

FACEBOOK USERS' EXPERIENCE AND  
ATTITUDE TOWARD FACEBOOK ADS

By

XUEYING ZHANG

Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics

Beijing Foreign Studies University

Beijing, China

2005

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
May, 2013

FACEBOOK USERS' EXPERIENCE AND  
ATTITUDE TOWARD FACEBOOK ADS

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Derina Holtzhausen

---

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Joey Senat

---

Dr. Kenneth Eun Han Kim

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

( Acknowledgements reflect the views of the author and are not endorsed by committee members or Oklahoma State University. )

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Derina Holtzhausen, for the continuous support of my graduate study and research, for her valuable time, motivation, enthusiasm and immense knowledge. Her guidance helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. I could not have imagined having a better mentor for my master study.

I would also like to thank the rest of my thesis committee: Dr. Joey Senat and Dr. Ken Kim for their encouragement, insightful comments and hard questions. My sincere thanks also go to Dr. Stan Ketterer and Dr. Cynthia Nichols. Dr. Ketterer's statistical expertise has aided me to present empirical data to support research hypotheses. Dr. Nichols's detailed effort has enlightened me of data entry using SPSS software.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Joey Senat, Dr. Ken Kim, Professor Mike Sowell, Dr. Cynthia Nichols, Professor Juliana Nykolaiszyn and her husband and Dr. Tieming Liu and Dr. Zhenyu Kong in Industrial Engineering department for use of their class time to administer the surveys. I appreciate the participating students' time and effort in filling out the questionnaire, this study would not be possible without their assistance.

Lastly, I wish to thank my mom, for giving birth to me at the first place and supporting me spiritually throughout my life. It is to her I dedicate this work.

Name: XUEYING ZHANG

Date of Degree: MAY, 2013

Title of Study: FACEBOOK USERS' EXPERIENCE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD  
FACEBOOK ADS

Major Field: MASS COMMUNICATION

Abstract:

As Facebook is gaining power as an advertising vehicle, it is crucial for both Facebook and advertisers to understand users' Facebook experience. Based on media context effect studies and media uses and gratification theory, this research proposes and empirically tests the relationship between users' Facebook experience and their attitude toward ads (Aad). Three Facebook experience factors and five Aad factors are generated. Most of the experience factors are highly and significantly correlated with users' Aad factors, however, the empowerment experience is shown to have a stronger association with Aad than the other two experience factors. The individual factors of gender and online shopping time's effect on Aad are also tested but only minor associations are found. Implications for Facebook and advertisers were then posited and discussed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Chapter  | Page |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION.....   | 1    |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....  | 5    |
| Advertising hierarchy of effects model and attitude toward ads ..... | 5    |
| Media context effect and media engagement as antecedents of Aad..... | 8    |
| Defining users' Experience with Facebook .....                       | 14   |
| Conceptualizing advertising on Facebook .....                        | 15   |
| Individual difference factors .....                                  | 19   |
| Hypotheses and research questions.....                               | 21   |
| III. METHODOLOGY .....   | 24   |
| Sampling .....   | 24   |
| Measures .....   | 25   |
| Users' experience with Facebook .....                                | 25   |
| Facebook users' attitude toward the ads .....                        | 28   |
| Statistical Analysis.....  | 28   |

| Chapter  | Page |
|--|------|
| IV. FINDINGS.....  | 32   |
| Characteristics of respondents .....                                     | 32   |
| Factor analysis of Facebook experience .....                             | 34   |
| Factor analysis with Facebook users' attitude towards ads .....          | 37   |
| T-test .....   | 41   |
| Regression tests.....  | 42   |
| V. CONCLUSION.....   | 61   |
| Discussion.....  | 61   |
| RQ1: What are the underlying factors of users' Facebook experiences..... | 63   |
| H1: Users' experience with Facebook differs by gender.....               | 65   |
| RQ2: What are the underlying factors of users Aad. ....                  | 65   |
| H2: Users Facebook experiences are related to attitude toward ads.....   | 66   |
| Implications.....  | 70   |
| Limitation & Future research.....  | 72   |
| REFERENCES .....   | 74   |
| APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENTS.....   | 83   |
| Figure A1: Survey Consent.....   | 83   |
| Figure A2: Questionnaire.....  | 84   |
| APPENDIX B: IRB DOCUMENTATION .....                                      | 91   |
| Figure B1: Application Approval.....                                     | 91   |
| Figure B2: Approved Script for Introduction of Survey.....               | 92   |
| Figure B3: Approved Consent Document .....                               | 93   |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table   | Page |
|---|------|
| 3.1 Facebook Experience Measures.....   | 27   |
| 4.1 Sample Demographics .....   | 32   |
| 4.2 Factor Analysis of Facebook experience .....  | 35   |
| 4.3 Factor Analysis of Attitude toward ads .....  | 39   |
| 4.4.1 T-test Comparing Gender by Facebook experience—Empowerment .....  | 41   |
| 4.4.2 T-test Comparing Gender by Facebook experience—Community-self-worth.....  | 41   |
| 4.4.3 T-test Comparing Gender by Facebook experience—Social participation .....   | 42   |
| 4.5 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Facebook Experience and Attitude toward ads .....                              | 43   |
| 4.6.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Click-forward and Facebook experiences .....                   | 46   |
| 4.6.2 Sequential Regression for Click-forward and Facebook Experiences.....   | 47   |
| 4.7.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Attention-interest and Facebook experiences .....              | 49   |
| 4.7.2 Sequential Regression for Attention-interest and Facebook Experiences .....                                       | 50   |
| 4.8.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Perceived ads Value for Facebook and Facebook Experience ..... | 52   |
| 4.8.2 Sequential Regression Statistics for Perceived ads Value for Facebook and Facebook Experience.....                | 53   |
| 4.9.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Ads Avoidance and Facebook Experience .....                    | 54   |
| 4.9.2 Sequential Regression for ads Avoidance and Facebook experience .....   | 55   |
| 4.10.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Friend Forwarded ads Avoidance and Facebook experience.....   | 56   |
| 4.10.2 Sequential Regression for Friend Forwarded Ads Avoidance and Facebook Experience .....                           | 57   |
| 4.11 Person Correlation Coefficients for Facebook Experience and Attitude toward Ads Variables.....                     | 58   |
| 4.12 Regression R <sup>2</sup> Change on Attitude toward Ads .....  | 5    |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Social Networking Sites (SNS) have become an important online destination among internet users over the last decade. comScore Data Mine (2012) reported that in October 2011 Social Networking Sites ranked as the most popular content category in World Wide Web engagement, accounting for 19 percent of all time spent online. Nearly 1 in every 5 minutes spent online is now spent on SNSs, which represents a stark contrast from when the category accounted for only 6 percent of time spent online in March 2007. Among the most popular SNSs is Facebook, which claimed to have 955 million monthly active users at the end of June 2012 (Facebook.com). Along with building their public profiles and establishing connections with others in their social network (Boyd & Ellison, 2007), Facebook users derive a variety of uses and gratifications from social networking sites and develop “stickiness” of the site (Joinson, 2007, p.1035).

Ever since the penny press newspaper was introduced in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, media companies have been operating on advertising revenue. SNSs are no exception to this business model. By providing an arena for people to interact with one another, SNSs



seem to display a greater deal of potential for business to reach their target audiences (Todi, 2008). The momentum of SNS has given rise to the broad anticipation of using it as a marketing tool, such as turning it into a new destination of online shopping and perfect place for advertising. However, doubts have been cast on both options. Last year, several pioneers such as Gap Inc., J.C. Penny (JCP) Co. and Nordstrom (JWN) Inc., have opened and closed storefronts on Facebook (Lutz, 2012). Skepticism about effectiveness of advertising on Facebook is also prevailing. Paralleled with the General Motors' withdrawal of \$ 10 million annual ad spending on Facebook is the fact that the click-through rates for Facebook ads are as tiny as .05%. Facebook seems to be facing a problem serving as advertising platform and analysts do not view this conundrum to be surprising. "People on Facebook use it to communicate with friends and family, while happily ignoring the ads that Facebook runs along the side of the page" (Evans, 2012, para.4). The skeptical argument about advertising on Facebook also goes to Facebook pages brands create, since "many 'likes' simply have to do with contests and giveaways as opposed to consumers being enthralled with a brand" (Evans, 2012, para. 6).

Up to August 15, 2012 Facebook's stock has tumbled 46% since it went public in May 2012, valued at a more than \$100-billion (Raice, 2012). Much of the drop has been fueled by concerns over the efficacy of Facebook's ads. "The crux of advertisers' doubts centers on whether Facebook ads actually sell goods and if they can be measured in a way that can be compared to other forms of advertising" (Raice, 2012, para. 16). Marketers aired their frustration of not being able to get access to the exact data of Facebook users' reaction to the ads, and they are afraid that this conundrum is likely to

continue since Facebook cannot reveal too much information about individual people due to privacy policies, which is the information marketers need (Raice, 2012).

The need for research on advertising on SNS like Facebook is apparent, especially because SNS users' information is not readily available to advertisers. More empirical research is needed to sooth the fears of investors or analysts who are looking at Facebook as an advertising platform with tremendous marketing potential. One way to provide new insights for advertisers hoping to better understand how ads on SNS work would be to use research based on behavioral analysis. "A variety of behavioral variables can help deliver improved ROI (Return of Investment). There is an opportunity to develop models to more efficiently target audiences with characteristics similar to brand Fans and Friends of Fans" (comScore, 2012, p. 3). On the other hand, communication researchers have also recognized the media context effect on consumers' acceptance of the ads presented on the platform and posited that consumers tend to be more responsive to advertising when they are "highly engaged with a media vehicle " (Calder, Malthouse & Schaedel, 2009, p. 321). Therefore, it is possible to approach the efficacy of ads on Facebook by probing into Facebook users' usage patterns, to see if their engagement with Facebook relates with consumers' acceptance of the ads, and how this happens.

The contribution of this study is twofold. First, it adds to the study of media engagement dimensions, as previously studied in print, broadcasting and Internet (Bronner & Neijens, 2006; Calder, Malthouse & Schaedel, 2009). Understanding users' engagement with Facebook specifically is an extension of these studies. Second, it yields insights regarding how advertisers can best manage their campaign message to reach the

consumers with the greatest likelihood of having a favorable reaction and strong brand affinity.

This study adds to this field of knowledge through a thorough review of the relevant literature and a quantitative survey among a student population before describing the results of the study and drawing conclusions on users' engagement with ads on Facebook.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

A relatively large number of theories have in the past been applied to the study of reaction to advertisements in different media context. Each of these theoretical approaches was discussed below.

#### **Advertising hierarchy of effects model and Attitude toward Ads**

In their ground breaking model for predictive measurements of advertising effectiveness, Lavidge and Steiner (1961) suggested advertising is a force to move people up a series of steps from initially being aware of the product, to liking and preference, and then making purchase decisions. In this hierarchy of effects model, consumers' attitudes at each stage of the process can be used as an important measure in evaluating the effectiveness of marketing practice (Poh & Adam, 2012). Attitude refers to a person's internal evaluation of an advertisement, which is relatively stable and can indicate enduring predisposition to behavior (Mitchell & Olson, 1981). In advertising studies, the majority of attitude toward ad research comes from two sources: Shimp (1981) and

Mitchell and Olson (1981). They introduced the concept of attitude toward ad (Aad) as individuals' evaluations of the overall advertising stimulus, which should be considered distinct from beliefs and brand attitudes (Muehling & McCann, 1993). Mackenzie and Luz (1986) elaborated more specifically on Aad's role and purported a dual mediation hypothesis (DMH). According to DMH, Aad and the other four measures -- Ad Cognitions (C ad), Brand Cognitions (Cb), Attitude toward the brand (Ab) and Intention to Purchase the Brand (Ib) -- are considered indicators of advertising effectiveness. Aad plays a mediating role in advertising effectiveness by influencing brand attitude both directly and indirectly through its effect on brand cognitions, which in turn will influence consumers' intention to buy.

