YOU HAD ME!

..II 🗢 🔳

Volgen

2

...



YOU HAD ME!

Do the type of influencer (micro-influencer or macro-influencer), social presence and product congruence have an influence on consumer influencer engagement, and what is the role of source credibility?

Author:Anouk KlijnsmaStudent number:S2211726E-mail:a.l.klijnsma@student.utwente.nl

Institution:University of TwenteMaster:Communication ScienceMaster specialization:Digital Marketing Communication

Supervisor: Second supervisor: M. Galetzka R. Jacobs

Word count: Date: 11,604 November 17, 2020

ABSTRACT

Objective – Instagram is an important social media platform for micro- and macroinfluencers as it reaches approximately 1 billion people. These days consumer rely more on other people's opinions, which is an important factor, especially for micro-influencers. However, not only the type of influencer is important for gaining more consumer engagement on Instagram, but also how influencers identify themselves (social presence) and what kind of products they show (product congruence). Other studies investigated the influence on purchase intentions, whereas this study specifically looks at what extent type of influencer, social presence and product congruence have more influence on consumer engagement.

Method – In this study, a 2 (influencer: micro- vs. macro-influencer) x 2 (social presence: influencer vs. product) x 2 (product congruence: congruent vs. incongruent) between subject design (N = 252) has been applied. Social presence has been manipulated by showing the influencer or by showing the products only. Further, product congruence has been manipulated by showing congruence or incongruence products. Lastly, source credibility tested what respondents thought of the influencer, such as trustworthy, attractive and/or provides expertise in the Instagram post.

Results – Results showed that one hypothesis was accepted. The impact of type of influencer on consumer influencer engagement was partially mediated by source credibility. Other important findings regarding social presence showed that the visible influencer scored higher than the non-visible influencer. The product congruence showed that companies should choose congruence products. Interaction effects (source credibility and attractiveness) showed that when a micro-influencer was shown, companies should use incongruent products; however, with a macro-influencer they should use incongruent products.

Implications – The results of this study provide important guidelines for companies that work with influencers. Macro-influencers are perceived as more credible, more trustworthy, having more expertise, and appear more attractive than micro-influencers.

Keywords: micro- vs. macro-influencers, social presence, source credibility, product congruence, Instagram

TABLE OF CONTENT

1.	Intr	oduction	. 5
2.	The	oretical framework	. 7
	2.1	Consumer influencer engagement and customer reach	7
	2.2	Micro-influencers	9
	2.3	The difference between micro- and macro-influencers	10
	2.4	Social presence	11
	2.5	Product congruence	13
	2.6	Source credibility	14
	2.7	Research model	16
3.	Me	thod section	17
	3.1	Stimulus materials	17
	3.2	Procedure	20
	3.3	Participants	20
	3.4	Measurements	23
	3.5	Reliability	25
4.	Res	ults	26
	4.1	Manipulation checks	26
	4.2	Main effects and interaction effects: consumer influencer engagement and	
	evalu	ation of the influencer	27
	4.3	Effects on source gradibility	
	лл		32
	4.4	Results hypotheses	32 41
5.	Diso	Results hypotheses	32 41 42
5.	4.4 Dise 5.1	Results hypotheses	32 41 42 42
5.	Diso 5.1 5.2	Results hypotheses	32 41 42 42 44
5.	Diso 5.1 5.2 5.3	Results hypotheses	32 41 42 42 44 45
5.	Dise 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4	Results hypotheses	 32 41 42 42 44 45 47
5. Re	Diso 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 feren	Results hypotheses	 32 41 42 44 45 47 48
5. Re Ap	Disc 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 feren	Results hypotheses Main findings Implications Limitations and future research Conclusion ix	 32 41 42 42 44 45 47 48 56
5. Re Ap	Diso 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 feren Appe	Results hypotheses	 32 41 42 44 45 47 48 56 56
5. Re Ap	Diso 5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 feren Appe Appe	Results hypotheses	 32 41 42 44 45 47 48 56 56 60

1. INTRODUCTION

"Instafamous" is a term that applies to a very small number of people who have gained billions of followers on Instagram instantly. Instafamous changes the way people seek entertainment, information and interact with others (Jin et al., 2019). Worldwide 3.96 billion people are active on social media (Data Reportal, 2020). With these social media users, the communication environment for businesses has changed with the growth of Social Networking Sites (SNS), which are platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Instagram (Woods, 2016). More than 4.5 billion internet users use social networks; however, Kemp (2020) expected that more than half of the world's population will use social media by 2021. The growing popularity and massive SNS user numbers have a great impact on consumers' purchasing decisions. Consumers rely more on recommendations from their peers (Lu et al., 2014): 74 per cent of consumers rely on social media to influence their purchase decisions (Bennett, 2014).

Further, marketers make more use of brand placement via influencer marketing to reach customers and to increase the number of purchase intentions. This can be achieved by using individuals who are able to influence the attitude and purchase intentions of the target groups. In July 2020, Instagram had 1.082 million active users, which makes it a potential social media platform to reach a large audience (Data Reportal, 2020).

For micro- and macro-influencers Instagram is an important social media platform. It is a platform based on visualizing and filtering images, which makes it an acceptable application for promoting products (Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017). Instagram allows users to gather followers, connect with different brands and facilitate social interactions among consumers (Blight et al., 2017; Chen, 2017). Not only consumers can make use of Instagram, companies too make use of Instagram to define their brand image, show their company culture and endorse their followers by liking and commenting on their posts (Chen, 2017; Miles, 2014; Neher, 2013; Virtanen et al., 2017).

On social media, social presence is a significant factor with regard to purchasing decisions (Weisberg et al., 2011). Social presence is an important concept in order to understand the psychological media immersion and matching behavior (Biocca et al., 2003). As Van Noort et al. (2012) state the more interactive a person is, the higher the affinity and trust. In relation

with this study, social presence was about the visibility of the influencer, in showing the influencer or showing products only.

Prior research shows that social presence positively influences user trust and purchase intention on online platforms (Gefen & Straub, 1997, 2003; Karahanna & Straub, 1999; Kumar & Benbasat, 2002). When influencers stay close to their followers, followers show more trust and the purchase intention is stronger. Further, Hassanein and Head (2007) found that social presence has a positive impact on people when they instill trust, show enjoyment and produce perceived usefulness, which leads to increased purchase intentions. It is more likely that a follower will follow the influencer when they trust and recognize traits they have in common with the influencer (Shen, 2012).

Moreover, product congruence can enhance the purchase intentions of followers by showing congruent or incongruent products in the Instagram post. Studies confirm that when a product matches the person, it enhances the purchase intention, while a product that does not fit the person is less credible (Fink et al., 2004; Till & Bussler, 2000).

Factors as trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness of an influencer have an effect on the purchase intentions of followers (Chen, 2016). These factors can increase the proximity, intimacy and familiarity with others, which occurs often with micro-influencers (Chen, 2016; Sztompka, 1999). Hassanein and Head (2007) find that social presence has a relation with source credibility; when people see the person, they find the person trustworthy.

Since less is known about the influence of micro-influencers with regard to consumer engagement, the following research question is defined; "To what extent do the type of influencer (micro-influencer or macro-influencer), social presence and product congruence have an influence on consumer influencer engagement, and what is the role of source credibility?".

This report comprises a theoretical framework that provides an overview of the different concepts, theories and hypotheses. To answer the research question, an experimental design was conducted by means of a questionnaire. The results of the questionnaire are discussed in the results section, and the final section discusses the discussion and conclusion.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Influencer marketing and influencers themselves have a significant impact on customer engagement and customer reach. In this chapter, the most relevant literature related to the different constructs will be discussed. Furthermore, this chapter contains hypotheses about the relationships between the different independent and dependent variables and the mediator. In the final section, a research model is shown that illustrates the different relationships.

2.1 CONSUMER INFLUENCER ENGAGEMENT AND CUSTOMER REACH

Consumer engagement is directly related to the development of new media and how consumers can interact with firms (Libai, 2011). However, consumer engagement not only includes consumer-to-firm interactions but also consumer-to-consumer interactions. Consumer engagement is mainly used in brand communities, blogging, and media platforms, such as Instagram and Facebook (Van Doorn, 2011).

According to Van Doorn (2011) consumer engagement can be defined as behavior from a consumer who focuses on a brand or firm with motivational drivers. Another definition is provided by Bowden (2009) who defines consumer engagement as a more psychological process, which encourages consumer loyalty. In Bowden's definition loyalty incorporates a more valuable process, as he mentions "It examines the pathways and processes that are followed by experience-based segments on their journey toward loyalty through satisfaction, enjoyment, trust, involvement, and commitment toward a brand" (Bowden, 2009) or, in this study, towards an influencer. In this study, the definition of Bowden was used, meaning consumer engagement was what people *feel* when they engage with the influencer.

Nelson-Field and Taylor (2012) define the new marketing catchphrase as "engage or die". They see consumer engagement as how effectively a brand is in getting their audience to engage with their content. Furthermore, consumer engagement can help create a deeper and more long-term consumer brand relationship (Kumar et al., 2010; Menezes, 2013).

According to Vinerean (2019) consumer engagement is directly and positively related to satisfaction, trust, affective commitment, and loyalty. Consumer engagement has the potential to affect consumer behavior and is considered to be a successful retention and

acquisition strategy for digital marketing (Brodie et al., 2011; Brodie et al., 2013; Hollebeek et al., 2014). For consumer influencer engagement it is important that the influencer shows satisfaction and affective commitment to generate high engagement.

Additionally, consumer engagement can also be applied to consumer brand engagement. Consumer brand engagement can be defined as the level of the consumer's motivational state of mind in relation to a brand in a specific context distinguished by behavioral, cognitive and emotional activity (Hollebeek, 2011).

Consumer brand engagement is about the intensity of an individual's participation and connection with the activities of an organization, or consumer behavior with a brand or firm focus (Van Doorn et al., 2010; Hollebeek, 2011; Vivek et al., 2012). According to Dessart et al. (2015) consumer brand engagement is not only about interaction with the brand, but also about the interaction with other users in the brand community (Pongpaew et al., 2017). On Instagram, for example, these are the influencers who interact with their followers. Consumer brand engagement is not included in this study because the experimental design shows an image of an influencer with products only. The images did not show any products that are brand or firm related. However, it is important what people's opinions were of the Instagram post; therefore, the study included the dependent variable evaluation of the influencer.

In comparison with consumer engagement, consumer brand engagement is more about the interaction with the brand itself, whereas consumer engagement is more about the loyalty of consumers for a specific brand.

In addition to consumer engagement, customer reach can also have an impact on the type of influencers (micro- or macro-influencers). Reach can be defined as the number of people that receive the information from an influencer. It can influence the type of influencers in such a way that when more people are exposed to the information, the reach will be higher (Dada, 2017). According to Scott (2014), if an influencer has more followers the influencer will be deemed more trustworthy, which will result in more engagement by the followers. Therefore, customer reach will have more impact on macro-influencers than on micro-influencers because of the difference in the number of followers.

Moreover, customer reach can create, expand and foster a wider audience for online marketing content. On social media, reach depends on the marketers' efforts who try to connect with their brand, this will generate more followers on Instagram, Facebook or subscribers to a feed (Menezes, 2013). The higher the reach, the more people will see the influencer's Instagram post and raise people's awareness.

2.2 MICRO-INFLUENCERS

Finding the right influencer is crucial for reaching the brand's target group. According to Domingues Aguiar and Van Reijmersdal (2018), Hatton (2018), and Revell (2017) microinfluencers are "normal people who turned instafamous and typically have dozens to hundreds (up to 10,000) of followers" (Boerman, 2020; p.201).

