576. Retrieved from http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/1013106/volumes/v40/NA-40

CBS (2016). Meer Nederlanders shoppen online. Retrieved from: https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/nieuws/2016/24/meer-nederlanders-shoppen-online

Chang ,Y. & Ko, Y. (2016). *Reconsidering the Role of Fit in Celebrity Endorsement: Associative-Propositional Evaluation (APE) Accounts of Endorsement Effectiveness.* Psychology & Marketing. Vol. 33 (9): 678-691.

Chatterjee, Patrali (2001), "Online Reviews – Do Consumers Use Them?" ACR 2001 Proceedings, eds. M. C. Gilly and J. Myers-Levy, Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research, 129-134.

Chen, Y. & Xie, J. (2008). *Online consumer review: Word-of-mouth as a new element of marketing communication mix.* Management science Vol. 54.

Choi, S.M. & Rifon, N.J. (2016). *It is a Match: The impact of congruence between celebrity image and consumer ideal self on endorsement effectiveness*. Psychology and Marketing. DOI: 10.1002/mar.20550

Constantinides, E. (2014). *Foundations of Social Media*. Social and Behavioral Sciences 148 (2014) 40-57.

#AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image. 47 April, 2017 Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 127–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(98)90001-7

Eirinaki, M., Monga, S.P.S., Sundaram, S. (2012). *Identification of influential social networkers.* International Journal of Web Based Communities 8(2):136–158 Erchul WP, Raven BH (1997)

Evans, S. (2015) Kim Kardashian caves in to FDA pressure and reposts 'misleading' morning sickness drug ad WITH warnings about potential side effects (but was the timing deliberate?). Retrieved from: <u>http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3216680/Kim-Kardashian-caves-FDA-pressure-reposts-misleading-morning-sickness-drug-ad-warnings-potential-effects-timing-deliberate.html</u>

Gastblogger, (2016). (Analyse) Hoe gaat het nu met de 'Nieuwe Blokker?'. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.marketingonline.nl/blog/analyse-hoe-gaat-het-nu-met-de-nieuwste-blokker</u>

Gastblogger, 2016. Micro-influencer: effectieve optie voor je influencer marketing. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.adformatie.nl/blog/micro-influencers-effectieve-optie-voor-je-influencer-marketing</u>

Godes, D. & Mayzlin, D. (2009). *Firm-Created Word-of-Mouth Communication: Evidence from a Field Test*. Marketing Science 28(4):721-739. http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1080.0444

Global Trust in Advertising. Winning strategies for an Evolving Media Landscape. Nielsen (2015).

Hall, (2016). The Influencer Gold Rush is Coming: Are you prepared? Retrieved from: <u>http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnhall/2016/04/17/the-influencer-marketing-gold-rush-is-coming-are-you-prepared/#1e3fdddd2964</u>

Hernandez, R. (2015). Kim Kardashian's Social Media Post Prompts FDA Letter to Duchesnay. Retrieved From: <u>http://www.biopharminternational.com/kim-kardashian-s-social-media-post-prompts-fda-letter-duchesnay</u>

Lee, J., Park, D., Han, I. (2008). *The effect of negative online consumer reviews on product attitude: An information processing view*. ScienceDirect. Electronic Commerce Research and Applications 7 - 341-352.

Lee, R. M., & Robbins, S. B. (1995). Measuring belongingness: The Social Connectedness and the Social Assurance scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *42*(2), 232–241. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.42.2.232

Liu, F., Xiao, B., Lim, E., Tan, C. (2016). *Do other's opinion matter? Investigating the impact of gender differences on trustworthiness of E-WOM*. Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.

Liu, S., Jiang C., Lin, Z., Ding, Y., Duan, R., Xu, Z. (2015). *Identifying effective influencers based on trust for electronic word-of-mouth marketing: A domain-aware approach*. Information Sciences 306 (2015), 34-52

Marketing Online (2016). Poll Sarah Jessica Parker en Blokker goede combi. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.marketingonline.nl/nieuws/poll-sarah-jessica-parker-en-blokker-goede-combi</u>

Marketing School. Influencer Marketing. Explore the strategy of influencer marketing. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.marketing-schools.org/types-of-marketing/influencer-marketing.html</u>

Marvin, G. (2015). Report: Global Internet Spend To Overtake Traditional TV By 2020. Online ads spending already dominates in seven countries. Retrieved from: <u>http://marketingland.com/report-global-internet-ad-spend-to-overtake-traditional-tv-by-2020-132913</u>

McCormick, K. (2016). *Celebrity endorsements: Influence of a product-endorser match on Millenials attitudes and purchase intentions*. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services 32 - 39-45.