Although a lot of researchers have recognized Aad as a distinct dimension, they never reached a consensus on what it is exactly comprised of. Some researchers referred to Aad as a purely affective dimension (Lutz, 1985; Mackenzie & Lutz, 1989) while others considered it in multidimensional terms (Shimp, 1981; Olney, Holbrook, & Batra, 1991; Muehling & McCann, 1993). And a vast body of research gave diverse answers to the question of what affects Aad (Muehling & McCann, 1993; Brackett & Carr, 2001). In their review of Aad, Muehling and McCann (1993) summarized the purported antecedents and subdivided them in to three categories: 1) personal/individual factors that are inherent in the ad processer (e.g. Litz, Mackenzie & Belch, 1983); 2) ad-related Factors, e.g. use of humor or celebrity to enhance an individual's view about the ad; 3) other factors such as time and product features. Muehling and McCann (1993) argued that "settling the definitional/dimensional issue would appear to be critical before

questions concerning Aad's antecedents and consequences can be further explored" (p.51).

Allowing a wide range of definition of Aad antecedents actually give researchers flexibility in applying the concept to different contexts. For example, when Lutz (1985) viewed Aad as a purely affective term without involving cognitive or behavioral components, he noted this view of Aad should focus on a particular exposure to a particular ad (Muehling & McCann, 1993). Choosing different models of Aad actually allows researchers to operationalize their research of advertising effectiveness in "varying degrees of depth, breadth, and specificity" (Brackett & Carr, 2001, p. 24). This diversified model allowed research on attitude toward web advertising to flourish when it came into being. Some researchers based their investigations upon the existent model of Aad of traditional advertising. For example, Karson and Fisher (2005) reexamined Makenzie and Lutz's (1989)'s Dual Mediation Hypothesis in an online advertising context, substituting attitude toward site for attitude toward ad. Brackett and Carr (2001) tested Ducoff's (1995) model with its three perceptual antecedents (entertainment, informativeness and irritation) to investigate Aad on the internet. They added credibility and demographic variables to construct a new model, which they tested using a student sample. Poh and Adam's (2012) research on online marketing context was also based on Ducoff's (1995) model but they substituted ad with commercial website as the subject of the test.

Other researchers have paid special attention to examining unique characteristics of online advertising. This line of research addressed the impact of the interactivity of the ads (Rosenkrans, 2009), the Web site's complexity (Bruner & Kumar, 2000) and the

placement of ads and fee paid to access internet content (Gorden & Turner, 1997). They also took Web users' attributes into consideration. For example, Sicilia and Ruiz's (2007) research introduced flow state to the model of Aad and Korgaonkar and Wolin (2002) examined the variance of Aad among heavy, medium and light users. To summarize, since there's no universal definition of Aad, researchers have introduced a broad variety of antecedents for Aad to approach specific research situations.

### **Media context effect and media engagement as antecedents of Aad**

Researchers have long recognized the capacity of media context to influence audience perceptions of the ads (De Pelsmacker, Geuens & Anckaert, 2002; Moorman, Neijens & Smit 2002; MacInnis & Park, 2002; Lord, Burnkrant & Unnava 2001; Kim & Sundar, 2012). Such influence can be generated from multiple attributes of the medium, such as the similarity in the mood of the media context and the ads; the prestige of the media source that rubs off on the brand; and the media context serving as a cognitive prime that guides the attention and determines the interpretation of the ad (Dahlen, 2005). The nature of the medium itself may also moderate the editorial content's influence on acceptance of the ads. Norris and Colman (1992) provided a medium-related view, claiming that because ads in print media can be skipped more easily compared to ads on radio and television, the appreciation of the context leads to less ad processing in print media than on radio and television. When it comes to Internet ads, Kim and Sundar, (2012) have noticed the ad relevance effect, which was called *fittingness* (Kanungo & Pang, 1973) or *congruence* (Kamins, 1990; Lynch & Schuler, 1994). Ad relevance effect in traditional advertising research applied well to the Internet environment with the ad relevance contributing positively to both the users' attitude toward website and attitude

toward ads (Kim & Sundar, 2012). The researchers suggested the rationale behind this is that Internet users are goal-oriented when they use a website, therefore, the ads that are relevant to the website context would probably match their goals for browsing this site and therefore be of greater interest. These and other studies combined to form Media Context Studies, which “investigate how and which media context variables influence the effects of the advertisements embedded in that context” (Bronnner & Neijens, 2006, p.82).

While the influence of media context on embedded ads undoubtedly exists and is important, it is also complicated and difficult to evaluate. Hypotheses should be posited with caution, since related theories may be conflicting in this regard. For example, the *Feelings-as-information Theory* suggested that people in a positive mood tend to avoid stimuli such as ads (Kuykendall & Keating, 1990). If people acquire a good mood as a result of processing media content, they may avoid paying attention to ads embedded in this context and process them less intensively. However, the *Hedonic Contingency* view stated that people in a positive mood may engage in greater processing of a stimulus because they believe that the consequences are going to be favorable (Lee & Sternthal, 1999). Given the complexity of the issue, a framework of media context effect on advertising response is demanded. One such endeavor is conceptualizing media engagement as an antecedent of the attitude toward the embedded advertisements (Malthouse & Calder, 2009; Dahlen, 2005; Bronner & Neijens, 2006).

Initially, scholars used the term *experience* to refer to these influential factors when relating to how media use would influence advertisement acceptance. For example, in Bronner and Neijens’ (2006) study on audience experience of media context and



embedded advertising, the authors used the *experiences* variables to refer to all media context variables. Experience was described as “an emotional, intuitive perception that people have while using the media” (p. 84). Calder and Malthouse (2009) defined media experience as “the thoughts and feelings consumers have about what is happening when they are doing something” in or with media (p.257). For example, users have a *utilitarian experience* when they believe a website provides information that facilitates their decision making. They have an *intrinsically enjoyable experience* when other content enables them to escape from the pressures of daily life. Calder and Malthouse (2009) described experience as consisting of two dimensions: the hedonic value associated with the experience and the motivational component, which is posited as *engagement*. Hence, the engagement is conceptualized as “the sum of the motivational experiences consumers have with the media product” (p.259), which affects the strength of media experience. It influences people’s reaction to advertisements because the strong motivational experiences consumers have with a media vehicle would make an ad potentially part of something that consumers are trying to make happen in their life. This theory has an important relevance for this study as it indicates a relationship exists between media users’ behaviors with the media platform and their reaction toward ads.

When Calder et al. (2009) applied this theory to examine the effectiveness of advertising; they developed second-order engagement factors by applying factor analysis to eight online experiences. They identified two types of engagement, *personal engagement* and *social interactive engagement*. They argued personal engagement is manifested in experiences that have counterparts in magazines and newspapers. It is about users seeking stimulation and inspiration, interactions with other people, self-worth

and a sense of intrinsic enjoyment in using the site itself. Social-Interactive Engagement relates to users experiencing some of the same things in terms of intrinsic enjoyment, utilitarian worth, and valuing the input from the larger community of users, but in a way that links to a sense of participating with others and socializing on the site. It is proposed to be more specific to Websites because Internet is thought to be more social in nature and Social-interactive Engagement emphasizes the value users can get from the social use of the website.

Malthouse and Calder's (2009) conceptualization of experience and *engagement* to approach people's involvement with the media viewed the audience as proactive individuals. This approach paralleled with *uses and gratifications theory*, which posited that media users actively seek out media to satisfy either utilitarian or hedonic needs (Katz & Foulkes, 1962). Katz, Blumber and Gurevitch (1974) pointed out that the uses and gratifications approach is concerned with the social and psychological origins of needs, which generate expectations of the mass media or other sources. This leads to differential patterns of media exposure or engagement in other activities resulting in need gratifications and other consequences, perhaps mostly unintended ones. According to this theory, if the acceptance of the ads on media is viewed as an unintended consequence, both the media uses and gratifications and the motives -- "the expressed desires for gratification in a given class of situations" (McLeod & Becker, 1981, p.74) -- should be held as accountable for the variance of ad acceptance.

The importance of examining motives that drive individuals to use the Internet has long been recognized by scholars when they examine what kind of ads and ad appeals attract attention and prompt click-throughs (Clary, Ridge, Stukas, Snyder, Copeland,

Haugen & Miene, 1998; Rodgers & Sheldon, 2000). The central idea of this approach is to understand why individuals visit the Internet before beginning to understand how people process Web-based ads (Rodgers & Thorson, 2000). Rodgers and Thorson (2000) proposed this approach as a functionalist model and posited that the rationale is based on John Dewey's (1896) notion of the reflex circuit, that is, the activity does not start with a stimulus, it is a "reflex circuit" where the responses become the stimuli (Rodgers & Thorson, 2000, p. 44.). The researchers argued that in terms of Internet advertising, how Internet users perceive and process ads do not start with the advertising message, but rather represents a response to individual needs. Rodgers and Thorson posited that the functionalist model is broader than the Uses and Gratifications model. While the Uses and Gratification approach more often than not just focuses on the *why* of the users' Internet motives, a functionalist approach strives to articulate both the *why* and *how* of users' Internet motives. For example, Internet users can log onto cyberspace for searching or surfing and these two motives might switch during the process. So, in addition to the motive, Rodgers and Thorson proposed a second component of their model, namely, the mode, which is the extent to which the Internet users are goal oriented. The difference of *mode* would make the online experience more serious or just being playful. These two dimensions of motives and mode, the authors argued, are the most important factors to understand how interactive advertising operates. Again, their approach, the functionalist model, represents an effort to apply Uses and Gratifications theory to evaluate Internet ads' outcome. It is similar to Malthouse and Calder's (2009) effort to conceptualize *media experience* and *engagement* to approach consumers' attitude toward ads.

After providing the conceptual clarity for thinking about media context effects, scholars proposed and tested the relationship between media engagement and advertising effectiveness. They suggested that all things being equal, if consumers engaging with a media vehicle have strong motivational experiences, an ad potentially becomes more effective on this medium as well. Based on this argument Calder and Malthouse (2006) proposed a media congruency hypothesis and tested it empirically with magazine ads, with positive results. Bronnner and Neijens (2006) tested this hypothesis with eight media platforms ranging from print to broadcasting and showed different strengths of the interaction between media context and the embedded advertising. The strongest relationships were found for print media, and the weakest for television and cinema. With the emergence of the Internet, Calder, Malthouse and Schaedel (2007) tested it in Website context and also got supportive results. The experiment yielded a positive correlation between Web users' engagement with Websites and reaction toward an Orbitz (an online travel agency) ad. This study showed both overall engagement and personal and social interactive engagement affected reaction to ads, while social interactive engagement was more uniquely attributed to online media having an independent effect on ad reaction.

This study adopts the above theoretical framework to examine Facebook users' engagement and their attitude toward ads. This requires identifying Facebook users' SNS engagement factors first. In this regard, studies using Use and Gratifications theory casts light on the current study.

## **Defining Users' Experience with Facebook**

Social networking sites (SNS) are important social platforms for computer-mediated communication. In recent years, they have infiltrated people's daily lives with amazing rapidity (Lin & Lu, 2011). As Web-based service aims to foster group formation, scope and influence (Kane, Fichman, Gallagher, & Glaser, 2009; Lin & Lu, 2011), SNS allow individuals to construct a profile that is public or semi-public, keep a list of other users with whom they share a connection, view others' lists of connections, share text and images, and link other members of the site by applications and groups (Boyd & Ellison, 2008; Lin & Lu, 2011). Examples of successful SNS may include Facebook, MySpace, Friendster, Live Journal, LinkedIn, Cyworld and Xiaonei (Pempek, Termolayeva, & Yermolayeva, 2009; Kwon & Wen 2009; Taylor, Lewin, & Strutton, 2011).