Moreover, other researchers define micro-influencers as individuals who operate in a specific niche group, such as fashion, food or sport and those who have between 1,000 and 10,000 followers (Barker, 2016; Barker, 2017; Browne & Fiorella, 2013; Christens, 2017) this definition was used in this study. Micro-influencers are more intimate with their followers, earn more trust because they do not have financial motives such as macro-influencers (Tashakova, 2016; Tolij, 2018). According to Dhanik (2016), micro-influencers can be more effective as their personal connection is greater with their followers and because they have a higher engagement rate. Other research suggests that as the number of followers increases, the engagement for influencers drops, suggesting that micro-influencers are in the "sweet spot" (Chen, 2017). For example, research by Kusumasondjaja and Tjiptono (2019) shows that celebrities (influencers) create a greater level of pleasure and arousal in Instagram food posts than experts (differentiated by using the average number of likes per post).

Nevertheless, micro-influencers have a smaller number of followers than macro-influencers. Despite the smaller number of followers, micro-influencers have a greater engagement, and more interaction with their followers than macro-influencers (Barker, 2016; Barker, 2017; Christens, 2017). In addition, micro-influencers generate content in topics they are interested in, which makes their posts more effective and credible (Bernazzani, 2017; Chen, 2016). Usually, micro-influencers have more active communities and have a greater influence on their audience than macro-influencers, which compensates for their smaller number of followers (Izea, 2018).

Micro-influencers demonstrate that minimum attention is still valuable in a digital economy (Borza, 2017). Moreover, micro-influencers provide a cost-efficient way to diversify brand appeal and advertise to niche populations. Companies are recognizing that visibility on Instagram is more profitable than traditional advertising (Zulli, 2017). Furthermore, the use of micro-influencers has been a more effective way to build a brand in audience reception and return on investment, as individuals trust those influencers more (Zietek, 2016).

H1a: Micro-influencers have a higher consumer influencer engagement than macroinfluencers

H1b: Micro-influencers have a higher evaluation of the influencer than macro-influencers

2.3 THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MICRO- AND MACRO-INFLUENCERS Macro-influencers are a group of celebrities with a broad range of followers. Mostly, macroinfluencers have more than 10,000 followers and are mainly called "celebrities". Microinfluencers are a group of bloggers or groups of people who have fewer followers than the macro-influencer group, mostly between 1,000 and 10,000 (Mediakix, 2016). One of the biggest advantages of macro-influencers is their large and broad range of followers (Tashakova, 2016).

It is proposed that micro-influencers have perceptions of authenticity and connection with their followers, which will lead to communication in their posts being more persuasive than macro-influencers'. Moreover, Ilicic and Webster (2016) suggest that celebrities who are perceived as more authentic have a greater influence on consumer engagement. According to Chen (2017) micro-influencers get an average of two-to-five times more organic engagement per Instagram post compared to macro-influencers. Moreover, the content of micro-influencers performs better organically due to the inherent superior engagement (Chen, 2017).

Furthermore, macro-influencers will have a more positive impact on customer reach than micro-influencers because macro-influencers reach more people compared to micro-influencers.

2.4 SOCIAL PRESENCE

Social presence refers to the extent to which media users identify the mediated characters as psychologically present and intelligible (Rice, 1993). Further, social presence is an important factor in social media marketing, in how people trust and enjoy e-commerce platforms (Shen, 2012). Social media marketing is built upon interacting with brands and consumers, listening to genuine reviews and looking at users' experiences (Tafesse, 2016).

Social presence can be defined as a positive predictor of consumers' online trust and intention towards online shopping (Beldad et al., 2010). People feel more comfortable transacting with an online source, and if they feel that an actual human is presented at the other end (Shen, 2012). The more interactive and visible an influencer is in an Instagram post, the more likely it will generate higher affinity and trust (Van Noort et al., 2012). In this research, the visibility of social presence was the most important factor and was tested by means of an experimental design. Stimulating the imagination of interaction with other humans can increase the social presence; for example, through personalized content and image content (Hassanein & Head, 2005). Influencers can use their own personalized content on Instagram to increase the social presence among followers.

According to Biocca et al. (2003) social presence refers to the subjective experience of being present with a real person (influencer) and having access to his or her thoughts and emotions. The change that followers experience will be felt more acutely by micro-influencers than macro-influencers because micro-influencers have more in common with their followers and will experience the emotions and thoughts of the influencer (Shen, 2012).

Several studies found that social presence can be influenced by contextual and individual factors that impact perceptions of psychological distance between interactions (e.g., Siriaraya & Siang Ang, 2012; Kang & Gratch, 2014; Verhagen et al., 2014). Hassanein and Head (2007) find that social presence has a positive effect on people when they instill trust, show enjoyment and produce perceived usefulness, which leads to greater purchase intentions. According to McCabe (2001) consumers are more willing to purchase products online when emotive descriptions or touch properties are provided, compared to a basic listing.

An example of different types of social presence on social media platforms is Facebook content compared with blogs. On Facebook, the content shows who the writer is, which provides a higher level of interaction, compared to blogs, where authors are mostly invisible. According to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) even with the user-generated content on social media platforms, Facebook has a greater level of social presence than blogs. Both on Facebook and Instagram the influencer's identity is visible and therefore ensures a higher level of interaction.

If media have a stronger social presence, influencers are more inclined to read the responses of receivers, and thus receivers have stronger motives to respond to the messages because influencers pay attention to the users (Robert & Dennis, 2005). Media with a low level of social presence requires influencers to process the information more elaborately (Robert & Dennis, 2005).

This research makes use of a fictitious healthy food influencer called "Healthyfoodlover". The Instagram posts show the influencer "Healthyfoodlover" (visible) or shows the products only (non-visible). Hassanein and Head (2005) state that when an influencer shows their own personalized content it increases social presence. Their study explores the impact of introducing social presence via interface across websites with selling different product types. Hassanein and Head (2005) conclude that perceived usefulness, trust and enjoyment are important antecedents to online shoppers regardless the type of product.

Research shows that the effects of social presence are higher for micro-influencers than macro-influencers, due to the smaller number of followers, the fact that micro-influencers have more in common with their followers and show content that matches their followers' interests (Bernazzani, 2017; Chen, 2016, Izea, 2018). Although much is known about the influence and difference with regard to micro-influencers and macro-influencers, present research specifically looked at the difference between micro-influencers and macro-influencers regarding social presence. What is the impact of social presence of micro-influencers compared to macro-influencers and is the impact of social presence higher for micro-influencers?

H2a: A visible influencer leads to higher consumer influencer engagement than a non-visible influencer

H2b: Social presence has a higher consumer influencer engagement when micro-influencers are shown instead of macro-influencers

H2c: Social presence has a higher evaluation of the influencer when micro-influencers are shown instead of macro-influencers

2.5 PRODUCT CONGRUENCE

The product match-up, in this study referred to product congruence (model by Kamins et al. (1989)) consists of image, expertise and attractiveness (Forkan, 1980; Till & Busler, 2000), and presents the congruence between products. In this study product congruence presented the congruence between the product and the influencer. The product match-up model explores the fit between an endorser and the brand (Kamins, 1990).

Kamins and Gupta (1994) state that a celebrity showing a congruent image with the product makes for a better advertisement and instills credibility. Furthermore, expertise is deemed more applicable for matching products (Misra & Beatty, 1990; Till & Busler, 2000). Thus, a perfect match between social media influencers and the product will significantly strengthen the advertising results. However, this does not automatically guarantee successful advertising (Till & Busler, 2000). Previous research shows that the effectiveness of a celebrity's advertisement is tied to the degree of the image, personality or expertise of the influencer that fits the product (Kamins, 1990; Kamins & Gupta, 1994).

In this study the product congruence post was defined as the degree of similarity that exists between the characteristics associated with the influencer and the product in the post. For the product incongruence there is no similarity between the characteristics associated with the influencer and the product in the post. Therefore, the product congruence has a more positive influence on consumers compared with the product incongruence.

H3a: A product congruence has a higher consumer influencer engagement when a visible influencer is shown instead of a non-visible influencer

H3b: A product congruence has a higher consumer influencer engagement when macroinfluencers are shown instead of micro-influencers

H3c: A product congruence has a higher evaluation of the influencer when macro-influencers are shown instead of micro-influencers

H3d: A product congruence has a negative impact on micro-influencers instead of macro-influencers

2.6 SOURCE CREDIBILITY

Source credibility explains the extent to which the target audience views the source to gain expertise and knowledge in their understanding of the product (Teng et al., 2014; Ohanian, 1990). According to Harmon and Coney (1982), credibility has a positive effect on the persuasive message. Previous research states that source credibility of endorsers has a positive influence on the purchase intentions (Lafferty et al., 2002; Pornpitakpan, 2004; Wang et al., 2017).

Source credibility is based on three constructs: trustworthiness, attractiveness and expertise of the communicator (Ohanian, 1990).

According to Ohanian (1990) trustworthiness refers to how honest, reliable and dependable the source is perceived to be. The degree to which audiences perceived the source to be dependable is also associated with trust. Thus, Instagram may increase the extent to which audiences perceive the source as someone who can verify and elaborate on the transmitted information (Labrecque, 2014). Messages from sources who resemble the follower decrease psychological reactance (Brinol & Petty, 2009). Therefore, Instagram influencers can be more effective with audiences as they are perceived as regular audiences. Instagram influencers are more likely to interact with fans than celebrities (Jin et al., 2019).

Further, the attractiveness of an influencer is an important factor that has an effect on the beliefs and attitudes of consumers. Attractiveness does not only refer to physical attractiveness but also to other attributes, such as intellectual skills, lifestyle or personality (Erdogan, 1999; Ohanian, 1990). When Instagram users perceive influencers as elegant, classy, attractive, beautiful, or sexy, attractiveness appears (Jin et al., 2019).

The final dimension of source credibility is expertise, which can be defined as the level on which a communicator represents a source of suitable assertions about the object; in this study the type of influencer (micro- or macro-influencer). Expertise refers to the knowledge, skill or experience of an endorser, or influencer (Erdogan, 1999). Expertise is considered as an important determinant of product evaluation because the celebrity is perceived as a user of the products, and celebrity expertise has a positive influence on product evaluation (Rossiter & Smidts, 2012). Moreover, expertise can also be defined as "the degree to which the endorser is perceived to have the adequate knowledge, experience or skills to promote

the product" (van der Waldt et al., 2009, p.104). An influencer is considered an expert when Instagram users perceive them as expert, experienced or skilled (Jin et al., 2019).

H4: The impact of the type of influencer (micro- or macro-influencer) on consumer influencer engagement is mediated by source credibility (trustworthiness, attractiveness, expertise)

H5a: Micro-influencers are perceived as more credible than macro-influencers
H5b: Micro-influencers are perceived as more trustworthy than macro-influencers
H5c: Micro-influencers are perceived more as an expert than macro-influencers
H5d: Micro-influencers are perceived as more attractive than macro-influencers

2.7 RESEARCH MODEL

The research model that was used for this research is shown in Figure 1. This model summarizes all the hypotheses made in the theoretical framework, including the different independent variables, such as type of influencer (micro vs. macro), social presence (human vs. product), product congruence (low vs. high), and dependent variables, such as consumer influencer engagement, evaluation of the influencer, and the mediator source credibility.

Despite the fact that hypotheses do not show any three-way interaction, a three-way interaction could occur between type of influencer, social presence and product congruence on the dependent variables or on the mediator (source credibility).



FIGURE 1 RESEARCH MODEL

3. METHOD SECTION

This chapter discusses the research methodology and research design that was conducted for this study. First, the experimental design is presented, followed by the results of the preliminary test. Second, the procedure and participants. Finally, the measurements of this study will be discussed.

3.1 STIMULUS MATERIALS

3.1.1 EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The main goal of this study was to find out if there is a difference in type of influencer (micro vs. macro), social presence (human vs. product) and product congruence (low vs. high) on consumer influencer engagement and on the evaluation of the influencer. This study has a 2 (type of influencer: micro- vs. macro-influencer) x 2 (social presence: influencer vs. products) x 2 (product congruence: congruent vs. incongruent) between subjects design, where type of influencer, social presence and product congruence are the independent variables, consumer influencer engagement and the evaluation of the influencer the dependent variables, and source credibility the mediator. According to the experimental design, this study results in eight different conditions as visualized in Table 1.