McCroskey, J.C. & Teven, J.J. (1999) Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and its measurement, Communication Monographs, 66:1, 90-103

Mediakit (2016). How Brands can reach new audiences with micro influencers. Retrieved from: <u>http://mediakix.com/2016/06/micro-influencers-definition-marketing/#gs.djZJdOk</u>

Nijhuis, N., (2016). Met Gericht Influencer marketing van bereik naar betrokkenheid. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.marketingfacts.nl/berichten/Met-gerichte-influencer-marketing-van-bereik-naar-betrokkenheid?utm source=twitter&utm medium=content&utm campaign=extern</u>

NRC, (2016). Recordverlies voor moederbedrijf Blokker. Retrieved from: https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2016/05/18/recordverlies-voor-moederbedrijf-blokkera1407183

Probst, F., Grosswiele, L., Pfleger, R. (2014). *Who will lead and who will follow: Identifying Influential Users in Online Social Networks.* FIM Research Center Finance & Information Management.

Paliwal, A. (2014). *Extending associative network theory :the role of affect in the bidirectional image transfer process.* Open Access Theses and Dissertations. Paper 44.

Peetz, T. B. (2012). *Celebrity Athlete Endorser Effectiveness: Construction and Validation of a Scale*. University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Retrieved from http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations

RythmOne (2016). Influencer Marketing Benchmark Report full year 2015. Retrieved from: <u>https://www.rhythmone.com/rhythmbuzz/insights/2015-influencer-benchmarks-report</u>

Stephen, A. (2016). *The role of digital and social media marketing in consumer behavior.* Current Opinion in Psychology 2016, 10:17-21.

Sparks, B. & Browning, V. (2011). The impact of online reviews on hotel bookings intentions and perception of trust. Tourism Management 32, 1310 - 1323

#AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image. 49 April, 2017 Statista, (2015). Digital advertising spending worldwide from 2015 to 2017 (in billion U.S. dollars). Retrieved from: <u>https://www.statista.com/statistics/246567/global-online-advertising-revenue/</u>

Statista (2015). US Instagram User age distribution. Retrieved from:

https://www.statista.com/statistics/398166/us-instagram-user-age-distribution/

Tapinfluence. What is influencer marketing? Retrieved from: <u>https://www.tapinfluence.com/blog-what-is-influencer-marketing/</u>

Vermond, (2016). Het sterfhuis dat Blokker Holding heet. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.adformatie.nl/blog/het-sterfhuis-dat-blokker-holding-heet</u>

Walfried Lassar Banwari Mittal Arun Sharma, (1995),"Measuring customer-based brand equity", Journal of Consumer Marketing, Vol. 12 Iss 4 pp. 11 – 19

Whitler, K. (2014). Why Word of Mouth Marketing is the most important Social Media. Retrieved from: <u>http://www.forbes.com/sites/kimberlywhitler/2014/07/17/why-word-of-mouth-marketing-is-the-most-important-social-media/#1aeb13df7a77</u>

Wikipedia, (2016). Influencer Marketing. Retrieved from: <u>https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Influencer marketing</u>

Woods, S. (2016). *#Sponsored: The Emergence of Influencer Marketing*. University of Tennessee Honors Thesis Projects. <u>http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj/1976</u>

Yan, Q., Wu, S., Wang, L., Wu, P., Chen, H. & Wei, G. (2016). E-WOM from e-commerce websites and social media: Which will consumers adopt? Electronic Commerce Research and Applications.