Facebook's expansion has attracted scholars who examined SNS users' practices, motivations, and influences from a uses and gratifications perspective. Exploratory interview and survey studies yielded a series of social and informational motives (Joinson, 2008; Johnson & Yang, 2009; Kwon and Wen 2009; Pempek, et al., 2009), and researchers paid special attention to Facebook's advantage in forming relationships between individuals and enhancing interactions between users. They posited that Facebook usage had the potential to impact individuals' social capital by enabling interpersonal feedback and enhancing peer acceptance, by fulfilling the users' informational needs, and by providing a series of applications to meet users' needs for pure entertainment and recreation (Ellison, 2007). Researchers also proposed enjoyment is the most influential factor in people's continued use of Facebook, followed by number of peers who use the site and its usefulness (Lin & Lu, 2010).

Although studies varied in classification of what exactly constitutes the Facebook users' experiences, there is a probability that they can be reduced to a concise version of second-order engagement factors. Calder et al.'s (2009) experience measures covered both experiences that are common across media and specific in online experiences, which include most of the users' motives suggested in the above-mentioned SNS literature. Their study highlighted social engagement and the need of interactivity, which make them valuable measures to be tested within the Facebook environment. Therefore, this study will factor analyze Calder et al. (2009)'s experience measures and test whether they could plausibly be reduced to second-order engagement dimensions in Facebook context.

### **Conceptualizing Advertising on Facebook**

Social media emerged as a new advertising media with many advantages: the potential to reach large audiences exceeding those of traditional media, cost efficiency, and ability to target advertising more effectively (Todi, 2008). More importantly, social media advertising is changing the way companies communicate with their consumers. Not only can companies talk to customers on social media in the traditional way, but consumers can also talk to each other and produce a magnified form of word-of-mouth (WOM) (Mangold & Faulds, 2009). For companies, it means tremendous opportunities to “deliver maximum reach and achieve brand resonance and hopefully influence consumers to purchase or engage with the brand” (comScore, 2012, p.7).

“For brands to resonate on Facebook, the first step is literally to be seen (comScore, 2012, p.7)”. To create brand exposure, the most straightforward way would be placing ads on the Web page. Sponsored ads that appear on the right side bar resemble the

traditional banner ads on Web pages, except liking information would appear at the bottom (e.g. 2,945,499 people like AT&T). Sponsored ads are far from the core advertising effort brands make to take advantage of Facebook's social function. According to comScore's (2012) report, although Facebook emerged as a marketing channel, the early emphasis is just on developing a brand page for brand exposure, not on making Facebook exposure as a primary means of brand engagement on Facebook. With Fan acquisition as their objective, brands' Facebook presence is targeted at amplification of their Fan base and the continuous communication with these brand followers. Therefore, more effort is put on reaching fans and friends of fans with four primary dissemination channels of creating brand impressions:

1. Page Publishing: unpaid impressions appear on the Brand Page wall and may also appear in the News feed of a Fan or a Friend of a Fan.

2. Stories about Friends: Friends' engagement stories with a brand that can be seen on a Friend's wall or in the News Feed.

3. Sponsored Stories: Paid impressions, which are distributed more broadly and appear to Fans and Friends of Fans in the News Feed or in the right hand column.

4. Ads with Social: branded messages come directly from the advertisers with a social context on the unit that appears to Friends of Fans.

As much as brands are trying every means of amplify their fan base, what they really want to take advantage is of the (WOM) effect via Facebook. WOM refers to informal communication about products and services by two or more individuals, neither one of whom is a marketer (Arndt, 1967). It has an important effect on consumer

decisions because WOM information is perceived as more reliable and impartial than forms of paid, persuasive information such as advertising. In SNS context, two factors would differentiate the acceptance of WOM information passed from fans to friends of fans from ads purely sponsored by companies appearing on the side bar. For one thing, traditional studies of advertising suggested consumers distrust advertising and have strong inclinations to avoid advertising on media platforms (Shavitt, Lowrey & Haefner, 1998). For another, SNS is a powerful tool for eWOM, which has enhanced the ease and speed of information dissemination, including brand-related experiences, among peers (Chu & Kim, 2011; Alon, 2005). Previous research has shown that “a social network user may believe that interactions among ‘friends’ are trustworthy but may independently appraise the site itself or advertising content displayed inside panels” (Soares, Pinho & Nobre, 2012). Therefore, the current research examined users’ response toward the purely sponsored ads and advertising information their friends delivered respectively.

Different levels of response to ads on SNS are also of interest in the current research. According to comScore’s (2012) report, brands have multilayered marketing objectives: to deliver maximum reach, achieve brand resonance, and hopefully influence consumers’ purchase decisions. To achieve these objectives, brands’ information dissemination goes through three steps: (1) Fan reach: brand messages reach Fans in News Feeds; (2) Engagement: Fans ‘talk about’ news feed content; and (3) Amplification: News Feed content spreads to Friends, and Ads boost content and stories. Translating brands’ expectation of marketing efforts to SNS users’ reaction to ads, this study proposes three kinds of reaction to ads: (1) users pay attention to the ads; (2) users click through to check specific information; (3) users ‘like’ the brand and share the link



to the brand with their friends. Only the third reaction will generate information that can be seen on friends' news feed, and create a WOM effect. Literature examining users' motivation of engaging in WOM communication has suggested both individual motivations and social benefits can explain voluntary behavior in computer-mediated knowledge exchange networks (Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, & Gremler, 2004; Wasko & Faraj, 2005). Individual motivation may include advice seeking, self-enhancement, economic incentives and professional reputation enhancement. Social benefits involve connection to a large number of others, commitment to the community, true altruistic desire to help other consumers and companies, and so forth (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004; Wasko & Faraj, 2005).

Wiertz and De Ruyter (2007) conducted a study on contribution behavior to firm-hosted commercial online communities. It shows consumers who contribute most in terms of quantity and quality are driven primarily by their commitment to the community as well as member's online interaction propensity and the perceived informational value in the community. These results indicate a relationship between individuals' intrinsic motivation of participating in community activity and the intention of passing information to other community members. This provides a link to connect the SNS users' engagement with Facebook and their likelihood to share an ad link. As both individual motivation and social benefit will enhance the knowledge contribution to the virtual community, it is reasonable to assume that people who have both stronger personal and social-interactive engagement of SNS will also have stronger intention to share advertising information with their friends.

As social media have only recently come to the foreground of advertising, academic literature in this area is limited. Some papers provided a conceptual exploration of the future trends of integrating social media into companies' marketing mix (Mangold & Faulds, 2009; Wright, Khanfar, Harrington & Kizer, 2010). Others were exploratory investigations of representative advertising cases (Todi, 2008) or the qualitative study of consumer responses (Harris & Dennis 2011). Taylor, Lewein and Strutton (2011) represented a quantitative effort to construct a model of users' attitudes toward Ads on Social Networking sites (SNA), while they proposed content-related, structural, and socialization factors as antecedents. But still little is known regarding how the differences in consumers' use of SNS will influence their attitude toward SNA. The purpose of this study is to improve the current understanding of consumers' attitude toward SNA from a media engagement perspective.

### **Individual Difference Factor: Gender Differences and Online Shopping Time**

Individual differences should also be brought into consideration as we evaluate Facebook users' engagement and their attitude toward ads. For example, previous researches suggested that men and women have different motivations for Internet use and therefore different attitudes and behaviors (Shavitt, Sharon, Lowrey, & Haefner. 1999; Weiser, 2000; Wolin & Korgaonkar, 2003). Men are more likely to seek entertainment, leisure, and functional purposes on the Internet, while women tend to use the Internet for communication and interaction purposes (Weiser, 2000). So it is reasonable to suggest that men and women engage with Facebook in different ways. Gender differences also influence people's attitude toward SNA. In that regard, Taylor et al. (2011) suggested a moderating effect of gender differences on the perceived ads' features and perceived

social network usage's impact on attitude toward ads on social networks. Their findings indicated (1) the motivation to seek entertainment or information from ads on SNS had a stronger effect on women's Aad than men; (2) Users who use SNS as a way to improve quality of life (by purposefully distracting oneself from life's ongoing challenges) had a negative attitude toward advertisements on the sites and that negative relationship was stronger for men than women; and (3) The use of SNS as a means of structuring time (using sites as part of daily routine) had a negative influence on Aad for men but a positive influence on Aad for women. Noting that their findings contradict previous studies in that the positive relationships between informativeness and entertainment on Aad is stronger for women while the peer influence on attitude toward Aad was stronger for men, the researchers interpreted such contradiction as a unique feature of SNS use. They also suggested such differences may result from the evolvement of the user profile, indicating the previous research is no longer applicable.

In this study, we propose one individual factor, online shopping, would also influence users' attitude toward ads on Facebook. This consideration is based on the functionalist perspective of internet use (Rodgers& Thorson, 2000). Researchers have noticed that consumers' attention paid to ads is rooted in their need to shop. With the shopping need in mind, Internet users are likely to find an ad that satisfied the need and help them make decisions. Assuming that high online shopping frequency is a response to the consumers' needs to shop online, it is reasonable to assume that the Facebook users who happen to be frequent online shoppers have stronger shopping motivation and therefore are more likely to develop positive attitude toward ads on Facebook. In this regard, previous research showed that the experienced online shopper and inexperienced

ones have different ways in attending to retail information online. The experienced online shoppers are more likely to notice, understand and appreciate information and features required to search, compare and order (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). They are more open to purchase off the web (Ward & Lee, 2000), and pay less attention to security but more to reliability, personalization and ease of use (Yang & Jun 2002). Moreover, previous research also suggested a moderating role of online shopping experience in influencing favorable attitude toward retail websites for web site factors (Elliott, 2005). For inexperienced shoppers more so than for experienced shoppers, the ease of use is related to a more favorable evaluation of the retail sites. However, the product information and customer support are more important for online shoppers to develop positive attitude toward the sites than non-shoppers.

In light of the existing discussion of the influence of online shopping experience on Internet users' reaction toward ads, this study will include online shopping time as another independent variable in influencing Facebook users' reaction toward ads.

### **Hypotheses and Research Questions**

In the literature review, the attitude toward ad, media context and ad acceptance, media experience and engagement, users' experience with SNS and advertising on Facebook are discussed. In light of the previous studies, this study used original survey data to test users' Facebook experience and their attitude toward ads on Facebook. Regarding media experience, previous researchers have identified a set of measures and included them on surveys of website visitors, newspaper and magazine readers, and TV news viewers (Calder & Malthouse, 2004, 2005; Malthouse, Calder, & Tambane, 2007).

Calder et al. (2009) went a step further in factor analyzing experience measures and identified two types of second-order engagement of web users: personal engagement and social-interactive engagement. Personal engagement is intrinsically motivated and closely related to individual qualities while social interactive engagement is both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated with the value acquired from social relevance of the experience. This study aimed to first explore Facebook users' experience in general.

Since SNS users' experiences haven't been explored before, the research question was posited as:

RQ1: What are the underlying factors determining users' Facebook experiences?

The gender difference in Facebook experience was also of the interest of the current study. Past research suggested that men and women have different motivations and resultant attitudes and behaviors for Internet use (Schlosser et al., 2999; Weiser, 2000; Wolin and Korgaonkar, 2003). Therefore, the following hypothesis was posed:

H1: Users' experience with Facebook differs by gender.