	Human	Product
<u>Micro-influencer</u>		
Low match	N = 25	N = 37
High match	N = 34	N = 27
Macro-influencer		
Low match	N = 33	N = 31
High match	N = 32	N = 33

TABLE 1 CONDITIONS EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

3.1.2 PRELIMINARY TEST

Before the preliminary test was carried out, several images of a fictitious healthy food influencer (type of influencer) and images with a congruent product and an incongruent product were collected. These images were edited with Photoshop to present a realistic Instagram post. To test which images should be used in the main study, a preliminary test was done first.

Before the main study, a preliminary test was done to make sure the stimuli material was clear. First, ten participants were asked via Skype to express their thoughts about the images

(see Appendix 1). The preliminary test was taken via Skype due to COVID-19 related restrictions which made it impossible to conduct tests via focus groups. After this first group session it turned out that there was no clear difference regarding the images of type of influencer and product incongruence. Participants chose the influencer that resembled their identity, and all participants identified themselves with another influencer image, which makes it more complex. As it was not clear which images should be used after having consulted ten participants, six additional participants were asked to share their thoughts. After these six additional participants had been consulted it turned out that the image for type of influencer was clear after all.

For the congruent product, it turned out that the couscous product image was not clear enough. Eight out of the 16 participants found the poke bowl clearer. Participants found this image had a better match with the influencer. For the incongruent product, even after 16 participants were asked to share their thoughts, two images received five votes in total. In the end, the clearest incongruent product image was chosen. For the final images used in the main study see Table 2.

TABLE 2
FINAL STIMULUS MATERIAL

	Human						Product				
	Low match		High mat	ch		Low ma	tch		High ma	atch	
Micro-	12:09	all 🗢 💷	12:09		ail 🕈 🗩	12:09		all 🗟 🗊	12:09		al 😤 🗊
influencer	Berichten	Volgen	<	Berichten	Volgen	<	Berichten	Volgen	<	Berichten	Volgen
	Vind-k-leuks Katingtoology at this burget #unhealty #2	eatity is afficulty page of the address	V Q V AT vind-ik-louk Healthy Avitania	s fockebow!	vitaminel 2 Q	✓ A vind-ik-le Heattysoodi See my link for	✓ ✓ Uks where My guilty pleasure Water My guilty pleasure C Like	© A	A 7 vind-ik-le Heatingtood See my link to See my	Q €	Frequencies C C C C C C C C C C C C C
Macro-	12:09	all 🗢 💷	12:09		all 🕈 💷	12:09		ad 🗢 🗩	12:09		.ul ≑ ∎)
influencer	< Berichten	Volgen	<	Berichten	Volgen	<	Berichten	Volgen	<	Berichten	Volgen
	 Healthyfoodlovers • Healthyfoodlovers • Healthyfoodlovers • Classe vind-ik-leuks Healthyfoodlovers \$Constitutes being healthyfoodlovers \$Constitutes be	The set of the s	Healthytoo	flovers ©	v vtaminst 2 R	Healthyl Healthyl Constraints Constraints	toodlovers ●	 ↓	Healthy	todovers €	Trup tavorites: C

3.2 PROCEDURE

The questionnaire was created in Qualtrics. Snowball sampling was used to gather participants. First, the questionnaire was sent to friends, family member, classmates, colleagues, and different online groups. Next, these participants were asked to share the questionnaire within their respective networks to attract enough respondents.

The questionnaire started off by welcoming the respondents by a concise explanation of the study. Also, an informed consent form was included for the respondents. The respondents were asked if they make use of Instagram. Non-users of Instagram were excluded from the questionnaire. Then, participants had to answer six general questions about their Instagram use. Next, participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight conditions and had to take a close look at the image. Following that, they had to comment on several statements concerning type of influencer, social presence, product match-up, and the constructs of source credibility. The questionnaire ended with three demographical questions on gender, age and their completed education level.

3.3 PARTICIPANTS

After two weeks, a total of 438 responses had been gathered. At a later stage, 11 additional participants were gathered for the additional questionnaire with regard to the condition "micro-influencer high match (product)". However, a lot of the participants did not complete the questionnaire, and 30 participants in total did not make use of Instagram. Several participants stopped filling out the questionnaire after seeing the image. Those participants who did not fully complete the questionnaire were deleted from the total response list. The total response amounted to 252¹.

Most of these participants are aged 21 to 23 years (M = 22.62, SD = 2.62) and are educated either on applied university (29.8%) or university (30.6%) level. A reason for the high education level can be attributed to the sampling method; the questionnaire was established by means of snowball sampling. A one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) showed that educational level on the variable images was not statistically significant, F(7,244) = 1.55, p = .151. This means that there was no significant difference in educational level between the different conditions.

¹ The condition "micro-influencer high match (product)" had fewer participants. This condition was tested again later to get a better representation of the other conditions.

Most of the participants were aged between 21 and 23 (44.4%) years. However, the largest group was aged between 18 and 26 (93.3%) years. In the questionnaire participants were asked about their age, so that later age groups could be formed for analysis purposes. An ANOVA analysis was performed to determine whether there was a difference in age distribution between the eight conditions. This analysis was not statistically significant, F(7,244) = 0.47, p = .855. This means that there was no significant difference in age between the different conditions.

Furthermore, a majority of the participants was female (75% female; 25% male). A Pearson Chi-square was carried out to determine whether there was a difference in gender distribution between the eight conditions. The Chi-square was not statistically significant, $X^2(7) = 3.16$, p = .870. This means that there was no significant difference in gender between the different conditions. See Table 3 for an overview of the different demographic characteristics of the participants.

TABLE 3 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

		N (%)		N (%)		N (%)
	Age		Gender		Education	
	18-20	54 (21.4%)	Male	63 (25%)	VMBO	5 (2.0%)
	21-23	112 (44.4%)	Female	189 (75%)	HAVO	28 (11.1%)
	24-26	69 (27.4%)			VWO	39 (15.5%)
	27-29	11 (4.4%)			MBO	28 (11.1%)
	30-32	6 (2.4%)			НВО	75 (29.8%)
					WO	77 (30.6%
Total		252 (100%)		252 (100%)		252 (100%)

In addition to the demographic characteristics of the participants, they also answered several questions about their Instagram use. Most of the participants have used Instagram for four years or longer (69.4%), and most of the participants used Instagram several times a day (68.7%). Moreover, from the 252 participants, the majority (82.3%) follow influencers on Instagram. Most follow celebrities (61.1%) and/or fashion influencers (54%) (multiple answers possible). The reasons why participants follow influencers point at entertainment, beautiful images, inspiration, and interesting content. See Table 4 for an overview of Instagram use.

TABLE 4 INSTAGRAM USE

_

	N (%)		N (%)		N (%)		N (%)		N (%)
Instagram		Start using		Regular Instagram		Following		Type of	
use		Instagram		use		influencers		influencers	
Yes	252 (100%)	Shorter than 1 year	7 (2.8%)	Several times a day	173 (68.7%)	Yes	209 (82.9%)	Fashion influencers	136 (54%)
No	0 (0%)	1 - 2 years	16 (6.3%)	Daily	62 (24.6%)	No	43 (17.1%)	Food influencers	90 (35.7%)
		3 - 4 years	54 (21.4%)	A few times a week	13 (5.2%)			Make-up influencers	64 (25.4%)
		Longer than 4 years	175 (69.4%)	Weekly	2 (0.8%)			Sport influencers	99 (39.3%)
				Monthly	1 (0.4%)			Interior influencers	47 (18.7%)
				Several times a year	1 (0.4%)			Celebrities	154 (61.1%)
								Other	16 (6.3%)
	252		252		252		252		606
otal	(100%)		(100%)		(100%)		(100%)		(240.5%)

3.4 MEASUREMENTS

Consumer influencer engagement, evaluation of the influencer, and source credibility were measured for this study. Several questions on type of influencer, social presence and product congruence are manipulating questions; the other questions measure the independent variables. Most of the items in the questionnaire were adopted from comparable previous studies. All the constructs were measured on a 7-point Likert scale. This section will discuss the reliability of all the constructs.

3.4.1 DEPENDENT VARIABLES Consumer influencer engagement

Consumer influencer engagement measured to what extent the participants felt engaged with the influencer. An example statement is "I have a lot in common with this influencer". The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha for these items was good ($\alpha = .81$).

Evaluation of the influencer

The evaluation of the influencer was measured to record the opinions of the participants on the influencer, with statements such as "The influencer shows her passion" and "The influencer meets my expectations". These items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha of these items was good ($\alpha = .82$).

3.4.2 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES **Type of influencer**

To measure if participants noticed the difference in type of influencer (micro- vs. macroinfluencer), six statements were included in the questionnaire. The most important statement "The influencer has a lot of likes" should be deleted to get a higher Cronbach's alpha. The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha of these items was good (α = .76); however, the Cronbach's alpha was higher when the item "The influencer has a lot of likes" was omitted (α = .84).

Social presence

The total construct of social presence comprised 17 items; however, these items are separated in visibility of the influencer and identity of the influencer. Cronbach's alpha for the items was good ($\alpha = .88$).

Visibility of the influencer

In order to measure the visibility of the influencer, several items from Lowenthal (2003) were used in this study; for example, "It is clear who the influencer of the post is". Another example is "The influencer is clearly visible in the post". The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha of these items was very good (α = .90). The Cronbach's alpha could be slightly higher when omitting the item "I see a match between the influencer and the Instagram account" (α = .91). Because of this slightly higher Cronbach's alpha this item will not be deleted.

Identity of the influencer

The identity of the influencer consisted of two items of social presence that could not be used in the other constructs. The statements were "The influencer stays true to her identity" and "The influencer stays true to herself". The Cronbach's alpha of these items was good (α = .88). For the factor analysis, see Appendix 3.

Product congruence

Product congruence was measured to ascertain if participants notice when there is a congruence with the influencer and when there is an incongruence. An example statement is "I see a match between the influencer and the product". The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha of these six items was very good ($\alpha = .96$).

3.4.3 MEDIATOR Source Credibility

In order to measure source credibility, the three dimensions of Ohanian (1990) were measured: trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness. This scale was measured to ascertain what participants thought of the influencer as seen in the image. The Cronbach's alpha was higher than .80 for all three dimensions. The source credibility scales consist of 11 items broken down into four categories for trustworthiness, three for expertise and four for attractiveness. An example statement for trustworthiness is "The influencer is trustworthy".

Cronbach's alpha was very good (α = .92). For expertise, an example statement is "The influencer seems to be an expert". The Cronbach's alpha for expertise was very good (α = .91). Attractiveness scored a good Cronbach's alpha (α = .80), and an example statement is "The influencer is attractive". For all 11 items the Cronbach Alpha was very good (α = .91).

3.5 RELIABILITY

To test the reliability of the constructs for the total sample (N=252), the Cronbach's α scores were calculated. All constructs had a Cronbach's Alpha higher than .77, which means that the level of reliability is satisfactory. Table 5 shows the reliability scores from all the different constructs.

TABLE 5CRONBACH'S ALPHA

Construct	No. of items	Cronbach's α
Consumer influencer		
engagement	5	.82
Evaluation of the influencer	5	.82
Type of influencer	4	.84
Social presence		.88
 Visibility of the 		
influencer	5	.90
 Identity of the 		
influencer	2	.88
Product congruence	5	.96
Source Credibility	11	.91
- Trustworthiness	4	.92
- Expertise	3	.91
- Attractiveness	4	.81

4. RESULTS

In this chapter the results of the main research are presented. First, the manipulation checks of the variables are discussed. Second, the main and interaction effects will be discussed by way of the multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA); also, the effects of source credibility are presented. The chapter ends with an overview of the supported and rejected hypotheses.