Zaichkowsky, J. L. (1985). Measuring the Involvement Construct Measuring the Involvement Construct*. *Source Journal of Consumer Research*, *12*(3), 341–352. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/254378

7. Appendixes

A: Pretest influencers, products and comments

Micro and Macro influencer

Micro influencer



Macro influencer



Match and Mismatch product

Match product



Mismatch product



Michael Kors sunglasses comments			
Positive comments	Negative comments		
Love it, very curious how it looks like!	These glasses are #so2000		
Very nice!	They look like they're kind of unstable		
Cool glasses! Very modern!	Okay those are waaay to small for my head!		
Cool, is it available in other colors as well?	I hate round glasses, they so don't match my eybrows		
Where did you buy it? Love it!	I bet these glasses are more for show, than really practical!		
So nice! How expensive is it ?!	Oeh that nosebridge, it seems super unstable		
Perfect for a festival!	I bet these are superexensive, while you could buy something similar at the market for like €5!		
Giveaway?! Want it!	This model is so annoying, I tried them on, but they fall of my nose all the time		
Wowie awesome glasses!	Hate the frame, I bet she got paid for promoting these		
Nice sunglasses!	What a terrible color combination!		
Cool retro vibes!	I hate Michael Kors, it is so expensive!		
Love the shade of the glasses	Not my taste, at all!		
Love the combination of blue glasses with a gold/brown frame!	How could you promote these? They're so ugly!		
Love the print!	Come on, would you really buy these if you were not paid to promote them?!		
Cool those round shades! Now I could were round glasses without having to look like Ozzy Osboure	I would never buy these!!		

Sony wireless speaker comments

Positive comments	Negative comments
Cool, so modern!	What a useless thing, so boring and symmetrical
Nice gadget!	Doesn't seem like a product that would sell
#dopeshit	I bet she was paid to promote this, what a useless product!
Awesome, matches perfectly in my interior!	Ridiculous thing!
Great size for travel or work!	WTF is this?!
Omg love it, superhandy for train or carrides!	I thought you were a fashionblogger?!
Love the design!	Do you really need to promote this, just for money?!
Great design doesn't look like a speaker!	#sincewhendoyouthinkyouknowanythingaboutspeakers
I've read somewhere that this shape is the best for music quality!	#boring
Oh my, superhandy! Just one speaker instead of a whole set!	#unfollow
Cool! Is it expensive? Would love to buy one!	Weird black thing
Love the minimalistic design, totally me!	Doesn't match my interior at all!
Where did you get it, it looks so fancy!!	Ugly! It look's like my Dopper drinking bottle!
Perfect for some music at the beach!	Too minimalistic for my taste
I love gadgets, must have this one as well!	Why are you posting this?! This is so NOT you!

B: Online survey conducted with Qualtrics

Influencer Marketing Survey

Introduction

Dear participant, You were invited to participate in a research study regarding fashion instagrammers on Instagram. Please be aware that the decision to join or not to join is up to you. If you decide to participate you will be asked to answer a number of questions related to fashion instagrammers and products that are promoted on Instagram. The survey will not take more than 5 minutes of your time. You can quit at any time if you don't feel confident in continuing the survey. Your information will be processed anonymously and confidentially. If you have any questions regarding this survey, do not hesitate to contact the researcher on the following address: y.j.bijen@student.utwente.nl. Thank you so much, and let's start!

This study focuses on fashion instagrammers, therefore a few questions will be asked about your own Instagram usage and your general take on fashion and fashion instagrammers. After this the survey will really start, have fun!

Instagram questions

Do you use Instagram?

• Yes (1)

O No (2)

Condition: No Is Selected. Skip To: End of Block.

How often do you use Instagram? 0

- Multiple times a day (1)
 - O Daily (2)
- A few times a week (3) \mathbf{O}
 - O Weekly (4)
 - O Monthly (5)
- O Less than monthly (6)

Since when have you been using Instagram?

- Less than 3 months (1)
 - O 3 6 months (2)
 - 7 12 months (3)
 - O 13 18 months (4)
 - 0 19 - 24 months (5)
- 25 30 months (6) 0
- 0 31 - 36 months (7)
- O Longer than 36 months (8)

Involvement fashion and Influencer guestions

What do you think about the topic of fashion?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)
Unimportant:Important (1)	0	0	0	О	o	0	0
Uninteresting:Interesting (2)	o	О	О	О	o	О	o
Boring:Exciting (3)	О	О	О	О	0	О	О

What do you think about fashion instagrammers?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)			
Unimportant:Important (1)	О	0	0	О	o	О	0			
Uninteresting:Interesting (2)	o	О	О	О	o	o	o			
Boring:Exciting (3)	O	О	О	О	o	O	o			

So let's start the survey! On the following page you will be presented to a fashion instagrammer, one of her posts and the comments that were given underneath it. Please look at this information carefully, as the questions following will be focused on the amount of followers of the instagrammer, the product in the Instagram post and the sentiment of the comments. Manipululations influencers are shown