Regarding Facebook users' attitude toward ads, two dimensions were of concern in this study. On the one hand, previous research suggested that due to the WOM effect, the brand-sponsored stories on the side panel and friends' recommendation that appeared in the news feed would be treated differently (Soares, Pinho & Nobre, 2012). On the other hand, by simply paying attention to the ads or developing positive attitude and hence sharing the ads' information, the different SNS users' attitude toward ads will have a different influence on the amplification of brand information through Facebook (comScore's, 2012). However, no concrete evidence showed that these two dimensions

made a difference in Facebook users' attitude toward ads on Facebook. Therefore, this research explored the exact factors forming users' attitude toward Facebook ads:

RQ2: What are the underlying factors that lead to users' attitude toward ads?

The primary goal of the current research was to explore the relationship between users' Facebook experiences and their attitude toward ads on it. Researchers have proposed that the experience with the surrounding media context increases advertising effectiveness and they have tested this hypothesis with multiple media vehicles (Calder & Malthouse, 2006, 2009; Bronnner & Neijens, 2006). Although this hypothesis has not been tested in SNS context directly, Taylor, Lewin and Strutton's (2011) recent study on users' attitudes toward SNS advertising (SNA) lend support to this hypothesis. In their research, a model of content-related, structural and socialization factors that would affect users' attitudes toward advertising on SNS was tested and the conclusion posited, "When SNA delivers content that is consistent with the motivations originally expressed in media uses and gratification theory, consumers were more likely to ascribe positive attitudes toward advertising conveyed to them through an SNS medium" (p. 269). Based on the past research, the current study proposed that the users' Facebook experience is positively related with their attitude toward ads. And as theory suggested, another two individual factors – gender and individual's online shopping time -- would also contribute to users' attitude toward Facebook ads. Therefore, the current study proposed the research hypothesis regarding users' Facebook experience and their attitude toward ads as:

H2: Users' Facebook experiences are related to their attitude toward Facebook ads

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

To examine Facebook users' experience and their attitude toward ads (Aad) on it, this study employed survey research. This section discusses how survey participants were sampled, the specific procedures involved in the survey, how measures were identified, and which statistical methods were used.

#### **Sampling**

The study recruited students at Oklahoma State University as participants for a paper-pencil survey. Justification for selecting this target group is based on the fact that students' involvement with Facebook has increased considerably since 2004. Many college students interact on social networking sites such as Facebook as a daily activity and they have become heavy users of SNS (Ellison, Stainfield, & Lampe, 2007). Participants were selected by applying nonprobability sampling. The researcher reached potential participants in two ways: (1) the researcher entered selected classes and sought cooperation from the students; (2) the researcher randomly sought interested participants

in the university library. As such the researcher had access to a student group covering a varied range of school status, ages and major areas.

Before handing out the questionnaire, students were screened by being asked if they are Facebook users. Only Facebook users were invited to participate. Students were not required to participate in the study and could opt out of it at any time. All paper surveys were completely anonymous.

A consent form was attached at the beginning of the questionnaire to allow the participants to make an informed and voluntary decision whether or not to participate in the research. Subsequently a series of Likert-type statements were posited on three topics:

1. Users' experiences with Facebook
2. Users' attitude toward Ads on Facebook
3. Demographic information

The survey took about 10 minutes to complete. Next the specific measures are explained.

## **Measures**

As mentioned, two dimensions were measured: users' experiences with Facebook and users' attitude toward ads on Facebook. Demographic information also was collected.

### **Users experience with Facebook**

This research used Calder et al. (2009)'s measurement of users' online experience in their study of online experience and advertising reaction. Their study measured eight



online experiences using 38 items. In this study, one item was deleted from Community experience, namely, “I am as interested in input from other users as I am in the regular content on this site.” This was removed because the regular content on Facebook is generated by users. The items used to measure the eight Experience dimensions in this study are displayed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1  
Facebook Experience  
Measures

| Experience                        | Item   |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Stimulation and Inspiration       | <p>It inspires me in my own life.</p> <p>Facebook makes me think of things in new ways.</p> <p>Facebook stimulates my thinking about lots of different topics.</p> <p>Facebook makes me a more interesting person.</p> <p>Some stories I read from Facebook touch me deep down.</p>  |
| Social Facilitation               | <p>I bring up things I have seen Facebook in conversations with many other people.</p> <p>Facebook often gives me something to talk about</p> <p>I use things from Facebook in discussions or arguments with people I know.</p>  |
| Temporal                          | <p>Logging on Facebook is part of my routine.</p> <p>This is one of the sites I always go to anytime I am surfing the web.</p> <p>I use it as a big part of getting my news for the day.</p> <p>It helps me to get my day started in the morning.</p>  |
| Self-Esteem and Civic Mindfulness | <p>Using Facebook makes me feel like a better citizen.</p> <p>Using this site makes a difference in my life.</p> <p>I use Facebook to reflect my values.</p> <p>It makes me more a part of my community.</p> <p>I'm a better person for using Facebook</p>   |
| Intrinsic Enjoyment               | <p>It's a treat for me.</p> <p>Going to this site improves my mood, makes me happier.</p> <p>I like to kick back and wind down with it.</p> <p>I like to go to this site when I am eating or taking a break.</p> <p>While I am on Facebook, I don't think about other websites I might go to.</p>  |
| Utilitarian                       | <p>Facebook helps me make good purchase decisions.</p> <p>You learn how to improve yourself from using Facebook.</p> <p>Facebook provides information that helps me make important decisions.</p> <p>Facebook helps me better manage my money.</p> <p>I give advice and tips to people I know based on things I've read through Facebook.</p>  |
| Participation and Socializing     | <p>I do quite a bit of socializing on this site.</p> <p>I contribute to the conversation on this site.</p> <p>I often feel guilty about the amount of time I spend on this site socializing.</p> <p>I should probably cut back on the amount of time I spend on this site socializing.</p>   |
| Community                         | <p>A big reason I like Facebook is what I get from other users.</p> <p>Facebook does a good job of getting its visitors to contribute or provide feedback.</p> <p>I'd like to meet my friends who regularly visit Facebook</p> <p>I've gotten interested in things I otherwise wouldn't have because of others on Facebook.</p> <p>Overall, the visitors to Facebook are pretty knowledgeable about the topics it covers so you can learn from them.</p> |

Adopted from Calder et al. (2009)

## **Facebook users' attitude toward the Ads**

This study used the following steps to form measures evaluating users' reaction toward ads. First, a six items scale was borrowed and adapted from Soares et al.'s (2012) research on people's response to marketing efforts on Social Networks Sites (SNS). They derived the items from exploratory interviews and adapted others from Muehling (1987).

The six items were:

1. I never really pay attention to it.
2. I fully ignore it.
3. It makes me less willing to use Facebook.
4. It is very boring.
5. It is necessary for funding Facebook.
6. It adds value to my use of Facebook.

This study added two additional measures to further investigate users' reaction and contribution to spreading advertising messages on Facebook. These are "I would like to click on the ads and check out information" and "I would like to share the ads' links to my Facebook friends."

## **Statistical Analysis**

To measure Facebook users' experience and their attitude toward ads, the questionnaire used the above-mentioned statements, which were used in previous studies (Calder et al. 2009; Soares et.al 2012; Muehling, 1987), and asked participants' agreements with them based on a 7-point Likert-type Scale (1- 7 scale: where 1=Strong disagree and 7= Strongly agree). The scores were reverse-coded when necessary to make

the measurement consistent regarding to the level that people positively/negatively engage with Facebook and react to ads on it.

After the data were collected, the researcher screened the information for miscoded and suspicious-looking data entries. Then data were entered to SPSS 20.0 software and a report of descriptive statistics from the data collected was produced. Next, data were screened for missing responses and the assumptions of factor analysis. First, all variables had missing cases representing less than 5% of the data, so Listwise deletion was used (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005, p.36). Second, all variables with outliers were recorded, and the Z-scores were generated. For the variables that had outliers exceeding the benchmark  $\pm 3.0$  (Garson, 2008), a new variable was created by winsorizing these outliers (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p.69).

Subsequently factor analysis was conducted to identify dimensions underlying Facebook users' experiences and their attitude toward ads. For initial extraction, Principle Components was used and components with eigenvalues greater than one were obtained. Then an alternative scree plot test (Cattell, 1966) was used to retain the factors "with eigenvalues in the sharp descent part of the plot" (Green and Salkind, 2005, p.317). Lastly the factor loading was checked and factors that had components with loadings higher than .50 were retained.

Next, the Principle Components was used as an extraction technique to determine the meaningful factors, and varimax rotation was used to maximize high correlations and minimize low ones. Four criteria were used for factor extraction: (1) factors must have an eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater (Kaiser, 1960; Guttman, 1956); (2) factors had to appear on a

scree plot before it leveled off (Cattell, 1966); (3) variables had to have loadings of at least .50 (Schwab, 2007; Horvath, 2004) on one variable and less than .40 on all other variables in this exploratory factor analysis (American Psychiatric Association, 1994; Horvath, 2004; Schwab, 2007); and (4) at least two variables must load at .50 or higher on each factor (Schwab, 2007).

After that, a reliability analysis was conducted on each of the Facebook experience and Aad factors since some researchers suggested using Cronbach's alpha to assess the internal consistency of the factors (Pett, Lackey and Sullivan, 2003; Schwab, 2007). Factors with Cronbach's alpha value above Garson (2009)'s standard of .60 for exploratory analysis were collapsed into new variables and were used in the subsequent regression analysis.

To answer the research question that if a statistically significant difference exists between the male and female Facebook users' experience, the experience variables were separated into two groups according to gender and an independent *t*-test was conducted. Alpha was set at .05, which means if the *p*-value (probability value) was below .05 then it was statistically significant.

Subsequently regression tests were conducted to investigate the relationship between Facebook experience and users' Aad. First, variables were screened for linearity and multicollinearity. All correlations between DV and IV's were checked and two standards were used for checking multicollinearity: 1) The correlations between the IVs is of .70 or higher (Tabachnick and Fidell, p. 86); 2) The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values are 4.0 or higher. The influential outliers were also screened by using Cook's

distance and Standardized Studentized Deleted Residuals. The data generated a maximum for Cook's Distance of .062, well below the standard of 1.0 for problems. Similarly, the minimum and maximum Studentized Deleted Residuals were -1.59 and 3.25, below the standard of  $\pm 3.3$  for problems. Thus these statistics indicated no problems with outliers in the solution and indicated the model fits the data well.

Next a sequential regression test was used to test the hypotheses. The individual factor, gender, was entered into the model first followed by online shopping time, because demographic variables occur prior to other variables and are unlikely to be affected by other transitory variables (Cohen & Cohen, 2002). They were entered first also to control for their influence. The order of the Facebook experience factors that were entered into the regression model was determined by consulting the correlation matrix. The Facebook experience variable with the highest zero-order correlations would have the most effect on the reaction toward ads variable, hence it was entered first and all others were entered in descending order according to their zero-order correlations. The sequential regression allowed each Facebook experience variable's full contribution to the reaction toward ads variables to be explored when they were correlated (Cohen & Cohen, 2002).