4.1 MANIPULATION CHECKS

Manipulation checks were conducted for the independent variables type regarding influencer, the visibility of the influencer (social presence) and product congruence to make sure they were interpreted correctly.

Type of influencer

According to the measurements in Paragraph 3.5, it follows that the most important statement regarding type of influencer should be deleted to get a higher reliability rating. However, this statement is the only one that measures if participants noticed the difference between the micro- or macro-influencer. Therefore, by means of the manipulation check, the statement "The influencer had a lot of likes" was used to ascertain if participants view the micro-influencer as micro and the macro-influencer as macro. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed a statistically significant difference, F(1,250) = 61.48, p = <.001. The descriptive results showed that the micro-influencer (M = 3.69, SD = 1.51) did not have a lot of likes and the macro-influencer (M = 5.04, SD = 1.21) did. The ANOVA showed that there was a significant difference between micro- and macro-influencer, which means the manipulation was successful.

Social presence

To check whether participants recognized the influencer was clearly visible in the post statements such as "The influencer is clearly visible on the post" and "It is clear who the influencer of the post is" were included in the questionnaire. There was a significant difference in the scores for "influencer visible" (M = 5.45, SD = 0.94) and "influencer not visible" (M = 2.67, SD = 1.04) condition. The ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference, F(1,250) = 492.69, p = <.001. The ANOVA showed that participants noticed the difference when the influencer was visible in the post and when not, which means the manipulation was successful.

Product congruence

To ascertain if respondents notice the difference in congruence and incongruence products, an ANOVA was performed. The mean scores showed a significant difference between congruence (M = 5.07, SD = 1.14) and incongruence products (M = 3.43, SD = 1.36). The ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference, F(1,250) = 108.16, p = <.001. This means that the manipulation check for the independent variable product congruence was successful as well.

4.1.1 MEAN COMPARISONS OF THE CONSTRUCTS

In Table 6 the different mean scores and standard deviations for the eight conditions are shown (N = 252).

TABLE 6 MEAN COMPARISONS OF THE CONSTRUCTS

	Human	Product
<u>Micro-influencer</u>	M (SD)	M (SD)
Consumer influencer engagement		
Low match	3.42 (1.20)	3.52 (1.00)
High match	3.90 (0.96)	3.44 (0.97)
Evaluation of the influencer		
Low match	3.92 (1.16)	3.93 (1.04)
High match	5.10 (0.92)	5.02 (0.83)
<u>Macro-influencer</u>		
Consumer influencer engagement		
Low match	3.86 (0.89)	3.47 (1.10)
High match	3.77 (1.16)	3.76 (1.13)
Evaluation of the influencer		
Low match	3.88 (1.23)	3.65 (1.28)
High match	5.10 (0.73)	5.22 (0.91)

4.2 MAIN EFFECTS AND INTERACTION EFFECTS: CONSUMER INFLUENCER ENGAGEMENT AND EVALUATION OF THE INFLUENCER

The main effects of the independent variables were measured using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The MANOVA was performed with the following factors: type of influencer (micro vs. macro), social presence (visible vs. not visible) and product congruence (congruent vs. incongruent). Consumer influencer engagement, evaluation of the influencer, visibility of the influencer, and identity of the influencer were included as dependent variables. The test showed that there were no significant effects for type of influencer, F(4,241) = 1.21, p = .308. Furthermore, the multivariate test showed that there was a

significant main effect for social presence, F(4,241) = 146.65, p = <.001. Moreover, the test showed that there was a statistically significant effect for product congruence, F(4,241) =27.05, p = <.001. The table also showed that there were no interaction effects between the different independent variables. Table 7 shows the multivariate tests. Even though only product congruence and social presence showed a significant result in the MANOVA, type of influencer is discussed in the follow-up analyses.

TABLE 7 MULTIVARIATE TESTS (WILK'S LAMBDA)

	F	df	Error df	р	ηp2
Type of influencer	1.21	4	241	.308	0.02
Social presence	146.65	4	241	.000	0.71
Product congruence	27.05	4	241	.000	0.31
Type of influencer * social presence	0.08	4	241	.988	0.00
Type of influencer * product congruence	0.50	4	241	.734	0.01
Social presence * product congruence	0.64	4	241	.634	0.01
Type of influencer * social presence * product congruence	1.05	4	241	.381	0.02

TABLE 8 MAIN FINDINGS BETWEEN SUBJECTS

			-10	لاسمير مال		
		F	ar	Error ui	р	ηpz
Main effects						
	Consumer influencer					
Type of influencer	engagement	1.18	1	244	.278	0.01
	Evaluation of the influencer	0.06	1	244	.801	0.00
	Visibility of the influencer	0.78	1	244	.378	0.00
	Identity of the influencer	1.15	1	244	.285	0.01
	Consumer influencer					
Social presence	engagement	2.01	1	244	.158	0.01
	Evaluation of the influencer	0.11	1	244	.744	0.00
	Visibility of the influencer	489.83	1	244	.000	0.67
	Identity of the influencer	2.2	1	244	.140	0.01
	Consumer influencer					
Product congruence	engagement	1.23	1	244	.269	0.01
0	Evaluation of the influencer	95.06	1	244	.000	0.28
	Visibility of the influencer	7.70	- 1	244	.006	0.03
	Identity of the influencer	18.26	- 1	244	000	0.07
	identity of the influencei	10.20	-			0.07
Interaction effect						
Type of influencer * social	Consumer influencer					
presence	engagement	0.01	1	244	.931	0.00
	Evaluation of the influencer	0.01	1	244	.926	0.00
	Visibility of the influencer	0.15	1	244	.698	0.00
	Identity of the influencer	0.06	1	244	.809	0.00
Type of influencer * product	Consumer influencer					
congruence	enagaement	0.14	1	244	.705	0.00
	Evaluation of the influencer	1	1	244	.319	0.00
	Visihility of the influencer	0 17	1	244	677	0.00
	Identity of the influencer	0.40	1	244	527	0.00
	identity of the influencer	0.40	-	2	.527	0.00
Social presence * product	Consumer influencer					
congruence	engagement	0.13	1	244	.718	0.00
	Evaluation of the influencer	0.28	1	244	.594	0.00
	Visibility of the influencer	0.33	1	244	.565	0.00
	Identity of the influencer	0.75	1	244	.389	0.00
Type of influencer * social						
presence * product	Consumer influencer					
congruence	engagement	3.17	1	244	.076	0.01
	Evaluation of the influencer	0.71	1	244	.401	0.00
	Visibility of the influencer	0.94	1	244	.334	0.00
	Identity of the influencer	0.00	1	244	.988	0.00

4.2.1 MAIN EFFECT: TYPE OF INFLUENCER

The MANOVA showed no statistically significant effect for type of influencer on the dependent variables, F(4,241) = 1.21, p = .308. Further, no main effects were found for type of influencer on consumer influencer engagement, F(1,244) = 1.18, p = .278, and on evaluation of the influencer, F(1,244) = 0.06, p .801. These effects show that micro-influencers did not have a higher influence on consumer influencer engagement and evaluation of the influencer than a macro-influencer. The macro-influencer did have more influence on the dependent variables. Therefore, hypotheses H1A and H1B could be rejected.

4.2.2 MAIN EFFECT: SOCIAL PRESENCE

The MANOVA showed that there was a significant main effect for social presence on the dependent variables (consumer influencer engagement, evaluation of the influencer, visibility of the influencer, and identity of the influencer), F(4,241) = 146.65, p = <.001. This main effect demonstrated that showing the influencer (visible) had a higher influence on the dependent variables compared to showing the products only (non-visible).

The univariate test showed that there was only a significant effect for social presence on visibility of the influencer, F(1,250) = 489.83, p = <.001. This result demonstrated that showing the influencer (visible) leads to a higher social presence than showing products only (non-visible). The hypothesis stated that a visible influencer leads to a higher consumer influencer engagement as opposed to a non-visible influencer. Therefore, the ANOVA on consumer influencer engagement showed that there was no significant main effect, F(1,250) = 2.01, p = .158, and H2A must be rejected.

The ANOVA showed that there was no interaction effect for social presence * type of influencer on consumer influencer engagement, F(1,250) = 0.01, p = .931. Moreover, the ANOVA showed no significant interaction effect for social presence * type of influencer on evaluation of the influencer, F(1,250) = 0.01, p = .926. With these outcomes it should be concluded that H2B and H2C should be rejected.

4.2.3 MAIN EFFECT: PRODUCT CONGRUENCE

The MANOVA showed a statistically significant effect for product congruence, F(4,241) = 27.05, p = <.001: a congruent product had a higher influence on the dependent variables than an incongruent product.

Looking at the univariate test, product congruence showed a statistically significant effect on evaluation of the influencer, F(1,244) = 95.06, p = <.001, on visibility of the influencer, F(1,244) = 7.70, p = .006, and on the identity of the influencer, F(1,244) = 18.26, p = <.001. This shows that a congruent product had a higher influence on these dependent variables than an incongruent product.

The ANOVA showed that product congruence had a statistically significant effect on social presence, F(1,250) = 6.51, p = .011: an influencer who is shown resulted in higher social presence (M = 4.5, SD = 1.51) than showing products only (M = 4.02, SD = 1.45). The ANOVA on consumer influencer engagement did not show a statistically significant effect, F(1,250) = 2.40, p = .123. These results showed that hypothesis H3A cannot be supported.

An ANOVA was conducted to investigate if product congruence has a negative impact on a micro-influencer instead of a macro-influencer. The ANOVA showed no statistically significant interaction between type of influencer and product congruence, F(1,250) = 0.19, p = .663. This result showed that hypothesis H3B also should be rejected.

To ascertain if there was a higher effect between product congruence, evaluation of the influencer, and macro-influencer an ANOVA was performed. The test showed that there was no discernable effect between those variables. The ANOVA also showed that there was no significant main effect for product congruence on type of influencer, F(1,250) = 0.19, p = .663; however, there was a significant effect for product congruence on evaluation of the influencer, F(1,250) = 98.06, p = <.001. These results showed that H3C should be rejected as well.

Moreover, the MANOVA showed that there was no statistical interaction effect between product congruence and type of influencer on the dependent variables (consumer influencer engagement, evaluation of the influencer, visibility of the influencer, and identity of the influencer), F(4,241) = 0.50, p = .734. Therefore, H3D cannot be supported.

4.3 EFFECTS ON SOURCE CREDIBILITY

This study not only looked at the main and interaction effects between independent and dependent variables, but also focused on source credibility (trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness) as mediator between the independent and dependent variables. For the relationships between source credibility and independent variables, a MANOVA analysis was conducted. The results showed that the main effects were all significant. The independent variable type of influencer had a significant effect on source credibility, F(3,242) = 3.39, p = .019. The effect of social presence on source credibility was significant as well, F(3,242) = 10.65, p = <.001. Finally, the effect of product congruence on source credibility was significant, F(3,242) = 8.91, p = <.001. Table 9 shows the multivariate tests of between subjects, Table 10 shows two interaction effects on source credibility and on attractiveness.