Manipulation check questions

Now let's start with the questions! Please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the statements below. If positive comments shows

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)			
I believe this instagrammer has a lot of followers (1)	O	o	o	O	O	o	o			
I believe this product fits this instagrammer (2)	О	О	Э	О	О	O	О			
I believe these comments are positive (3)	О	О	о	О	о	O	О			

If negative comments shown:

Now let's start with the questions! Please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the statements below

				-			
	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I believe this instagrammer has a lot of followers (1)	Q	O	O	Q	O	o	O
I believe this product fits this instagrammer (2)	О	о	Э	О	Э	O	О
I believe these comments are negative (3)	О	о	o	О	o	0	о

Involvement product questions is as a fashion item? (OR)What do

involvement product questions												
What do you think abou	What do you think about sunglasses as a fashion item? (OR) What do you think about wireless speakers?											
	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)					
Unimportant:Important (1)	o	o	О	О	0	О	o					
Uninteresting:Interesting (2)	o	o	О	О	0	О	o					
Irrelevant:Relevant (3)	O	O	О	О	O	О	O					
Useless:Useful (4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					

Attitude towards the brand questions

What do you think about the brand Michael Kors (OR) Sony?											
	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)				
Unappealing:Appealing (1)	o	о	o	о	о	o	o				
Bad:Good (2)	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	O				
Unpleasant:Pleasant (3)	o	o	o	o	o	o	0				
Unfavorable:Favorable (4)	o	o	o	o	o	o	0				
Unlikable:Likable (5)	0	0	O	0	0	О	O				

[#]AD: The effects of an influencer, comment and product combination on brand image. 54 April, 2017

The average designer sunglasses/wireless speaker has a price of around €180. How much do you consider the Michael Kors sunglasses in this Instagram post to be worth? Please fill in a price in the box below.

speaker?											
	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)				
Never:Definitely (1)	О	o	o	o	о	о	о				
Definitely do not intend to buy:Definitely intend to buy (2)	О	О	О	О	О	О	о				
Very low purchase interest:Very high purchase interest (3)	О	о	о	О	О	О	о				
I would definitely not buy it:I would definitely buy it (4)	О	О	О	О	О	О	O				
l would probably not buy it:l would probably buy it (5)	0	O	O	0	0	0	0				

Purchase Intention

Would you consider buying these Michael Kors sunglasses? OR Would you consider buying this Sony wireless

Brand Trust Please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I consider the brand Michael Kors to be sincere (1)	O	o	O	o	O	0	o
I consider the brand Michael Kors to be genuine (2)	O	O	O	O	O	0	o
I consider the brand Michael Kors to be knowledgeable (3)	о	о	O	О	O	О	o
The brand Michael Kors keeps their promises (4)	O	o	O	O	O	0	о
I feel secure when I use products from the brand Michael Kors (5)	о	о	O	о	O	О	o
I believe the brand Michael Kors would act in my best interest (6)	О	о	O	O	O	O	O
I believe that the brand Michael Kors does not take	0	0	0	0	0	О	о

advantage of				
consumers (7)				

OR

Please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the statements below.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I consider the brand Sony to be sincere (1)	О	o	o	0	o	0	O
I consider the brand Sony to be genuine (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	О
I consider the brand Sony to be knowledgeable (3)	О	о	Э	О	O	О	о
The brand Sony keeps their promises (4)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
I feel secure when I use products from the brand Sony (5)	О	о	Э	О	О	О	о
l believe the brand Sony would act in my best interest (6)	О	о	Э	О	O	О	О
I believe that the brand Sony does not take advantage of consumers (7)	О	Э	О	о	О	O	Э

Mediator source credibility questions

Please indicate your opinion on this instagrammer on this scale.										
	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)			
Unattractive:Attractive (1)	o	О	О	o	О	О	o			
Not classy:Classy (2)	О	О	О	О	О	О	О			
Ugly:Beautiful (3)	О	О	О	О	О	О	O			
Plain:Elegant (4)	О	О	О	О	О	О	0			
Not sexy:Sexy (5)	0	0	0	o	0	0	0			

Please indicate your opinion on this instagrammer on this scale.