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

#### Characteristics of Respondents

*Table 4.1*

*Sample Demographics (N=367)*

| Demographics            | N   | %     |                             | N  | %     |
|-------------------------|-----|-------|-----------------------------|----|-------|
| <b>Gender</b>           |     |       | <b>Online shopping time</b> |    |       |
| Female                  | 201 | 55.5  | Never shop on line          | 18 | 4.92  |
| Male                    | 166 | 45.5  | Seldom shop online          | 65 | 17.76 |
| <b>Age</b>              |     |       | Once every several month    | 70 | 19.13 |
| 18-24                   | 253 | 78.57 | Once a month                | 55 | 15.03 |
| 23-25                   | 44  | 13.65 | 2-3 times a month           | 68 | 18.58 |
| 25-40                   | 25  | 7.73  | Once a week                 | 43 | 11.75 |
| <b>Time on Facebook</b> |     |       | 2-3 times a week            | 32 | 8.74  |
| No time at all          | 2   | 0.54  | Everyday                    | 15 | 4.1   |
| < 10 min                | 36  | 9.84  |                             |    |       |
| 10-30 min               | 76  | 20.77 |                             |    |       |
| 30min --1hr             | 99  | 27.05 |                             |    |       |
| 1hr -- 2 hr             | 75  | 20.49 |                             |    |       |
| 2 hr -- 3hr             | 43  | 11.75 |                             |    |       |
| > 3 hr                  | 35  | 9.56  |                             |    |       |

Of the 367 subjects responding to the survey question, 366 reported gender. Of these 45.5% (n=366) were males and 55.5 % (n=366) were females. The age range of the 322 respondents who reported their age was 18 to 40 years. The average age of respondents was 21.52 years, with 78.57 % at 18 to 24 years; 13.65% at 23 to 25 years and 7.73% above 25.

In addition to collecting the demographic data, respondents were asked two more questions regarding to their individual traits. One was, “On a typical day, about how much time do you spend on Facebook?” This question was used to assess more accurately their ability to provide meaningful information regarding their Facebook usage. For the 366 respondents who answered this question the average time spent was between the levels “more than 30 minutes, up to 1 hour” and “more than 1 hr, up to 2 hrs”. Only 9.8% indicated they spend less than 10 minutes a day. The research retained the less informed respondents for two reasons as stated in the previous research on SNS advertising (Taylor et al., 2011). First, the samples featuring varying levels of usage and knowledge are statistically desirable to get findings that are more generalizable to the population the sample represents. Second, less well-informed consumers’ attitudes still matter to advertisers since SNS providers should expect less frequent users.

Another question was “How often do you shop online?” This question was to see how the respondents’ online shopping experience would influence their reaction toward ads. For the 366 respondents who answered this question on a scale where 0 represented “never shop online” and 7 represented “shopping online every day”, the mean response was 3.16, pointing at somewhere between “once a month” and “two to three times a month”.



## **Factor Analysis of Facebook experience**

This research aimed to explore the relationship between users' Facebook experience and their attitude toward ads. As mentioned, the independent variable, Facebook experience, was measured using 37 items adopted from the previous research on Internet experience (Calder et al., 2009). Research question 1 asked if users' Facebook experience could be collapsed into fewer underlying factors and what they would be. Hence a factor analysis was conducted to analyze intercorrelations among the 37 measurement items for users' Facebook experience.

Table 4.2 Factor analysis (principal components analysis and varimax rotation) of measures of Facebook experience, N=367

| Experience   | Item   | M  | SD   | Standard loading |
|--|--|--|------|------------------|
| Empowerment<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$ )<br>M = 2.61 SD = .86   | I give advice and tips to people I know based on things I've read through Facebook | 2.04   | 1.10 | 0.778            |
|  | Using Facebook makes me feel like a better citizen                                 | 2.39   | 1.26 | 0.752            |
|  | I'm a better person for using Facebook   | 2.49   | 1.25 | 0.747            |
|  | Facebook provides information that helps me make important decisions               | 2.68   | 1.37 | 0.725            |
|  | Facebook helps me better manage my money   | 2.64   | 1.37 | 0.724            |
|  | I learn how to improve myself from using Facebook.                                 | 2.52   | 1.32 | 0.702            |
|  | Facebook helps me make good purchase decisions                                     | 2.78   | 1.44 | 0.681            |
|  | A big reason I like Facebook is what I get from other users                        | 2.77   | 1.40 | 0.668            |
|  | Using Facebook inspires me in my own life  | 3.35   | 1.51 | 0.523            |
|  | Community-self-worth<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .80$ )<br>M = 3.63 SD = 1.16         | I've gotten interested in things I otherwise wouldn't have because of others on Facebook | 3.28 | 1.59             |
| Overall, the visitors to Facebook are pretty knowledgeable about the topics it covers so you can learn from them |  | 3.78   | 1.69 | 0.75             |
| I'd like to meet my friends who regularly visit Facebook   |  | 4.01   | 1.54 | 0.601            |
| Facebook makes me feel more a part of my community.  |  | 3.83   | 1.70 | 0.574            |
| Using Facebook is a treat for me.  |  | 3.60   | 1.55 | 0.571            |
| I use Facebook to reflect my values.   |  | 3.26   | 1.69 | 0.532            |
| Social participation<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .89$ )<br>M = 3.72 SD = 1.77                                       | I do quite a bit of socializing on Facebook.                                       | 3.51   |      | 0.912            |
|  | I contribute to conversations on Facebook.   | 3.94   |      | 0.904            |

As shown in Table 4.2, the principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation of Facebook experience items found three factors. The first factor (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .90$ ) included 9 items and a closer look at them found that these items shared in common the experience of being empowered by using Facebook. Users get useful information to facilitate daily life or acquire the ability to give advice. They improve lives by feeling better about themselves while using Facebook. This factor would be called empowerment in the following analysis. The empowerment factor accounted for the most variance, 28.25%, among the users' Facebook experiences.

The second factor would be called community-self-worth factor, since items in this category pertained to the enjoyment the users acquire from being in a Facebook community. With Facebook friends, users are stimulated by learning new things from a larger community, they enjoy revealing themselves to their friends, and they feel happy simply by being accompanied with friends. This factor explained 17.75% of the total Facebook experience variance.

The third factor includes two participation items. Users socialize and contribute to the conversation on Facebook and it therefore was called social participation factor. This factor accounted for 12.35% of the total variance. Together these three factors explained 58.35% of the variance among users' Facebook experiences.

Some researchers such as Pett, Lackey and Sullivan (2003) and Schwab (2007) suggest using Cronbach's alpha to assess the internal consistency of the factors. So the three factors were evaluated using reliability analysis. The Cronbach's alpha for factor 1 was a very high .90, well above the .70 standard (Garson, 2009) for exploratory factor

analysis, indicating the highest correlations among variables. Factor 2 had an acceptable alpha at .80 and the alpha for Factor 3 was above the standard at .89. All factors meet the .60 criteria for Cronbach's alpha for exploratory factor analysis.

Subsequently, each of the three Facebook experience factors was collapsed into a single variable, to correlate with Facebook users' attitude toward ads. On a Likert scale of 1 to 7 where 7 represented the most positive value, the average responses ranged from 2 to 4, which indicated an overall negative attitude from the Facebook users toward the statements of the possible experiences. Among the three factors, Social participation had the highest mean score ( $M=3.72$ ,  $SD = 1.77$ ), followed by Community-self-worth ( $M=3.63$ ,  $SD = 1.16$ ). Empowerment, which had the highest explained variance, had the lowest mean score ( $M=2.61$ ,  $SD = .86$ ).

### **Factor Analysis with Facebook users' Attitude toward Ads (Aad)**

In this study, the questions asked about users' Aad, which were designed with two dimensions. The first dimension assumed users would develop different Aad toward the purely sponsored ads versus ads forwarded by their friends. The second dimension addressed the different levels of the possible engagement with the Facebook ads – users may start engaging with ads by paying attention, followed by clicking through and then take a step further to share the ads to their friends. However, no existent evidence showed how many Aad factors were formed by these two dimensions. Therefore, factor analysis was conducted on the 16 Aad items to determine what the Facebook users' Aad consisted of.

The initial extraction indicated 5 factors that have eigenvalues of 1.0 or more. The varimax rotation was then used and the confounded variables and the variables with loading below .50 standard (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996; Schwab, 2007) were removed. The rotated solution with five factors explained 72.15 % of the variation in the data, which is higher than Schwab's standard of .60 or more.

Table 4.3 Factor Analysis (principal components analysis and varimax rotation) of Measures of Attitude toward Ads, N=367

| Aad   | Item   | M    | SD   | Standard loading |
|---|--|------|------|------------------|
| Intention to click and share<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .831$ )<br>M = 2.08 SD = .97      | I would forward the friend recommended ads to my other friends           | 2.05 | 1.19 | 0.84             |
|   | I often click through Friends' recommended ads and check out information | 2.28 | 1.26 | 0.79             |
|   | I would forward the ads to my friends                                    | 1.81 | 1.1  | 0.75             |
|   | I often click through the ads and check out information                  | 2.17 | 1.23 | 0.69             |
| Attention and interest<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .76$ )<br>M = 3.43 SD = 1.37            | Ads add value to my use of Facebook                                      | 3.67 | 1.87 | 0.83             |
|   | I always pay attention to ads on Facebook.                               | 3.56 | 2.02 | 0.73             |
|   | Friends' recommendation of ads adds value to my use of Facebook          | 3.31 | 1.65 | 0.70             |
|   | Ads on Facebook are very boring  | 3.16 | 1.61 | 0.66             |
| Perceived value for Facebook<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$ )<br>M = 3.75 SD = 1.50      | Friends' recommended ads are necessary for funding Facebook.             | 3.51 | 1.61 | 0.87             |
|   | Ads are necessary for funding Facebook.                                  | 3.99 | 1.77 | 0.82             |
| Avoidance of ads<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .67$ )<br>M = 2.76 SD = 1.42                  | I fully ignore ads on Facebook.  | 2.42 | 1.57 | 0.85             |
|   | Ads make me less willing to use Facebook.                                | 3.10 | 1.70 | 0.75             |
| Avoidance of Friend forwarded ads<br>(Cronbach's $\alpha = .74$ )<br>M = 2.78 SD = 1.50 | I fully ignore friends' recommended ads                                  | 2.57 | 1.65 | 0.88             |
|   | Friends' recommended ads make me less willing to use Facebook            | 3.00 | 1.73 | 0.80             |

As shown in Table 2, principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation of Attitude toward ads items generated five factors. The first factor (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .83$ ) included 4 items relating to the users' intention to click through and share the ads to their friends. This factor involved the deeper engagement with the ads on Facebook, which accounted for the most variance, 29.51%, of the Aad measurement.

The second factor included four items pertaining to the users' willingness to pay attention to ads, their evaluation of the interest of the ads, and the value that Facebook ads bring to their general Facebook experience. In this regard, whether the ads are forwarded from their friends did not make a difference. This factor would be called Attention and Interest in the following analysis and this factor explained 18.8% of the Aad variance.

The third factor included two items relating to the users' perception about the ads' value for the Facebook company. Again users perceived the pure ads and the friend forwarded ads in the same way on this issue. This factor accounted for 9.97% of the total variance.

The fourth and fifth factors related to the users' intention to avoid the ads. To avoid the ads, they would either ignore the ads or simply log on to Facebook less often. On this issue, the source of the ads made a difference in the users' attitude. Factors four and five addressed the pure ads and the friend recommended ads respectively, and they accounted for 7.60% and 6.25% of the total variance.

Next each Aad factor was collapsed into a single variable, to correlate with users' Facebook experience variables. Overall, subjects ( $n=367$ ) had a negative attitude and

passive reaction toward ads on Facebook. The average score of each variable ranged from 2 to 3 on a 7-point Likert scale. Of these, the perceived value of the ads for Facebook had the highest mean ( $M = 3.75$ ,  $SD = 1.5$ ) while the intention to click and share the ads had the lowest mean ( $M = 2.08$ ,  $SD = .97$ ).

### T-test

Hypothesis 1 predicted users' Facebook experiences differ by gender. Independent  $t$ -tests were conducted to compare means of two unrelated groups on three Facebook experience factors—Empowerment, Community-self-worth and Social Participation.