TABLE 9 TESTS OF BETWEEN-SUBJECTS EFFECTS

	F	df	Error df	р	ηp2
Type of influencer	3.39	3	242	.019	0.04
Social presence	10.65	3	242	.000	0.12
Product congruence	8.91	3	242	.000	0.01
Type of influencer * social presence	0.34	3	242	.796	0.00
Type of influencer * product congruence	0.63	3	242	.596	0.01
Social presence * product congruence	1.77	3	242	.154	0.02
Type of influencer * social presence * product congruence	2.04	3	242	.109	0.03

 TABLE 10

 MAIN FINDINGS OF THE BETWEEN-SUBJECT ANALYSIS ON SOURCE CREDIBILITY

		F	df	Error df	р	ηp2
Main effects					-	
Type of influencer	Source credibility	6.87	1	244	.009	0.03
	Trustworthiness	2.54	1	244	.112	0.01
	Expertise	6.19	1	244	.014	0.02
	Attractiveness	6.69	1	244	.010	0.03
Social presence	Source credibility	4.17	1	244	.042	0.02
	Trustworthiness	4.24	1	244	.041	0.02
	Expertise	1.07	1	244	.302	0.00
	Attractiveness	18.77	1	244	.000	0.07
Product congruence	Source credibility	22.19	1	244	.000	0.08
	Trustworthiness	10.84	1	244	.001	0.04
	Expertise	24.17	1	244	.000	0.09
	Attractiveness	12.80	1	244	.000	0.05
Interaction effect						
Type of Influencer * social		0.00	4	244	000	0.00
presence	Source credibility	0.00	T	244	.999	0.00
	Trustwortniness	0.21	1	244	.648	0.00
	Expertise	0.22	1	244	.638	0.00
	Attractiveness	0.00	1	244	.955	0.00
Type of influencer * product						
congruence	Source credibility	0.49	1	244	.483	0.00
0	, Trustworthiness	0.46	1	244	.497	0.00
	Expertise	0.00	1	244	.954	0.00
	Attractiveness	1.34	1	244	.248	0.01
Social presence * product						
congruence	Source credibility	0.14	1	244	.707	0.00
	Trustworthiness	0.82	1	244	.365	0.00
	Expertise	0.83	1	244	.362	0.00
	Attractiveness	1.16	1	244	.284	0.01
Type of influencer * social						
presence * product				• • •		
congruence	Source credibility	4.72	1	244	.031	0.02
	Trustworthiness	2.81	1	244	.095	0.01
	Expertise	1.83	1	244	.177	0.01
	Attractiveness	6.03	1	244	.015	0.02

4.3.1 MAIN EFFECT: TYPE OF INFLUENCER

The multivariate test showed that there was a significant main effect for type of influencer on source credibility, F(3,242) = 3.39, p = .019. The descriptive results of the multivariate test showed that the participants who saw the micro-influencer (N=123) gave the influencer a mean score of M = 4.25 (SD = 1.12). Participants who saw the macro-influencer (N=129) gave the influencer a mean score of M = 4.50 (SD = 0.89). With this result, it should be noted that participants found the macro-influencer more credible than the micro-influencer where the hypotheses stated that the micro-influencer is more credible than the macro-influencer, and, therefore, H5A should be rejected.

In this study, source credibility was divided into three different constructs: trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness. The three constructs were examined by means of an ANOVA. For trustworthiness, the ANOVA showed no significant difference, F(1,250) = 2.54, p = .112, which means that there was no significant difference when showing a micro- or macro-influencer. Therefore, H5B should be rejected.

Next, the ANOVA of expertise gave a statistically significant difference, F(1,250) = 6.19, p = .014. The analysis showed that there is a difference between showing a micro- or macro-influencer. To further investigate the difference, the descriptive results showed that participants found the macro-influencer had more expertise (M = 4.06, SD = 1.41) than the micro-influencer (M = 3.62, SD = 1.35). These results showed that hypothesis H5C should be rejected.

Moreover, attractiveness also gave a statistically significant difference, F(1,250) = 6.69, p = .014, resulted in a significant difference between micro- and macro-influencer. The descriptive results showed that the macro-influencer scored higher (M = 4.62, SD = 0.94) than the micro-influencer (M = 4.30, SD = 1.02), which means H5D should also be rejected.

4.3.2 MAIN EFFECT: SOCIAL PRESENCE

The MANOVA showed that there was a significant main effect for social presence on source credibility, F(3,242) = 10.65, p = <.001. The descriptive results showed that participants who saw the influencer (M = 4.38, SD = 1.01) gave a higher score than participants who saw the products only (M = 4.13, SD = 0.94). This concludes that participants found the influencer more credible than the products only. Moreover, the univariate analysis showed that visibility of the influencer also had a significant effect on trustworthiness (F(1,250) = 4.24, p =

.041) and attractiveness (F(1,250) = 18.77, p = <.001). The descriptive results for trustworthiness showed that when participants saw the influencer (M = 4.51, SD = 1.24) the mean score was higher than when they saw the products only (M = 4.20, SD = 1.09). It can be concluded that participants show more trust when seeing the influencer instead of seeing the products only. Finally, the descriptive results of attractiveness also showed that the mean score for the influencer (M = 4.73, SD = 0.93) was higher than for the products (M =4.21, SD = 0.98). This means that participants found the image with the influencer more attractive than the image with the products only.

This paragraph shows that showing an influencer generated more trust, more expertise and participants found this image more attractive than when only products were shown.

4.4.3 MAIN EFFECT: PRODUCT CONGRUENCE

For product congruence the MANOVA showed a significant main effect on source credibility, F(3,242) = 8.91, p = <.001. The descriptive results showed that congruence products (M =4.53, SD = 0.87) had a higher mean score than incongruence products (M = 3.98, SD = 1.01). This concludes that participants who saw the congruence products found this image more credible than the incongruence product image. Additionally, the ANOVA for trustworthiness showed a significant effect, F(1,250) = 10.84, p = .001. The descriptive results showed that the congruence products (M = 4.59, SD = 1.10) scored higher than the incongruence products (M = 4.11, SD = 1.20). This concludes that participants trusted the influencer more when seeing the congruence products. Expertise also had a significant effect, F(1,250) =24.17, p = <.001, and the congruence product also scored higher (M = 4.26, SD = 1.22) than the incongruence products image (M = 3.43, SD = 1.44). The influencer gained more expertise when congruence products were shown. Finally, attractiveness produced a significant effect as well, F(1,250) = 12.80, p = <.001. Hereby, the descriptive results again showed that the congruence products (M = 4.68, SD = 0.80) scored higher than the incongruence products (M = 4.25, SD = 1.11). This means that the congruence products are more attractive than the incongruence products.

Overall, it can be concluded that the congruence products on an image score higher with regard to trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness instead of showing incongruence products in the image.

4.3.3 INTERACTION EFFECT: SOURCE CREDIBILITY

The MANOVA showed an interaction effect on source credibility and on attractiveness. Type of influencer, social presence and product congruence showed a significant interaction effect on source credibility, F(1,244) = 4.72, p = .031. The descriptive results showed that when participants saw the congruent product the macro-influencer (M = 4.65, SD = 0.74) scored higher than the micro-influencer (M = 4.14, SD = 0.93). Which means that the macro-influencer was more credible than the micro-influencer when showing congruence products. The descriptive results also showed that the mean score for the influencer (visible) (M = 4.38, SD = 1.01) was higher than when showing products only (non-visible) (M = 4.13, SD = 0.94). The influencer (visible) was rated more credible than when showing products only (non-visible).

Looking at the incongruent product image with the influencer, the macro-influencer (M = 4.38, SD = 0.91) scored higher than the micro-influencer (M = 3.71, SD = 1.20), which means that the macro-influencer was more credible when showing incongruence products with an influencer.



FIGURE 2 INTERACTION EFFECT CREDIBILITY OF THE MICRO-INFLUENCER



FIGURE 3 INTERACTION EFFECT CREDIBILITY OF THE MACRO-INFLUENCER

Looking at Figure 2 and Figure 3, the credibility of the micro-influencer showed an interaction effect for the incongruence products, where the macro-influencer showed an interaction effect for the congruence products.

4.3.4 INTERACTION EFFECT: ATTRACTIVENESS

The construct attractiveness showed a significant interaction effect with type of influencer, social presence and product congruence, F(1,244) = 6.03, p = .015. The descriptive results showed that by the congruence products with influencer (visible), the micro-influencer (M = 4.90, SD = 0.88) scored higher than the macro-influencer (M = 4.78, SD = 0.66). It can be concluded that the micro-influencer with a congruent product was more attractive than the macro-influencer. However, when showing the products only (non-visible), the macro-influencer (M = 4.72, SD = 0.62 vs. M = 4.25, SD = 0.91) scored higher and was more attractive according to participants.

When looking at the incongruence products the macro-influencer scored higher in both, by the influencer (visible) (M = 4.92, SD = 0.92 vs. M = 4.19, SD = 1.13) and showing products

only (non-visible) (M = 4.03, SD = 1.22 vs. M = 3.86, SD = 0.91). Overall, the macro-influencer was more attractive than the micro-influencer; see also Figure 4 and Figure 5. The figures show that only an interaction effect was found for attractiveness on macro-influencer. The figures show that the micro-influencer is rated more attractive by the incongruence products, where the macro-influencer is more attractive when showing the congruence products.



FIGURE 4 INTERACTION EFFECT ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE MICRO-INFLUENCER



FIGURE 5 INTERACTION EFFECT ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE MACRO-INFLUENCER

4.3.5 MEDIATOR ANALYSIS: SOURCE CREDIBILITY

Source credibility was the mediator between the dependent and independent variables. To determine whether the mediator analysis source credibility had an impact on the dependent variable consumer influencer engagement, a mediation analysis was conducted by means of a regression analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Darlington, 2016). For a mediator to be successful four steps need to be taken. The first step of the mediation model, the regression of type of influencer on consumer influencer engagement, was significant $b^* = 0.70$, t(249) =14.56, p = <.001. Step 2 showed that the regression type of influencer with the mediator, source credibility, was also significant $b^* = 0.70$, t(250) = 11.24, p = <.001. Next, step 3 of the mediation process showed that the mediator (source credibility) for consumer influencer engagement was significant $b^* = 0.25$, t(249) = 5.04, p = <.001. The final step, step 4, of the analysis revealed that, controlling the mediator (source credibility), the type of influencer was a significant predictor of consumer influencer engagement, $b^* = 0.59$, t(249) = 14.56, p = 14.56<.001. The mediation analysis showed that there was a partial mediation effect between type of influencer, consumer influencer engagement and source credibility. Because of the partial mediation, hypothesis H4 can be supported; the impact of type of influencer on consumer influencer engagement is partially mediated by source credibility. There is a partial mediation as the beta score decreased between the first and final step, while the Ttests showed the effects remain significant.



FIGURE 6 MEDIATION ANALYSIS

4.4 RESULTS HYPOTHESES

	Hypotheses	Results
H1a	Micro-influencers have a higher consumer influencer engagement than macro-influencers	Rejected
H1b	Micro-influencers have a higher evaluation of the influencer than macro-influencers	Rejected
H2a	A visible influencer leads to higher consumer influencer engagement than a non-visible influencer	Rejected
H2b	Social presence has a higher consumer influencer engagement when micro-influencers are shown instead of macro-influencers	Rejected
H2c	Social presence has a higher evaluation of the influencer when micro- influencers are shown instead of macro-influencers	Rejected
НЗа	A product congruence has a higher consumer influencer engagement when a visible influencer is shown instead of a non-visible influencer	Rejected
H3b	A product congruence has a higher consumer influencer engagement when macro-influencers are shown instead of micro-influencers	Rejected
Н3с	A product congruence has a higher evaluation of the influencer when macro-influencers are shown instead of micro-influencers	Rejected
H3d	A product congruence has a negative impact on micro-influencers instead of macro-influencers	Rejected
H4	The impact of the type of influencer (micro- or macro-influencer) on consumer influencer engagement is mediated by source credibility (trustworthiness, attractiveness, expertise)	Supported
Н5а	Micro-influencers are perceived as more credible than macro- influencers	Rejected
H5b	Micro-influencers are perceived as more trustworthy than macro- influencers	Rejected
Н5с	Micro-influencers are perceived more as an expert than macro- influencers	Rejected
H5d	Micro-influencers are perceived as more attractive than macro- influencers	Rejected

5. DISCUSSION

The goal of this study was to investigate if micro- or macro-influencers' social presence and product congruence had an influence on consumer influencer engagement with source credibility. In this chapter the results of this study were discussed in relation with supporting literature. The following paragraphs discuss the main findings, practical implications, and finally several suggestions for future research are presented.