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)
Undependable:Dependable (1)	o	o	0	0	0	0	0
Dishonest:Honest (2)	O	O	О	О	О	О	О
Unreliable:Reliable (3)	O	O	О	О	О	О	О
Insincere:Sincere (4)	O	O	О	О	О	О	О
Unthrustworthy:Thrustworthy (5)	o	o	О	0	0	О	0

. 10400 11410		000.0 900.	opinion on	time interagi			
	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)
Not an expert:Expert (1)	О	0	0	0	0	O	O
Inexperienced:Experienced (2)	О	0	0	0	0	•	•
Unknowledgeable:Knowledgeable (3)	О	o	0	o	o	0	0
Unqualified:Qualified (4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unskilled:Skilled (5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please indicate on this scale your opinion on this instagrammer.

Influencer Characteristics questions

Please take a look at the profile of this fashion instagrammer and the Instagram post again. Please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	ease maleate	to milat dogio	o you agroo or	alougioo mar	and renowing of	atornorito.	
	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I can identify with the instagrammer (1)	O	0	O	0	О	0	0
The instagrammer and I are similar (2)	O	0	O	0	О	0	0
The instagrammer and I share similar viewpoints (3)	Э	о	О	О	О	0	О
The instagrammer and I are in a similar stage of life (4)	О	O	O	О	О	O	о

Please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I feel disconnected from the instagrammer (1)	О	О	о	О	Э	O	О
I feel distant from the instagrammer (2)	O	O	О	O	о	O	O
The instagrammer feels close to me (3)	O	O	О	O	О	0	O

Please indicate to what degree you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
The instagrammer stays true to itself (1)	o	0	o	o	O	O	O

The instagrammer stands out between other instagrammers (2)	о	о	О	о	О	О	О
The instagrammer is unique (3)	0	0	O	0	0	0	O
The instagrammer makes a genuine impression (4)	о	о	Э	о	Э	O	о

Pl	ease indicate	to what degree	e you agree or	disagree with	the following st	atements.	
	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
The instagrammer would not lie to me (1)	O	0	О	O	о	0	0
The instagrammer can be trusted (2)	O	0	о	О	о	0	0
The instagrammer is hypocrite (3)	O	0	О	O	О	o	O
The instagrammer acts out of self interest (4)	О	О	Э	О	Э	O	О
The instagrammer is commercial (5)	O	0	О	О	О	0	0
The instagrammer is paid to promote this product (6)	О	о	o	O	o	O	О

Demographic questions What is your gender? O Male (1)

O Female (2)

What is your age? What is is your highest educational degree? O High School graduate (1)

- O MBO graduate (2)
- O HBO graduate (3)
- O University graduate (4) O PHD graduate (5)

	Condition 1 Macro * match * positive	Condition 2 Macro * mismatch * positive	Condition 3 Micro * match * positive	Condition 4 Micro * mismatch * positive	Condition 5 Macro * match * negative	Condition 6 Macro * mismatch * negative	Condition 7 Micro * match * negative	Condition 8 Micro * mismatch * negative	Total	%
Age groups										
18-24	8	11	14	7	12	11	21	8	92	38,33
25-34	13	24	15	17	20	13	14	18	134	55,83
35-44	2	2	0	0	1	3	0	2	10	4,17
45-54	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0,83
55-64	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0,83
Total	24	37	30	24	33	27	37	28	240	100
Educational level										
High School	4	6	3	2	3	1	7	3	29	12,08
MBO	4	4	4	2	4	4	6	3	31	12,92
НВО	8	13	15	9	14	7	12	13	91	46,67
University	6	14	8	11	12	15	12	9	87	44,62
PhD	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0,83
Total	24	37	30	24	33	27	37	28	240	100
Use of Instagram										
Yes	19	31	26	21	29	22	28	19	195	81,25
No	5	6	4	3	4	5	9	9	45	18,75
Total	24	37	30	24	33	27	37	28	240	100
Usage of Instagram										
Multiple times a day	8	19	13	15	12	10	16	12	105	53,85
Daily	5	8	7	3	10	10	7	4	54	27,69

C: Overview of demographic information of participants

A few times a week	4	3	6	3	5	2	3	2	28	14,36
Weekly	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	1,54
Monthly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1,03
Less than monthly	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	1,54
Total	19	31	26	21	29	22	28	19	195	100
Time since using Instagram										
Less than 3 months	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	4	2,05
3-6 months	1	1	3	2	0	1	1	0	9	4,62
7-12 months	3	1	3	0	3	2	3	2	17	8,72
13-18 months	2	2	2	0	4	2	3	1	16	8,21
19-24 months	2	2	2	2	3	3	5	3	22	11,28
25-30 months	2	7	3	7	0	3	5	1	28	14,36
31-36 months	1	4	1	1	4	5	2	3	21	10,77
Longer than 36 months	8	14	10	8	15	6	8	9	78	40
Total	19	31	26	21	29	22	28	19	195	100