*Table 4.4.1 T-test Comparing Gender by Facebook Experience—Empowerment*

|         | $n$ | $M$  | $SD$ | $t$  | $\eta$ | $\sqrt{\eta^2}$ |
|---------|-----|------|------|------|--------|-----------------|
| Males   | 166 | 2.67 | .92  | 1.00 | .053   | .003            |
| Females | 198 | 2.58 | .79  |      |        |                 |

\*  $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4.4.1 shows that  $t(362) = 1.00$ ,  $p = .17$ , so males ( $M = 2.67$ ,  $SD = .92$ ) were not statistically more empowered by Facebook compared Females ( $M = 2.58$ ,  $SD = .79$ ).

*Table 4.4.2 T-test Comparing Gender by Facebook Experience—Community-self-worth*

|         | $n$ | $M$  | $SD$ | $t$ | $\eta$ | $\sqrt{\eta^2}$ |
|---------|-----|------|------|-----|--------|-----------------|
| Males   | 167 | 3.64 | 1.19 | .29 | .015   | .000            |
| Females | 197 | 3.61 | 1.31 |     |        |                 |

\*  $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$



Similarly, as Table 4.4.2 shows,  $t(362) = .29, p = .72$ , so males ( $M = 3.64, SD = 1.19$ ) did not statistically differ with Females ( $M = 3.61, SD = 1.31$ ) on Community-selfworth experience with Facebook.

*Table 4.4.3 T-test Comparing Gender by Facebook Experience—Social participation*

|         | <i>n</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t</i> | $\eta$ | $\sqrt{\eta^2}$ |
|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|-----------------|
| Males   | 165      | 3.59     | 1.68      | -1.41    | .074   | .006            |
| Females | 197      | 3.85     | 1.82      |          |        |                 |

\*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .01$

Again, Table 4.4.3 demonstrated that  $t(362) = -1.31, p = .18$ , so males ( $M = 3.59, SD = 1.68$ ) and females ( $M = 3.85, SD = 1.82$ ) do not have statistically difference in Social participation experience with Facebook.

T-tests showed that Facebook users' experience do not differ statistically by gender on all three experience factors. Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

### **Regression tests**

This research hypothesized that the users' Facebook experiences contribute to explain their attitude toward ads. A regression test was conducted to explore this hypothesis. Based on the result of factor analysis, the dependent variable, Attitude toward ads, was operationalized with five variables: Intention to click and share, Attention and interest, Perceived value for Facebook, Avoidance of ads and Avoidance of Friend forwarded ads. The independent variables, users' Facebook experiences, were tested with

three variables: Empowerment, Community-Self-worth and Social participation. Before these were entered into the model, the demographic variables of first gender and second online shopping time were entered to control their effect. Subsequently the Facebook experience variables were entered one by one to see the additional variations that each of them would contribute to the model. To decide the order in which the Facebook experience variables had to be entered, a correlation matrix had to be consulted.

*Table 4.5 Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Facebook Experience and Attitude toward Ads Variables*

| Variables                 | 2     | 3     | 4    | 5     | 6     | 7    | 8     | 9     |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| 1. Empowerment            | .76** | .42** | 0.04 | .45** | .33** | 0.05 | .17** | .19** |
| 2. Community-self-worth   |       | .36** | 0.08 | .33** | .31** | .13* | .14** | .17** |
| 3. Social participation   |       |       | 0.69 | .11*  | 0.10  | 0.03 | .11*  | 0.04  |
| 4. Online shopping time   |       |       |      | 0.10  | .13*  | 0.00 | .11*  | 0.03  |
| 5. Click and share        |       |       |      |       | .44** | .11* | .28** | .34** |
| 6. Attention and interest |       |       |      |       |       | 0.22 | .20** | .11*  |
| 7. Perceived value        |       |       |      |       |       |      | .13*  | 0.03  |
| 8. Avoidance              |       |       |      |       |       |      |       | .41** |
| 9 Avoidance friend        |       |       |      |       |       |      |       |       |

\*\*  $p < .05$

\*  $p < .01$

The correlation matrix shows the zero-order correlations that each of the Facebook experience variable had with each of the attitude toward ads variables. Table 5 showed that most of these correlations were statistically significant, suggesting possible significant contribution in the regression model. Based on the correlation value, the research hypothesis was broken down as follows:

Hypothesis 2.1.1: Users' Facebook experience -- Empowerment will contribute significantly to users' intention to click and share the Facebook ads after the gender and online shopping time's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.1.2: Users' Facebook experience -- Community-self-worth will contribute significantly to users' intention to click and share the Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time and Empowerment's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.1.3: Users' Facebook experience -- Social participation will contribute significantly to users' intention to click and share the Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time, Empowerment and Community-selfworth's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.2.1: Users' Facebook experience -- Empowerment will contribute significantly to users' attention and interest in Facebook ads after the gender and online shopping time's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.2.2: Users' Facebook experience -- Community-self-worth will contribute significantly to users' attention and interest in Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time and Empowerment's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.2.3: Users' Facebook experience -- Social participation will contribute significantly to users' attention and interest in Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time, Empowerment and Community-self-worth's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.3.1: Users' Facebook experience -- Community-self-worth will contribute significantly to users' perceived value of ads for Facebook after the gender and online shopping time's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.3.2: Users' Facebook experience -- Empowerment will contribute significantly to users' perceived value of ads for Facebook after the gender, online shopping time and Community-self-worth's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.3.3: Users' Facebook experience -- Social participation will contribute significantly to users' attention and interest in Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time, Community-self-worth and Empowerment's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.4.1: Users' Facebook experience -- Empowerment will contribute significantly to users' intention to avoid Facebook ads after the gender and online shopping time's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.4.2: Users' Facebook experience -- Community-self-worth will contribute significantly to users' intention to avoid Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time and Empowerment's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.4.3: Users' Facebook experience -- Social participation will contribute significantly to users' intention to avoid Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time, Empowerment and Community-self-worth's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.5.1: Users' Facebook experience -- Empowerment will contribute significantly to users' intention to avoid friend forwarded Facebook ads after the gender and online shopping time's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.5.2: Users' Facebook experience -- Community-self-worth will contribute significantly to users' intention to avoid friend forwarded Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time and Empowerment's effects have been considered.

Hypothesis 2.5.3: Users' Facebook experience -- Social participation will contribute significantly to users' intention to avoid friend forwarded Facebook ads after the gender, online shopping time, Empowerment and Community-self-worth's effects have been considered.

*Table 4.6.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Click-forward and Facebook Experiences*

|                      | Click-forward (DV) | Gender | Online shopping time | Empowerment | Community-self worth | Social participation |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Click-forward (DV)   |                    | -.17** | .10*                 | .45*        | .33**                | .11**                |
| Gender               |                    |        | .05                  | -.06        | -.03                 | .07                  |
| Online shopping      |                    |        |                      | .05         | .09                  | .08                  |
| Empowerment          |                    |        |                      |             | .75**                | .42**                |
| Community-self worth |                    |        |                      |             |                      | .36**                |
| Social participation |                    |        |                      |             |                      |                      |
| <i>M</i>             | 2.10               |        | 3.17                 | 2.61        | 3.64                 | 3.73                 |
| <i>SD</i>            | .99                |        | 1.88                 | .85         | 1.16                 | 1.78                 |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4.6.2 Sequential Regression Table for Click-forward and Facebook Experiences

| Variables |                      | <i>b</i> | $\beta$ | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> Change<br>(incremental) | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | <i>R</i><br>(model) |
|-----------|----------------------|----------|---------|---|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Model 1   | Gender               | 2.61**   | -.17    | .03**   | .03                              | .02                                       | .17**               |
| Model 2   | Gender               | -.34*    | -.17    | .01**   | .04                              | .03                                       | .20*                |
|           | Online shopping time | .09*     | .13     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Model 3   | Gender               | -.28**   | -.13    | .19**   | .23                              | .22                                       | .48**               |
|           | Online shopping time | .05      | .09     |   |                                  |   |                     |
|           | Empowerment          | .51**    | .44     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Model 4   | Gender               | -.28**   | -.13    | .00   | .23                              | .22                                       | .48                 |
|           | Online shopping time | .05      | .09     |   |                                  |   |                     |
|           | Empowerment          | .52**    | .45**   |   |                                  |   |                     |
|           | Community-self worth | -.02     | -.02    |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Model 5   | Gender               | -.27**   | -.13**  | .01   | .23                              | .22                                       | .48                 |
|           | Online shopping time | .05      | .09     |   |                                  |   |                     |
|           | Empowerment          | .56**    | .09**   |   |                                  |   |                     |
|           | Community-self worth | -.01     | -.01    |   |                                  |   |                     |
|           | Social participation | -.05     | -.09    |   |                                  |   |                     |

\**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01

As Table 4.6.1 indicates, Gender in Model 1 had a statistically significant effect on Facebook users' intention to click and share ads [ $F(1, 349) = 9.76, p = .002$ ] accounting for 2.7% of the variation. This finding was consistent with prior research.

Hypothesis 2.1.2 predicted online shopping time would significantly explain additional variance in Facebook users' intention to click and share ads after the effect of gender has been considered. The result [ $F(1, 348) = 4.36, p = .037$ ] was statistically significant, thus supporting the hypothesis. Adding online shopping increased the explained variance of the model by 1.2%, yielding an overall explained variance for the model of 3.4%.

Hypothesis 2.1.3 predicted Facebook experience -- Empowerment, significantly explained additional variance in users' intention to click and share ads after the effects of gender and online shopping had been considered. The result showed that it was statistically significant [ $F(1, 347) = 84.72, p = .0001$ ] in model 3, and it accounted for an additional 18.9% of explained variance, resulting in an overall explained variance of 22.8% for the model.

Hypothesis 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 predicted respectively another two Facebook experience-Community-self-worth and Social participation would add to the explaining power of users' intention to click and share ads. However, the results of model 4 and 5 were not statistically significant [ $F(1, 346) = .059, p = .81$  for model 4 and  $F(1, 345) = 2.86, p = .092$  for model 5]. Hence, Community-self-worth and Social participation did not help to significantly increase the explained variance of users' intention to click and share Facebook ads. Hypothesis 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 were not supported.

*Table 4.7.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Attention-interest and Facebook experiences*

|                        | Attention-interest (DV) | Gender | Online shopping time | Empowerment | Community-self worth | Social participation |
|------------------------|-------------------------|--------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Attention-interest(DV) |                         | .03    | .13*                 | .33*        | .31**                | .10*                 |
| Gender                 |                         |        | .04                  | -.06        | -.02                 | .08                  |
| Online shopping        |                         |        |                      | .04         | .08                  | .07                  |
| Empowerment            |                         |        |                      |             | .75**                | .42**                |
| Community-self worth   |                         |        |                      |             |                      | .36**                |
| Social participation   |                         |        |                      |             |                      |                      |
| <i>M</i>               | 3.42                    |        | 3.18                 | 2.61        | 3.64                 | 3.73                 |
| <i>SD</i>              | 1.36                    |        | 1.88                 | .85         | 1.16                 | 1.78                 |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$



Table 4.7.2 Sequential Regression for Attention-interest and Facebook Experiences

| Variables | <i>B</i>             | $\beta$ | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> Change<br>(incremental) | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | <i>R</i><br>(model) |       |
|-----------|----------------------|---------|---|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|-------|
| Model1    | Gender               | .08     | .03   | .00                              | .00                                       | -.002               | .03   |
| Model2    | Gender               | .06     | .02   | .02*                             | .02                                       | .01                 | .13*  |
|           | Online shopping time | .09*    | .13   |                                  |   |                     |       |
| Model3    | Gender               | .11     | .04   | .11**                            | .13                                       | .12                 | .35** |
|           | Online shopping time | .08*    | .12   |                                  |   |                     |       |
|           | Empowerment          | .52**   | .33   |                                  |   |                     |       |
| Model4    | Gender               | .11     | .04   | .01                              | .13                                       | .12                 | .36   |
|           | Online shopping time | .08*    | .11   |                                  |   |                     |       |
|           | Empowerment          | .36**   | .23   |                                  |   |                     |       |
|           | Community-self worth | .16     | .13   |                                  |   |                     |       |
| Model5    | Gender               | .13     | .05   | .00                              | .13                                       | .12                 | .37   |
|           | Online shopping time | .08*    | .11   |                                  |   |                     |       |
|           | Empowerment          | .40**   | .25   |                                  |   |                     |       |
|           | Community-self worth | .17     | .14   |                                  |   |                     |       |
|           | Social participation | -.06    | -.07  |                                  |   |                     |       |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4.7.2 showed that Gender in Model 1 did not have a statistically significant effect on Facebook users' intention to click and share ads, hence hypothesis 2.2.1 was not supported.