5.1 MAIN FINDINGS

The main findings of this study are discussed in this paragraph. It appears that only one hypothesis is supported by this research paper. The impact of the type of influencer on consumer influencer engagement was partially mediated by source credibility. All the other hypotheses produced the opposite outcome while the literature state that micro-influencers should score higher because they are more intimate with their followers compared to macro-influencers. Further, the hypotheses about source credibility showed that the macro-influencer is perceived as more credible, more trustworthy, more attractive, and had more knowledge (expertise) than the micro-influencer which does not correspond with the cited hypotheses.

5.1.1 CONSUMER INFLUENCER ENGAGEMENT AND EVALUATION OF THE INFLUENCER The hypotheses stated that a micro-influencer had more influence on consumer influencer engagement and on the evaluation of the influencer than a macro-influencer. While the results of this study showed that the macro-influencer had more influence on consumer influencer engagement and on the evaluation of the influencer. The literature state that micro-influencers do have a greater engagement, and more interaction with their followers than macro-influencers (Barker, 2016; Barker, 2017; Christens, 2017). It was expected that micro-influencers scored higher than macro-influencers, because micro-influencers generate content in topics which interests their followers thus making their posts more effective and credible (Bernazzani, 2017; Chen, 2016). However, other studies confirm that consumers perceive more credibility in messages when the Instagram post has more likes (Hong & Cameron, 2018; Kim & Xu, 2019).

Literature based on social presence show that the effects of social presence are higher for micro-influencers than macro-influencers, because of the smaller number of followers. As research shows social presence has a more positive effect on micro-influencers than on

macro-influencers (Bernazzani, 2017; Chen, 2016; Dhanik, 2016). Micro-influencers have more in common with their followers than macro-influencers because they have fewer followers. With a smaller number of followers, micro-influencers are more inclined to show more about themselves, which leads to a higher social presence because they show themselves or the products they use. However, this study showed that macro-influencers score higher by social presence instead of micro-influencers.

A study by Pongpaew et al. (2017) confirm that consumers show more trust when they see something that they like. Another study by Bakhshi et al. (2014) conclude that the presence of a face in an image positively affects social engagement. This study confirmed that seeing the influencer (visible) scored better than seeing the products only (non-visible). However, this does not apply to consumer influencer engagement.

Product congruence showed that the congruent product overall scored higher than the incongruent product. Literature from the theoretical framework states that the effectiveness of a celebrity's advertisement is tied to the degree of the image fitting the product (Kamins, 1990; Kamins & Gupta, 1994). Which means that showing congruent products generates more influence on Instagram posts than incongruent products. However, Belanche et al. (2020) state that the user's intention to interact with influencers' accounts is not influenced by the fit or non-fit products posts. This study showed that a congruent product overall scored higher than showing an incongruent product.

5.1.2 SOURCE CREDIBILITY

In this study source credibility showed what followers thought of the influencer. Ohanian (1990) mentions that source credibility is often used to draw the attention to the influencer's positive characteristics that influence the consumer. According to Ohanian (1990) source credibility could be defined as the extent to which the audience perceived the source as knowledgeable and from whom the consumer can gain expertise in terms of product knowledge (Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017; Ohanian, 1990).

The literature shows that micro-influencers are perceived more credible than macroinfluencers because of their smaller number of followers and their intimate contact with their followers. While this study showed that the macro-influencer scored higher on all three constructs of source credibility, other studies state that having a large audience ensures a better reputation, and that a macro-influencer with more followers can be perceived as more credible than a micro-influencer with fewer followers (Chapple & Cownie, 2017).

This study examined the relation between source credibility, type of influencer and the dependent variable consumer influencer engagement. The outcome showed that the impact of type of influencer on consumer influencer engagement was partially mediated by source credibility. Which means that type of influencer, showing a micro- or macro-influencer, had an impact on consumer influencer engagement with source credibility.

5.1.3 ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS

This study showed that only one hypothesis is supported; however, the results provided some additional insights. Type of influencer produced the opposite effects because of the number of likes under the Instagram post, which other studies confirm (Hong & Cameron, 2018; Kim & Xu, 2019). Showing congruent products ensured higher engagement with a macro-influencer than with a micro-influencer; the same applied for incongruent products. Social presence in showing the influencer (visible) or showing products only (non-visible), the macro-influencer ensured higher engagement than the micro-influencer. However, H2A cannot be supported; an influencer (visible) scored better on the Instagram post regarding the products only (non-visible).

An interesting interaction effect was found between type of influencer, social presence, and product congruence on source credibility and attractiveness. Where the micro-influencer should use an incongruent product on their Instagram post, the macro-influencer should choose a congruent product on their Instagram post. The same applied for the interaction effect on attractiveness.

5.2 IMPLICATIONS

5.2.1 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The outcomes of these study can be used by marketers. Nowadays, almost all companies make use of social media. Not every company makes use of Instagram, even though it is an effective marketing tool to reach a large audience. This paragraph discusses how marketers could make use of Instagram and influencers.

For marketers it is important to select a macro-influencer because this study shows that the macro-influencer is more credible, earns more trust, has more knowledge (expertise) and is more attractive (for followers) than the micro-influencer. When marketers make use of a

macro-influencer, this influencer should show incongruent products according to this study. For example, a fashion macro-influencer showing food in an Instagram post. These Instagram posts should earn more engagement. For marketers, a macro-influencer could help strengthen their brand image and increase their brand awareness. An extra stimulus that can be implemented by companies is to use a macro-influencer, as said the influencer has a large audience and reaches a wide range of people the company normally would not reach by means of advertising alone.

This study showed that showing an influencer (visible) on an Instagram post does not automatically lead to a higher consumer influencer engagement. However, studies confirm that it is better to show the influencer behind the Instagram account to increase engagement (Bakhshi et al., 2014). People will follow the influencer if "it feels good". During the preliminary tests it appeared that participants chose the influencer that resembled their own identity, and about whom they felt good. Therefore, marketers should choose an influencer that resembles the identity of their audience, which will ensure a higher engagement with their followers.

5.3 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This research produced some important insights about social media influencers (micro- and macro-influencers). Instagram is an interesting social media platform, not only for influencers but also for companies, who can use influencers to promote their products. However, there is hardly any literature available about the influence of influencers on Instagram regarding social presence and product congruence. Various limitations and future research possibilities came to mind during this study.

An important limitation is that this study only looked at one social media platform: Instagram. Nowadays, there are many social media platforms that are also used by social media influencers, and these could be interesting for scrutiny in further research. Another limitation is that almost half of all the participants did not complete the questionnaire; this could have impacted the results. For future research it would be good to mention, for example, that the image will appear again. This time the image was shown in the beginning of the questionnaire and a second time in between questions. However, this appeared to be confusing as a lot of participants stopped filling out the questionnaire when they did not see an image before they started answering the questions. Furthermore, the results of this study are only applicable to healthy food influencers because this study only used the product category "healthy food". For future research it would be interesting to use more product categories to determine if there is still a noticeable difference between congruent and incongruent products; for example, for fashion or interior design influencers. Is the gap just as large as with the healthy food influencer? These influencers could have more variety in their Instagram feed and people may not notice a big difference when a congruent or incongruent product is visible. For example, do followers notice a difference when the influencer shows interior images that fit the identity (congruent) and/or showing interior design images that do not fit the identity (incongruent).

In this study participants were only confronted with a screenshot of an influencer and were not able to have a look at the Instagram account to see what else was posted on the account. For future research it would be interesting to provide the participants with the option to look around on the Instagram account to get a realistic feeling of the influencer. Do people take another look at the influencer when they can see the entire Instagram feed, and will their opinions change when seeing one Instagram post or when seeing the entire Instagram feed.

More, it could be interesting to ascertain if followers behave differently when only the influencer is shown or when the influencer also shares more about their private life. In short, will there be a marked difference when the influencer shares more than only one passion? It could be interesting to conduct this research via a focus group and show the influencer's Instagram account who shares his or her passion only, to several groups, and show the other groups images of the influencer's private life only. Which group feels more connected with the influencer and why? What triggers them to follow the respective influencers?

5.4 CONCLUSION

To what extent do the type of influencer, social presence and product congruence have an influence on consumer influencer engagement, and what is the role of source credibility?

This study showed that it is important to choose the right type of influencer in order to generate consumer influencer engagement. Therefore, this study demonstrated that there was a difference in showing a micro-influencer or a macro-influencer; the macro-influencer appears to be the better choice.

Moreover, social presence is an important factor for influencers. Participants would like to see the influencer (visible) instead of products only (non-visible). The product congruence in this study showed that a macro-influencer should choose for a congruent product. However, the interaction effects on source credibility and attractiveness showed the opposite; the macro-influencer should use an incongruent product whereas the micro-influencer should use a congruent product on their Instagram feed.

REFERENCES

- Bakhshi, S., Shamma, D. A., & Gilbert, E. (2014). Faces engage us. Proceedings of the 32nd annual ACM conference on Human factors in computing systems - CHI '14, 965–974. <u>https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557403</u>
- Barker, S. (2016). *Micro vs Macro: how to get the most bang for your bucks with influencer marketing.* Retrieved from <u>https://medium.com/@shane_barker/micro-vs-macro-</u> <u>how-to-get-the-most-bang-for-yourbuck-with-influencer-marketing-e0848b6c0688</u>.
- Barker, S. (2017, 31 January). Why is influencer marketing better than celebrity endorsements? Retrieved from <u>https://shanebarker.com/blog/influencer-marketing-</u>celebrity-endorsements/.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal* of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173–1182. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173</u>
- Belanche, D., Flavián, M., & Ibáñez-Sánchez, S. (2020). Followers' reactions to influencers' Instagram posts. Spanish Journal of Marketing - ESIC, 24(1), 37–54. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/sjme-11-2019-0100</u>
- Beldad, A., de Jong, M., & Steehouder, M. (2010). How shall I trust the faceless and the intangible? A literature review on the antecedents of online trust. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), 857–869. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.03.013</u>
- Bennett, S. (2014, April 25). *Social Media Business Statistics, Facts, Figures & Trends 2014*. Retrieved from <u>http://www.adweek.com/digital/social-business-trends-2014/</u>
- Bernazzani, S. (2017, 7 March). *Micro-influencer marketing: a comprehensive guide*. Retrieved from <u>https://blog.hubspot.com/marketing/microinfluencer-</u> <u>marketing#sm.001wli6fibrteev10vg29xl05nazc</u>
- Bijen, Y. (2017). #AD: The effects of an influencer, comments and product combination on brand image (Thesis). University of Twente
- Biocca, F., Harms, C., & Burgoon, J. K. (2003). Toward a More Robust Theory and Measure of Social Presence: Review and Suggested Criteria. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 12(5), 456–480. <u>https://doi.org/10.1162/105474603322761270</u>
- Blight, M. G., Ruppel, E. K., & Schoenbauer, K. V. (2017). Sense of Community on Twitter and Instagram: Exploring the Roles of Motives and Parasocial Relationships. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 20*(5), 314–319. <u>https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2016.0505</u>

- Boerman, S. C. (2020). The effects of the standardized instagram disclosure for micro- and meso-influencers. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *103*, 199–207. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.09.015</u>
- Borza, E. (2017, June 8). How three brands found success with micro-influencers. PR News Online. Retrieved from <u>http://www.prnewsonline.com/how-three-brands-found-</u> <u>success-with-microinfluencers/</u>
- Bowden, J. L.-H. (2009). The Process of Customer Engagement: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *17*(1), 63–74. <u>https://doi.org/10.2753/mtp1069-6679170105</u>
- Braatz, L.A. (2017). Influencer Marketing on Instagram (Thesis). University of Twente
- Briñol, P., & Petty, R. E. (2009). Source factors in persuasion: A self-validation approach. European Review of Social Psychology, 20(1), 49–96. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280802643640</u>
- Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Jurić, B., & Ilić, A. (2011). Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research. *Journal of Service Research*, *14*(3), 252–271. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511411703</u>
- Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 105–114. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.029</u>
- Browne, D., & Fiorella, S. (2013). *Influence marketing: how to create, manage and measure brand influencers in social media marketing*. Indiana: Que
- Chapple, C. & Cownie, F. (2017). An Investigation into Viewers' Trust in and Response Towards Disclosed Paid-for-Endorsements by YouTube Lifestyle Vloggers. *Journal of Promotional Communications, 5*(2), 110-136
- Chen, H. (2017). College-Aged Young Consumers' Perceptions of Social Media Marketing: The Story of Instagram. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 39(1), 22– 36. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.2017.1372321</u>
- Chen, Y. (2016, 27 April). *The rise of 'micro-influencers' on Instagram*. Retrieved from <u>https://digiday.com/marketing/micro-influencers/</u>.
- Christens, N. (2017). *DE IMPACT VAN HET TYPE INFLUENCER OP CONSUMENTENPERCEPTIES* (Thesis). Faculteit Economie en Bedrijfskunde, Universiteit Gent
- Dada, G. A. (2017, November 14). What Is Influencer Marketing And How Can Marketers Use It Effectively? Retrieved from