THE BLOKKER - SARAH JESSICA PARKER CASE

News travels fast on the Internet. Several online tools have been developed to track what consumers are talking about online, and more importantly how they are talking. One of these tools is Coosto. With Coosto Dutch organizations are able to track down information on specific topics in the Netherlands. Coosto enables marketers to collect information spread online on specific topics. For the purpose of this research a Coosto analysis has been performed to track the spreading of news online. The Blokker - Sarah Jessica Parker collaboration was used to determine how a potential mismatch between brand and influencer could affect a brand online. The analysis, conducted by the researcher for the purpose of this thesis, led to the following:

FACTS

SOURCES & AUTHORS

Blokker has not been profitable since 2014

800 people lost their job due to the financial situation Blokker started a new omnichannel marketing strategy starring Sarah Jessica Parker

There is a possibility of a mismatch between Blokker and Sarah Jessica

ACTIVITY AND SENTIMENT

Coosto analysis resulted in 347 messages Time frame: 01 March 2016 - 06 December 2016 Search query: 'Blokker SJP' 24% > positive of tone 8% > negative of tone 68% > neutral of tone

After analyzing the comments it apppeared that Coosto, as many different social media tools does not have an accurate way of analyzing the sentiment of messages.

A poll initiated by Marketing Online on April 26th 2016 shows that most people who took the poll find the collaboration between Blokker and SJP a mismatch (54%).

THRIENIDIING TROPICS

Trending topics of this search query it can be seen that the new Blokker formula has raised questions on the match with Sarah Jessica Parker. The trending topic 'mismatch tussen ster' when searching for information on Blokker and SJP indicates that people are not convinced about the commercial and new strategy of the Blokker. However the other topics in the top 10 indicate people are talking about the Blokker and SJP collaboration, but it does not necessarily tell if it's negative or positive. However when looking at the messages sent, the sentiment is overall negative. Where some find it a brilliant move from Blokker to use Sarah Jessica Parker in their commercials, most people are

negative or skeptical



Most of the conversation took place on twitter (267 out of 347 messages were twitter messages), making this the most important online medium.

Robert Bohemen, Gastblokker and HaykeKookt were the most influential authors.

Gastblogger & HaykeKookt were both negative about the collaboration.

Gastblogger refers to the article of Bas Vermond on Marketing Online. As Gastblogger is not a Twitter account the number of followers and influence cannot be calculated. Gastblogger's tweet was retweeted 33 times.

Source types		Messages				
1. Twitter	88	267				
2. Facebook	回日	28				
3. News	88	27				
🗆 4. Blog	13 63	19				
S. Forum	88	9	II.			
🗆 6. Instagram	13 (3)	2				

Author		Messages 🕶		Retweets & comments	Followers	Influence		
0.1	* RobertBohemen	888	8		32	3,032	15.1	
0.2	🛉 Gastblogger	12 13	4	1000	33	λC.	×	
□ 5.	🛉 NinaFaith	080	-4		0	274	0.6	1
□ 4	🛉 HaykeKookt	E 8 6	3		3	4,605	4.6	
D.5.	🛉 Vincent Beerends	(B) (B)	3		0	ю		
D 6.	🛉 wilmabenst	E1 61 63	3		0	31	0.6	1
□ 7,	Almere_BN	E3 83 63	2	-	0	551	0.5	1
□ 8.	+ Amersfoort_BN	E3 68 63	Z	-	0	226	0.5	Ĩ.
9.	+ Amstelveen_BN	888	2	-	0	267	0.5	1
□ 10.	🛉 Amsterdam_BN	888	2	-	0	604	0.5	1

CONCLUSION

There is a potential mismatch between Sarah Jessica Parker and the Blokker. However further research is needed to be certain of the mismatch. Taking into account the data resulting from the Coosto analysis, it can be seen that consumers do not believe in the fit of the celebrity with the Blokker, resulting in negativity

spread online about the SJP - Blokker partnership.