Online shopping time had a statistically significant effect on Attention-interest the users would have on Facebook ads [ $F(1, 354) = 6.08, p = .014$ ], accounting for 2% of the variation. It showed that the online shopping time had a very weak influence on attention and interest variable.

Hypothesis 2.2.3 predicted that Facebook experience -- Empowerment would significantly explain additional variance in attention- interest on Facebook ads. The result [ $F(2, 353) = 43.15, p = .0001$ ], was statistically significant in Model 3, thus supporting hypothesis 2.2.3. Adding Empowerment increased the explained variance of the model by 11%, yielding an overall explained variance for the model of 13%.

Table 4.7.2 also indicated that Hypothesis 2.2.4 and 2.2.5, which respectively predicted two Facebook experiences, Community-self-worth and Social participation, would add to the explaining power of attention and interest in ads variable, were not supported, since the F tests were not statistically significant.

Table 4.8.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Perceived ads Value for Facebook and Facebook Experience

|                                   | Perceived value for Facebook (DV) | Gender | Online shopping time | Community-self worth | Empowerment | Social participation |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Perceived value for Facebook (DV) |                                   | -.03   | 0.01                 | .12*                 | .05         | .04                  |
| Gender                            |                                   |        | .05                  | -.02                 | -.06        | .07                  |
| Online shopping                   |                                   |        |                      | .08                  | .04         | .07                  |
| Community-self worth              |                                   |        |                      |                      | .75**       | .37**                |
| Empowerment                       |                                   |        |                      |                      |             | .43**                |
| Social participation              |                                   |        |                      |                      |             |                      |
| <i>M</i>                          | 3.75                              |        | 3.18                 | 3.64                 | 2.61        | 3.73                 |
| <i>SD</i>                         | 1.49                              |        | 1.88                 | 1.16                 | .85         | 1.77                 |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4.8.2 Sequential Regression Table Statistics for Perceived ads Value for Facebook and Facebook Experience

| Variables | <i>B</i>             | $\beta$ | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> Change<br>(incremental) | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | Adjusted<br><i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | <i>R</i><br>(model) |      |
|-----------|----------------------|---------|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|------|
| Model 1   | Gender               | -.08    | -.03  | .00                              | .00  | -.00                | .03  |
| Model 2   | Gender               | -.07    | -.03  | .00                              | .00  | -.00                | .03  |
|           | Online shopping time | -.01    | -.01  |                                  |  |                     |      |
| Model 3   | Gender               | -.07    | -.02  | .02*                             | .02  | .01                 | .13* |
|           | Online shopping time | -.01    | -.02  |                                  |  |                     |      |
|           | Community-self worth | .15*    | .12   |                                  |  |                     |      |
| Model4    | Gender               | -.08    | -.03  | .01                              | .02  | .01                 | .14  |
|           | Online shopping time | -.01    | -.02  |                                  |  |                     |      |
|           | Community-self worth | .25*    | .20   |                                  |  |                     |      |
|           | Empowerment          | -.17    | -.10  |                                  |  |                     |      |
| Model 5   | Gender               | -.08    | -.03  | .00                              | .02  | .01                 | .14  |
|           | Online shopping time | -.02    | -.02  |                                  |  |                     |      |
|           | Community-self worth | .25*    | .20   |                                  |  |                     |      |
|           | Empowerment          | -.17    | -.10  |                                  |  |                     |      |
|           | Social participation | .01     | .01   |                                  |  |                     |      |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4.8.1 showed that none of the independent variables had a statistically significant effect on Facebook users' perceived value of ads for Facebook, except for the Community-self-worth experience. It was statistically significant in model 3 [ $F(1,353) = 5.41, p = .021$ ]. Adding the Community-self-worth experience increased the explained variance of the model by 2%. Hypothesis 2.3.3 was supported. Hypotheses 2.3.1, 2, 4 and 5 were not supported.

*Table 4.9.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Ads Avoidance and Facebook Experience*

|                      | Avoidance (DV) | Gender | Online shopping time | Empowerment | Community-self worth | Social participation |
|----------------------|----------------|--------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Avoidance (DV)       |                | -.01   | .10*                 | .16**       | .13**                | .10*                 |
| Gender               |                |        | .05                  | -.07        | -.03                 | .08                  |
| Online shopping      |                |        |                      | .04         | .08                  | .07                  |
| Empowerment          |                |        |                      |             | .75**                | .37**                |
| Community-self worth |                |        |                      |             |                      | .43**                |
| Social participation |                |        |                      |             |                      |                      |
| <i>M</i>             | 2.78           |        | 3.18                 | 3.64        | 2.61                 | 3.73                 |
| <i>SD</i>            | 1.42           |        | 1.88                 | 1.16        | .85                  | 1.77                 |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4.9.2 Sequential Regression Table for Ads Avoidance and Facebook Experience

| Variables            | <i>B</i> | $\beta$ | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> Change<br>(incremental) | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | <i>R</i><br>(model) |
|----------------------|----------|---------|---|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| Model 1              |          |         |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Gender               | -.02     | -.01    | .00   | .00                              | -.00                                      | .01                 |
| Model 2              |          |         |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Gender               | .00      | .00     | .00   | .00                              | -.00                                      | .03                 |
| Online shopping time | .07      | .09     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Model 3              |          |         |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Gender               | .00      | .00     | .03**   | .03                              | .03                                       | .19                 |
| Online shopping time | .07      | .09     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Empowerment          | .26**    | .16     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Model4               |          |         |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Gender               | .00      | .00     | .00   | .04                              | .02                                       | .19                 |
| Online shopping time | .07      | .04     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Empowerment          | .25      | .15     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Community-self worth | .01      | .01     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Model 5              |          |         |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Gender               | -.00     | -.00    | .00   | .03                              | .02                                       | .19                 |
| Online shopping time | .07      | -.09    |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Empowerment          | .23      | .14     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Community-self worth | .01      | .10     |   |                                  |   |                     |
| Social participation | .03      | .05     |   |                                  |   |                     |

\**p*<.05; \*\**p* < .01

As shown in Table 4.9.2, only one independent variable, Facebook experience -- Empowerment, contributed significantly to the explained variance on Facebook users' intention to avoid Facebook ads. In model 3, [ $F(1,351) = 9.13, p = .003$ ] the Empowerment experience accounted for 3% of the explained variance in users' intention to avoid ads. Hypothesis 2.4.3 was supported; 2.4.1, 2, 4 and 5 were not supported.

*Table 4.10.1 Pearson Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Friend Forwarded Ads Avoidance and Facebook Experience*

|                       | Avoidance friend (DV) | Gender | Online shopping time | Empowerment | Community-self worth | Social participation |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Avoidance friend (DV) |                       | -.03   | .02                  | 2.00**      | .17*                 | .04                  |
| Gender                |                       |        | .04                  | -.06        | -.02                 | .08                  |
| Online shopping       |                       |        |                      | .04         | .08                  | .07                  |
| Empowerment           |                       |        |                      |             | .75**                | .37**                |
| Community-self worth  |                       |        |                      |             |                      | .43**                |
| Social participation  |                       |        |                      |             |                      |                      |
| <i>M</i>              | 2.83                  |        | 3.18                 | 3.64        | 2.61                 | 3.73                 |
| <i>SD</i>             | 1.52                  |        | 1.88                 | 1.16        | .85                  | 1.77                 |

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4.10.2 Sequential Regression Table for Friend Forwarded Ads Avoidance and Facebook Experience

| Variables | <i>B</i>             | $\beta$ | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> Change<br>(incremental) | <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup><br>(model) | <i>R</i><br>(model) |     |
|-----------|----------------------|---------|---|----------------------------------|---|---------------------|-----|
| Model 1   | Gender               | -.10    | -.03  | .00                              | .00                                       | -.00                | .03 |
| Model 2   | Gender               | -.10    | -.03  | .00                              | .00                                       | -.00                | .04 |
|           | Online shopping time | .02     | .02   |                                  |   |                     |     |
| Model 3   | Gender               | -.06    | -.02  | .04**                            | .04                                       | .03                 | .20 |
|           | Online shopping time | .01     | .02   |                                  |   |                     |     |
|           | Empowerment          | .35**   | .20   |                                  |   |                     |     |
| Model4    | Gender               | -.07    | -.02  | .00                              | .04                                       | .03                 | .20 |
|           | Online shopping time | .01     | .01   |                                  |   |                     |     |
|           | Empowerment          | .30     | .17   |                                  |   |                     |     |
|           | Community-self worth | .05     | .04   |                                  |   |                     |     |
| Model 5   | Gender               | -.05    | -.02  | .00                              | .04                                       | .03                 | .21 |
|           | Online shopping time | .01     | .02   |                                  |   |                     |     |
|           | Empowerment          | .33     | .19   |                                  |   |                     |     |
|           | Community-self worth | .06     | .05   |                                  |   |                     |     |
|           | Social participation | -.05    | -.06  |                                  |   |                     |     |

\**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01



Similarly, table 4.10 showed that only Facebook experience -- Empowerment contributed statistically significant to the Facebook users' intention to avoid friend forwarded ads. In Model 3 [ $F(1,353) = 14.42, p = .0001$ ], Empowerment experience increased the explained variance of the model by 4%. Hypothesis 2.5.3 was supported, and hypothesis 2.5.1, 2, 4 and 5 were not supported.

*Table 4.11 Person Correlation Coefficients for Facebook Experience and Attitude toward Ads Variables*

|                      | Click & share | Attention & Interest | Perceived Value for Facebook | Avoidance | Avoidance friend |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Empowerment          | .45**         | .33**                | 0.05                         | .17**     | .19**            |
| Community-selfworth  | .33**         | .31**                | .13*                         | .14**     | .17**            |
| Social participation | .11*          | 0.10                 | 0.03                         | .11*      | 0.04             |

\*\*  $p < .05$

\*  $p < .01$

Table 4.12 Regression  $R^2$  Change on Attitude toward Ads

|                      | Click & share | Attention & Interest | Perceived Value for Facebook | Avoidance | Avoidance friend |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Gender               | .03**         |                      |                              |           |                  |
| Online shopping time | .01*          | .02*                 |                              |           |                  |
| Empowerment          | .19**         | .11**                |                              | .03**     | .04**            |
| Community-selfworth  |               |                      | .02*                         |           |                  |
| Social participation |               |                      |                              |           |                  |

\*\*  $p < .05$

\*  $p < .01$

Overall, Table 4.11 shows that Facebook experience dimensions and Aad dimensions were most positive and highly significant correlated, except for Perceived value of ads for Facebook.