<u>https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescommunicationscouncil/2017/11/14/what-is-influencermarketing-and-how-can-marketers-use-it-effectively/#19996dd223d1</u>

- Darlington, R.B., & Hassey, A.F. (2016). Regression Analysis and Linear Models Concepts, Applications, and Implementation. Guilford Publications. (United Kingdom)
- Data Reportal. (2020). *Global Social Media Overview*. Retrieved from <u>https://datareportal.com/social-media-users</u>
- Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2015). Consumer engagement in online brand communities: a social media perspective. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 24(1), 28–42. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/jpbm-06-2014-0635</u>
- Dhanik, T. (2016). *Micro, not macro: Rethinking influencer marketing*. Retrieved from <u>https://adage.com/article/digitalnext/micro-macro-influencer-marketing-kim-kardashian/307118</u>
- Djafarova, E., & Rushworth, C. (2017). Exploring the credibility of online celebrities' Instagram profiles in influencing the purchase decisions of young female users. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 68, 1–7. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.11.009</u>
- Domingues Aguiar, T., & Van Reijmersdal, E. A. (2018). Influencer marketing. SWOCC 76. (Amsterdam, The Netherlands).
- Doorn, J. van. (2011). Comment: Customer Engagement. *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 280–282. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511414585
- Erdogan, B. Z. (1999). Celebrity Endorsement: A Literature Review. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *15*(4), 291–314. https://doi.org/10.1362/026725799784870379
- Fink, J. S., Cunningham, G. B., & Kensicki, L. J. (2004). Using Athletes as Endorsers to Sell Women's Sport: Attractiveness vs. Expertise. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18(4), 350–367. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.18.4.350
- Forkan, J. (1980). Product Matchup Key to Effective Star Presentations. *Advertising Age*, *51*(6), 42.
- Gefen, D., & Straub, D. W. (1997). Gender Differences in the Perception and Use of E-Mail: An Extension to the Technology Acceptance Model. *MIS Quarterly*, *21*(4), 389-400.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/249720</u>
- Harmon, R. R., & Coney, K. A. (1982). The Persuasive Effects of Source Credibility in Buy and Lease Situations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(2), 255. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/3151625</u>
- Hassanein, K., & Head, M. (2005). The Impact of Infusing Social Presence in the Web Interface: An Investigation Across Product Types. International Journal of Electronic Commerce, 10(2), 31–55. <u>https://doi.org/10.2753/jec1086-4415100202</u>

Hassanein, K., & Head, M. (2007). Manipulating social presence through the web interface and its impact on attitude towards online shopping. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies, 65*(8), 689-708

Hatton, G. (2018). Micro influencers vs macro influencers. Retrieved from <u>https://www.socialmediatoday.com/news/micro-influencersvs-macro-influencers/516896</u>

- Hollebeek, L. D. (2011). Demystifying customer brand engagement: Exploring the loyalty nexus. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *27*(7–8), 785–807. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257x.2010.500132</u>
- Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer Brand Engagement in Social Media: Conceptualization, Scale Development and Validation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28(2), 149–165. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002</u>
- Hong, S., & Cameron, G. T. (2017). Will comments change your opinion? The persuasion effects of online comments and heuristic cues in crisis communication. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, *26*(1), 173–182. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12215
- Ilicic, J., & Webster, C. M. (2016). Being True to Oneself: Investigating Celebrity Brand Authenticity. *Psychology & Marketing*, 33(6), 410–420. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20887</u>
- Izea Worldwide. Inc. (2018). *Influencer Marketer's Guide to Micro-influencer Marketing*. Retrieved from <u>https://izea.com/2017/06/14/micro-influencer-marketing-guide/</u>
- Jin, S., Muqaddam, A., & Ryu, E. (2019). "Instafamous and social media influencer marketing". *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 37*(5), 567-579. https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-09-2018-0375
- Kamins, M. A. (1990). An Investigation into the "Match-up" Hypothesis in Celebrity Advertising: When Beauty May Be Only Skin Deep. *Journal of Advertising*, 19(1), 4–13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1990.10673175</u>
- Kamins, M. A., & Gupta, K., (1994), "Congruence between spokesperson and product type: A matchup hypothesis perspective", *Psychology & Marketing*, *11*(6), 569-586
- Kamins, M. A., Brand, M. J., Hoeke, S. A., & Moe, J. C. (1989). Two-Sided versus One-Sided Celebrity Endorsements: The Impact on Advertising Effectiveness and Credibility. Journal of Advertising, 18(2), 4–10.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1989.10673146
- Kang, S.-H., & Gratch, J. (2014). Exploring users' social responses to computer counseling interviewers' behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 34, 120–130. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.01.006</u>

- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59–68. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003</u>
- Karahanna, E., & Straub, D. W. (1999). The psychological origins of perceived usefulness and ease-of-use. *Information & Management*, 35(4), 237–250. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-7206(98)00096-2</u>
- Kemp, S. (2020, 4 februari). *Digital 2020: 3.8 billion people use social media*. Retrieved from <u>https://wearesocial.com/blog/2020/01/digital-2020-3-8-billion-people-use-social-</u> <u>media</u>
- Kim, H., & Xu, H. (2019). Exploring the effects of social media features on the publics' responses to decreased usage CSR messages. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 24(2), 287–302. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/ccij-10-2017-0095</u>
- Kumar, N., & Benbasat, I. (2002). Para-Social Presence and Communication Capabilities of a Web Site: A Theoretical Perspective. *e-Service Journal*, 1(3), 5. <u>https://doi.org/10.2979/esj.2002.1.3.5</u>
- Kumar, V., Aksoy, L., Donkers, B., Venkatesan, R., Wiesel, T., & Tillmanns, S. (2010). Undervalued or Overvalued Customers: Capturing Total Customer Engagement Value. *Journal of Service Research*, *13*(3), 297–310. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375602</u>
- Kuster, E. (2017). *Social influencers: examining source credibility and homophily on Instagram* (Thesis). University of Twente
- Kusumasondjaja, S., & Tjiptono, F. (2019). Endorsement and visual complexity in food advertising on Instagram. *Internet Research*, 29(4), 659–687. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/intr-11-2017-0459</u>
- Labrecque, L. I. (2014). Fostering Consumer–Brand Relationships in Social Media Environments: The Role of Parasocial Interaction. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *28*(2), 134–148. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.003</u>
- Lafferty, B. A., Goldsmith, R. E., & Newell, S. J. (2002b). The Dual Credibility Model: The Influence of Corporate and Endorser Credibility on Attitudes and Purchase Intentions. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *10*(3), 1–11. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2002.11501916</u>
- Libai, B. (2011). Comment: The Perils of Focusing on Highly Engaged Customers. *Journal of* Service Research, 14(3), 275–276. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511414583</u>
- Lowenthal, P.R. (2003). *Social presence: what is it? How do we measure it?* (Thesis). University of Colorado Denver
- Lu, L.-C., Chang, W.-P., & Chang, H.-H. (2014). Consumer attitudes toward blogger's sponsored recommendations and purchase intention: The effect of sponsorship type,

product type, and brand awareness. *Computers in Human Behavior, 34*, 258–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.02.007

- McCabe, D.B. (2001). Online and offline decisions: The effect of product category and order of information (Thesis). Arizona State University
- Mediakix Press Release (2016). *What are Micro-Influencers: Definitions, trends & advantages* Retrieved from: <u>http://mediakix.com/2016/06/micro-influencers-definition-</u> <u>marketing/</u>
- Menezes, R.C. (2013). Advantages of strong brands on customer reach and customer engagement on social media marketing (Thesis). Erasmus University, Rotterdam
- Miles, J.G. (2014). *Instagram power. Build your brand and reach more customers with the power of pictures*. McGraw-Hill Education, New York: NY.
- Misra, S., & Beatty, S. E. (1990). Celebrity spokesperson and brand congruence. *Journal of Business Research*, 21(2), 159–173. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(90)90050-n</u>
- Neher, K. (2013). Social media marketing. Harnessing images, Instagram, Infographics and Pinterest to grow your business online. Boot Camp Publishing, Cincinnati: OH.
- Nelson-Field, K., & Taylor, J. (2012). Facebook fans: A fan for life? Admap, 25-27
- Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Celebrity Endorsers' Perceived Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Attractiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, *19*(3), 39–52. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1990.10673191</u>
- Pongpaew, W., Speece, M., & Tiangsoongnern, L. (2017). Social presence and customer brand engagement on Facebook brand pages. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 26(3), 262–281. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/jpbm-08-2015-0956</u>
- Pornpitakpan, C. (2004). The Effect of Celebrity Endorsers' Perceived Credibility on Product Purchase Intention. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, *16*(2), 55–74. <u>https://doi.org/10.1300/j046v16n02_04</u>

Revell, D. (2017). The difference between micro, macro and mega influencers. We are Anthology. Retrieved from <u>http://weareanthology.com/we-are-anthology-</u> <u>digitalinfluencer-and-social-media-marketing-blog/2017/4/26/the-difference-</u> <u>betweenmicro-macro-and-celebrity-influencers</u>

- RICE, R. E. (1993). Media Appropriateness. *Human Communication Research*, *19*(4), 451–484. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1993.tb00309.x</u>
- Robert, L., & Dennis, A. R. (2005). Paradox of Richness: A Cognitive Model of Media Choice. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 48(1), 10–21. <u>https://doi.org/10.1109/tpc.2004.843292</u>

- Rossiter, J. R., & Smidts, A. (2012). Print advertising: Celebrity presenters. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(6), 874–879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.01.010
- Scott, G. G. (2014). More Than Friends: Popularity on Facebook and its Role in Impression Formation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *19*(3), 358–372. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12067</u>
- Shen, J. (2012). "Social comparison, social presence, and enjoyment in the acceptance of social shopping websites". *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 13(3), 198-212.
- Siriaraya, P., & Siang Ang, C. (2012). Age differences in the perception of social presence in the use of 3D virtual world for social interaction. *Interacting with Computers*, 24(4), 280–291. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intcom.2012.03.003</u>
- Sztompka, P. (1999). Trust: a sociological theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tafesse, W. (2016). An experiential model of consumer engagement in social media. *Journal* of Product & Brand Management, 25(5), 424–434. https://doi.org/10.1108/jpbm-05-2015-0879
- Tashakova, O. (2016). Why micro-influencers matter most. Retrieved from http://www.khaleejtimes.com/business/local/why-micro-influencers-matter-most
- Teng, S., Wei Khong, K., Wei Goh, W., & Yee Loong Chong, A. (2014). Examining the antecedents of persuasive eWOM messages in social media. *Online Information Review*, 38(6), 746–768. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/oir-04-2014-0089</u>
- Till, B. D., & Busler, M. (2000). The Match-Up Hypothesis: Physical Attractiveness, Expertise, and the Role of Fit on Brand Attitude, Purchase Intent and Brand Beliefs. *Journal of Advertising*, 29(3), 1–13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2000.10673613</u>
- Tolij, F. van (2018). By whom do you like to be #influenced? (Thesis). University of Twente
- Van der Waldt, D., M van Loggerenberg, M., & Wehmeyer, L. (2011). Celebrity endorsements versus created spokespersons in advertising: a survey among students. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 12(1), 100–114. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v12i1.263
- van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). Customer Engagement Behavior: Theoretical Foundations and Research Directions. *Journal of Service Research*, *13*(3), 253–266. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375599</u>
- van Noort, G., Voorveld, H. A. M., & van Reijmersdal, E. A. (2012). Interactivity in Brand Web Sites: Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Responses Explained by Consumers' Online Flow Experience. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(4), 223–234. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2011.11.002</u>

- Verhagen, T., van Nes, J., Feldberg, F., & van Dolen, W. (2014). Virtual Customer Service Agents: Using Social Presence and Personalization to Shape Online Service Encounters. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(3), 529–545. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12066</u>
- Vinerean, S. and Opreana, A., 2019. Social Media Marketing Efforts of Luxury Brands on Instagram. *Expert Journal of Marketing*, 7(2), pp.144-152.
- Virtanen, H., Björk, P., & Sjöström, E. (2017). Follow for follow: marketing of a start-up company on Instagram. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 24(3), 468–484. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/jsbed-12-2016-0202</u>
- Vivek, S. D., Beatty, S. E., & Morgan, R. M. (2012). Customer Engagement: Exploring Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 20(2), 122–146. <u>https://doi.org/10.2753/mtp1069-6679200201</u>
- Wang, S. W., Kao, G. H.-Y., & Ngamsiriudom, W. (2017). Consumers' attitude of endorser credibility, brand and intention with respect to celebrity endorsement of the airline sector. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 60, 10–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2016.12.007
- Weisberg, J., Te'eni, D., & Arman, L. (2011). Past purchase and intention to purchase in ecommerce. Internet Research, 21(1), 82–96. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241111104893</u>
- Woods, S. (2016). *#Sponsored: The emergence of Influencer Marketing* (Thesis). University of Tennessee
- Zietek, N. (2016). *Influencer Marketing the characteristics and components of fashion influencer marketing* (Thesis). University of Boras
- Zulli, D. (2017). Capitalizing on the look: insights into the glance, attention economy, and Instagram. Critical Studies in Media Communication, 35(2), 137–150. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2017.1394582</u>

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1: PRE-TEST

De verschillende afbeeldingen van de wel of niet matchende producten, worden op het einde naast elkaar vertoond om te kijken of het duidelijk is dat er onderscheid zit en wat wel en niet bij de influencer past.

De pre-test zal beginnen met een introductie waar ik zal uitleggen wat het doel is van deze sessie.

Bedankt dat je wil deelnemen aan mijn onderzoek. Voor de Universiteit van Twente doe ik onderzoek naar het verschil in micro- en macro-influencers op Instagram in Nederland. Bij deze korte test zal ik verschillende afbeeldingen laten zien en je vragen wat je ziet en wat je als eerste is opgevallen aan de afbeeldingen. Geef ook gerust aan als je vind dat er iets anders moet aan de afbeeldingen. Dit alles zal helpen om mijn latere onderzoek beter uit te kunnen voeren.

Er volgen nu enkele afbeeldingen op je scherm. Kijk hier goed naar, na 30 seconden verdwijnen de afbeeldingen weer van je scherm.



Je hebt nu de afbeeldingen van de influencer gezien, wat zijn de <u>eerste steekwoorden</u> die in je opkomen na het zien van deze afbeeldingen.



Je krijgt nu opnieuw enkele afbeeldingen te zien op je scherm. Kijk hier goed naar, na 30 seconden verdwijnen de afbeeldingen weer van je scherm.



Je hebt nu alle afbeeldingen van de producten gezien, wat zijn de <u>eerste steekwoorden</u> die in je opkomen na het zien van deze afbeeldingen.

Naast deze afbeeldingen laat ik je nu nog wat extra afbeeldingen zien omtrent eten. Welke afbeelding zie het liefste terug op Instagram, vind je het meest aantrekkelijk?



De afbeeldingen van de influencer worden nu kort weer naast elkaar getoond, kijk goed en onthoud wat je hebt gezien. Na 30 seconden haal ik de afbeeldingen weg en stel ik je een paar vragen over de afbeeldingen die je net hebt gezien.

Social presence:

- Wat is jou gevoel bij het zien van deze influencer?
- Heb jij het idee dat je veel gemeen hebt met deze influencer?
- Hoe dichtbij staat deze influencer bij jou?
- Vind je dat deze influencer trouw aan zichzelf blijft?
- Heb je het gevoel in dezelfde levensfase als de influencer te zitten? En waarom?
- Hoe denk je over de identiteit van deze influencer? Houdt deze influencer zich aan haar identiteit?
- De influencer laat duidelijk zien wat haar passie is?
- De influencer spreekt mij aan
- Heb je het idee een verbonden gevoel te krijgen bij deze influencer?
- Vind je dat de influencer producten laat zien die bij haar identiteit passen?

De afbeeldingen van de producten worden nu kort weer naast elkaar getoond, kijk goed en onthoud wat je hebt gezien. Na 30 seconden haal ik de afbeeldingen weg en stel ik je een paar vragen over de afbeeldingen die je net hebt gezien.

Product match-up:

- Wat voor connectie zie je tussen de influencer en de post? Waarom wel/niet?
- Zie je een connectie tussen de influencer en de producten die gebruikt worden? Waarom wel/niet?
- Wat vind jij van de match tussen de producten en de influencer? Vind jij dit een goede match? Waarom wel/niet?
- Wat voor relatie zie jij tussen de influencer en de producten die gebruikt worden?
- Wat vind jij van de producten die de influencer gebruikt?

Zijn er nog bepaalde opmerkingen die je graag met mij wil delen na het zien en beantwoorden van alle vragen?

APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE

Voor mijn masteropleiding Digital Marketing Communication aan de Universiteit van Twente doe ik onderzoek naar influencers op Instagram in Nederland. U zou mij heel erg helpen als u een paar minuten de tijd wil nemen om deze vragenlijst in te vullen, dit kost ongeveer 5 tot 10 minuten van uw tijd.

Het onderzoek is volledig vertrouwelijk en de gegevens zullen anoniem worden verwerkt. U hebt ten alle tijden het recht om uw deelname aan het onderzoek te beëindigen.

Mocht u vragen hebben naar aanleiding van de vragenlijst dan kan u contact opnemen met mij, Anouk Klijnsma (a.l.klijnsma@student.utwente.nl). Heel erg bedankt voor uw deelname.

Door onderstaand 'akkoord' te geven, gaat u akkoord met deelname aan deze vragenlijst.

Akkoord

O Niet akkoord

Eerst volgen hier enkele algemene vragen over uw Instagram gebruik.

Maakt u gebruik van Instagram?

🔾 Ja

O Nee

Skip To: End of Survey If Maakt u gebruik van Instagram? = Nee

Hoe lang maakt u al gebruik van Instagram

Korter dan 1 jaar
1 tot 2 jaar
3 tot 4 jaar
Langer dan 4 jaar

Hoe vaak maakt u gebruik van Instagram?

O Meerdere malen per dag
○ Dagelijks
○ Een paar keer per week
○ Wekelijks
O Maandelijks
O Minder, namelijk
volgende vragen gaan ever influencers en Instagram. Met influencer wordt in deze

De volgende vragen gaan over influencers op Instagram. Met influencer wordt in deze vragenlijst een persoon bedoelt die foto's verspreidt om mensen te inspireren.

Volgt u verschillende influencers op Instagram?

🔾 Ja

○ Nee

Skip To: End of Block If Volgt u verschillende influencers op Instagram? = Nee

Wat voor type influencers volgt u op Instagram? (Meerdere antwoorden mogelijk)

Fashion influencers
Food influencers
Make-up influencers
Sport influencers
Interior influencers
Celebrities
Anders, namelijk

Waarom volgt u deze influencer(s) op Instagram? Geef maximaal drie steekwoorden

○ Steekwoord

○ Steekwoord

○ Steekwoord

Er volgt nu een afbeelding van een Instagram post van een influencer, kijkt u goed naar de afbeelding van boven naar beneden en beantwoord vervolgens de stellingen.

Geef naar aanleiding van de afbeelding die u gezien heeft aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Enigzins mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De post van de influencer heeft veel likes	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Ik zie een connectie tussen mij en de influencer	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
De influencer is uniek	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer past bij mijn identiteit	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer komt spontaan over	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer staat dicht bij mij	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Geef naar aanleiding van de afbeelding die u gezien heeft aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Enigzins mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De influencer is duidelijk zichtbaar op de post	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	\bigcirc
lk voel mij comfortabel bij het zien van deze post van deze influencer	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0	\bigcirc
lk heb veel gemeen met deze influencer	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
De influencer en ik zitten in dezelfde levensfase	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0
De influencer blijft trouw aan zichzelf	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer blijft bij haar eigen identiteit	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer toont haar passie	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer richt zich op healthy food	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Enigzins mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De influencer spreekt mij aan	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
lk voel mij verbonden met deze influencer	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer laat producten zien die bij haar identiteit passen	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer voldoet aan mijn verwachtingen	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer laat duidelijk het doel van haar account zien	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer komt voldoende naar voren op de post	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Het is duidelijk wie de influencer is van deze post	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Ik zie een match tussen de influencer en het Instagramaccount	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
De post laat duidelijk zien wie er achter het Instagramaccount zit	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Geef naar aanleiding van de afbeelding die u gezien heeft aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen. (Wanneer gesproken wordt over 'influencer' gaat het over de naam van het Instagramaccount)

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Enigzins mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik zie een connectie tussen de influencer en de post	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ik zie een connectie tussen de influencer en de producten die gebruikt worden	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc
Ik zie een match tussen de influencer en de producten	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer en de producten zijn een goede match	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Ik zie een relatie tussen de influencer en de producten die gebruikt worden	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc
Ik vind de producten bij de influencer passen	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer blijft trouw aan de producten die gebruikt worden	0	0	\bigcirc	0	0	\bigcirc	0

Geef naar aanleiding van de afbeelding aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Enigzins mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal eens (7)
De influencer is betrouwbaar	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	0
De influencer is oprecht	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer is eerlijk	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer is geloofwaardig	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Geef naar aanleiding van de afbeelding aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Enigzins mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal eens (7)
De influencer komt op mij over als een expert in haar vakgebied	0	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc
De influencer komt op mij over als een professional	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc
De influencer komt op mij over als deskundig	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Geef naar aanleiding van de afbeelding aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met de volgende stellingen.

	Helemaal oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Enigzins mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Enigzins mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal eens (7)
De influencer is aantrekkelijk	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer is stijlvol	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer komt oprecht over	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
De influencer is bekwaam	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Wat is uw geslacht

O Man

○ Vrouw

O Zeg ik liever niet

Wat is uw leeftijd?

Wat is uw hoogst behaalde opleiding?

О УМВО

- ◯ HAVO
- vwo
- О мво
- 🔾 нво
- ⊖ wo

APPENDIX 3: FACTOR ANALYSIS

TABLE 11

ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX

Items		Components			
	1	2	3	4	
The influencer is sufficiently on the post	.89				
The influencer is clearly visible on the post	.89				
It is clear who the influencer of this post is	.88				
The post clearly shows who the influencer is behind the Instagram account	.83				
I see a match between the influencer and the Instagram account	.58				
The influencer meets my expectations		.82			
The influencer clearly shows her purpose of her account		.79			
The influencer shows products that fits her identity		.76			
The influencer focuses on healthy food		.60			
The influencer shows her passion		.55			
The influencer suits me			.83		
I feel connected with this influencer			.83		
I have a lot in common with this influencer			.81		
The influencer and I are in the same stage of life			.61		
I feel comfortable by seeing this post of this influencer			.47		
The influencer stays true to her identity				.85	
The influencer stays true to herself				.83	