Table 4.12, the regression results, show that Facebook experiences added significant explanation power to Aad after taking into account two individual variables (gender and time spent online). The individual variable, Gender, did not appear to influence users' Aad except for the intention to click and share, which showed a weak association ( $R^2$  change = .03,  $p = .001$ ).

Another individual variable, Online shopping time, contributed slightly to explaining users' intention to click and share ads, the attention they paid to ads and interests they feel about ads.

Among the three experience dimensions, Empowerment contributed most to Aad dimensions, but its contribution to users' Intention to avoid ads dimension was very small.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

As Facebook continue to grow at an overwhelming speed and engage Internet users, its role of being an advertising vehicle becomes increasingly prominent. High expectations are casted on its ability to change advertising profoundly. Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg called ads on Facebook “social ad”, and claimed it can “help advertisers create some of the best ad campaigns ever built” (Klassen, 2007, para 1). Undeniably, his confidence comes from the fact that SNS ads can be highly targeted and relevant (Gangadharbatla, 2008). Basically, such advantage is gained through two mechanisms: (1) Advertisers can target Facebook users that are most likely to purchase their products by accessing the cookies from their browsers and checking their past purchase behaviors (Yaakop, Mohamed, Omar & Liam, 2012); (2) advertising messages can come through the news feed from friends and trigger a word of mouth effect.

Special features of Facebook ads have attracted researchers’ attention who had adopted a series new variables pertaining to SNS friends, SNS’s social feature and perceived features of SNS ads to evaluate advertisements’ effectiveness (Gangadharbatla,

, 2008; Yaakop, et al., 2012; Chang, Chen & Tan, 2012). Also, studies on SNS uses and adoption are expected to provide insights for advertisers to better use Facebook as advertising vehicles (Gangadharbatla, 2008).

The current study extended the existing research on SNS ads' effectiveness by establishing a relationship between Facebook users' experience and their reaction to ads. This new perspective would add value to the ability of advertisers to better target consumers, who are most directly defined by how they experience the media context. In so doing advertisers can then stay relevant by providing something that aligns with the experience the users are seeking from Facebook. Such need is highlighted since scholars have recognized that the synergy between the brand idea and media context is the key issue for marketers (Calder & Malthouse, 2008).

In this study, the factor analysis of Facebook experience was based on the first 37 first order experience items rather than the 8 subgroups that previous researchers (Calder & Malthouse, 2006; Calder et al., 2009) identified with traditional media. Three factors were generated as compared to the two second order website engagement dimensions found by Calder et al. (2009). The factor analysis of the Aad showed that it was the level of reactions, rather than the friends' recommendation that determined which variables related to each other. The results of factor analysis contribute to the adjustment of survey instruments of future study, progressing knowledge to more accurately define Facebook experience and users' attitude to SNS ads.

Sequential regressions were conducted on each Aad variable and results varied among different dependent variables. Significant associations were found with some

variables while others not. The following section addressed each findings specifically and their implications, limitations of the study and areas for future research.

**RQ1: What are the underlying factors of users' Facebook experiences?**

Previous research on social networking sites using Uses and Gratifications (U&G) theory tended to differentiate SNS users' gratification into two categories, namely, content/information gratification and social connection gratification (Johnson & Yang, 2009; Joinson, 2008). In this research, it is evident that Uses and Gratifications theory has relevance for the study of Facebook use in terms of users' need for information and connecting socially.

In this study three factors emerged, which enabled a better understanding of Facebook users' motives and gratifications. All three experiences involved information exchange. When Facebook users had an Empowerment experience, they sought or gave useful information to facilitate decisions and improve lives. With a Community-self-worth experience, information made users happy because they would not have been able to acquire it if the Facebook community did not exist, or because sending out information reinforced users' self-identification in a community. With a Social participation experience, information was basic to starting conversations and socializing activities.

Similarly, social connection gratification pervaded all three factors. The three experiences represented different ways to utilize information and experience the gratification users sought and acquired from socialization using Facebook. This finding was consistent with how this study defined the Facebook experience, i.e. how users believe Facebook fits into their lives. It was also consistent with the U&G explanation of

why people use media (McQuail, 1983). McQuail defined four dimensions that determined people's media use. The *information dimension* related to finding out relevant conditions of surroundings, seeking advice and satisfying curiosity. The *personal identity dimension* relates to finding reinforcement for personal values and identifying with valued others. The *integration and social interaction dimension* involves social empathy, identifying with others and gaining a sense of belonging. The *entertainment dimension* mainly deals with escaping and emotional release. The three Facebook experience factors found in this study, namely, Empowerment, Community-self-worth and Social Participation, largely corresponded to McQuail's (1983) information, personal identity and social interaction dimensions. Interestingly, McQuail's (1983) entertainment dimension did not load on any of the three factors in our finding. An examination of initial extraction of factor analysis found that the temporal experience cross-loaded among the other factors and hence was removed from this analysis. This suggested that Facebook helped users divert from their daily problems while having the other kinds of experiences at the same time, indicating all three kinds of users' Facebook experiences were quite fun and relaxing.

In Calder, Malthouse & Schaedel's (2009) research on website users' engagement, they suggested two second-order engagement dimensions: Personal Engagement and Social Interactive Engagement. They argued that Social Interactive Engagement was more specific to websites. Its dominant character, valuing input from the community, the sense of participating with others and socializing contribute to differentiate the Internet experience from traditional media experiences. The online experience appeared to be more active, participatory and interactive. In this study the Community-self-worth and

Social Participation experiences reinforced the previous statement about Internet as an interactive medium. Especially the fact that Social Participation had the highest mean (M= 3.72) among the three, suggested that Facebook users valued it more because it enabled them to interact with others.

### **H1: Users' experience with Facebook differs by gender**

The result of *T*-tests showed no statistically significant difference between males and females with all three Facebook experience dimensions. It appeared to contradict Weiser's (2000) research on gender differences in Internet use patterns. However, considering Weiser's investigation was conducted more than a decade ago when Internet users were perceived to be new technology adopters, the current finding was reasonable at a time when Facebook has become a site that is tightly integrated into daily media practices (Ellison et al., 2007). Using convenient sampling among a student population might be another reason why no gender differences in Facebook experience was obtained since the ages and life experiences were much less heterogeneous than the general users group. Although no difference in Facebook experience was observed, the result served as a contrast with gender's contribution in users' reaction to ads which was inspected in the following regression tests.

### **RQ2: What are the underlying factors of users' attitude toward ads?**

The factor analysis generated five underlying dimensions. On four of the five components, namely, users' intention to click and share the ads, attention paid and perceived interests of the ads and perceived value of ads for funding Facebook, users' attitude toward pure ads and friends recommended ads fell into the same factor. This



finding contradicted the intuitive expectation that Facebook friends have power to disseminate ad information. It can be argued that, instead of influencing consumers' attitude Aad directly, Word of Mouth (WOM) effect is a complicated mechanism that involves many variables, such as the strength of social ties, expertise of the recommender and product type (Chang, Chen & Tan, 2012), which may interact with each other in influencing consumers' reaction. It is therefore reasonable to assume that although the current research, which asked about users' general reaction toward ads, did not see friends' recommendation play an important role, friends would still function in other ways to help spread brand information. The fourth and fifth factors related to users' avoidance of ads, where friends' recommendations did matter. Facebook users' intention to avoid friend forwarded ads was slightly lower ( $M = 2.78$  reverse coded) than their intention to avoid pure ads ( $M = 2.76$ ). Overall, the factor analysis of the current study did not suggest a big role for Facebook friends to play in influencing users' attitude toward ads.

**H2: Users' Facebook experiences are related to their attitude to Facebook ads**

*Table 4.11 Person correlation coefficients for Facebook experience and Attitude toward ads variables*

|                      | Click & share | Attention & Interest | Perceived Value for Facebook | Avoidance | Avoidance friend |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Empowerment          | .45**         | .33**                | 0.05                         | .17**     | .19**            |
| Community-selfworth  | .33**         | .31**                | .13*                         | .14**     | .17**            |
| Social participation | .11*          | 0.10                 | 0.03                         | .11*      | 0.04             |

\*\*  $p < .05$

\*  $p < .01$

*Table 4.12 Regression  $R^2$  Change on Attitude toward ads*

|                      | Click & share | Attention & Interest | Perceived Value for Facebook | Avoidance | Avoidance friend |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Gender               | .03**         |                      |                              |           |                  |
| Online shopping time | .01*          | .02*                 |                              |           |                  |
| Empowerment          | .19**         | .11**                |                              | .03**     | .04**            |
| Community-selfworth  |               |                      | .02*                         |           |                  |
| Social participation |               |                      |                              |           |                  |

\*\*  $p < .05$

\*  $p < .01$

The regression results showed that the individual variable, gender did not appear to influence users' Aad except for the intention to click and share, which showed a weak association ( $R^2$  change = .03,  $p = .001$ ). As no significant difference existed between male and female subjects in Facebook experiences, gender's role in affecting users' intention to click and share the ads should either be independent, or serve to moderate the Facebook experience's influence on users' Aad. Taylor et al's (2012) research suggested that gender moderated the influence of using SNS as a way to improve quality of life and structuring time on users' attitude toward ads. This provides a possible direction for future research to explore more explicitly gender's role in moderating relationship between users' Facebook experience and their reaction to ads.

Another individual variable, online shopping time, contributed slightly to explaining users' intention to click and share ads, the attention they paid to ads and interests they feel about ads. This finding was in line with the functionalist perspective of internet use (Rodgers, & Thorson, 2000). Online shopping time might be an indicator of the tendency of a web user to shop, which led them to attend to ad information on Facebook. However, this relationship was weak, suggesting users mainly concentrated on getting a unique Facebook experience when they were on Facebook and mostly did not perceive Facebook as an additional shopping channel.

The correlation matrix of Facebook experience variables and Aad variables showed that most correlations were positive and highly significant, except for the Perceived value for Facebook and Aad. The regression results were consistent with this conclusion. Overall, results provided consistent evidence of the positive relationship between Facebook experience dimensions and Aad dimensions. After taking into account two

individual variables (gender and time spent online), Facebook experiences still added significant explanation power to Aad. Among the three experience dimensions, Empowerment contributed most to Aad variables. But its contribution to users' Intention to avoid ads dimension was very small.

This should not come as a surprise. Previous research had demonstrated that the reason why media context has an effect on ads' effectiveness lies in its contribution to activate certain needs within media users over others, thereby motivating consumers to concentrate on ads that are congruent with the theme of the main media content (MacInnis & Jaworski, 1989; Petty et al., 2002). So, if Facebook users have an Empowerment experience, it means their need to become better by seeking information, getting inspired and giving advice to others was primed when using Facebook. In this situation ads may be an integral part of information on Facebook that help users meeting their goals. This match earned the ads more favorable acceptance.

One Aad dimension, Perceived value of ads for Facebook, appeared to be different from the other Aad variables in that it correlated with neither the Empowerment nor the Social participation experience. Only a weak correlation with Community-self-worth experience was observed. It might be because the question tapped into the objective evaluation from the users. If the role that advertisements play to fund Facebook has become common knowledge among the users, their experience with Facebook would have little influence on their perception of this fact. In other word, the Perceived value of Facebook ads should have been viewed more as an antecedent of Aad rather than the Aad itself. Future research would benefit from investigating the relationship between the perceived value of the Facebook ads and users attitude toward ads.

## **Implications**

A major contribution of this study lies in conceptualization of Facebook experience and users' reaction to Facebook ads. The scale of Website experience, which Calder, Malthouse & Schaedel (2009) developed, was applied successfully in this study, yet the three underlying experience factors differed from Calder et al. (2009)'s second order Website engagement variables. This confirms the necessity of implementing novel experience scales when it comes to a new media platform. The items that fell in the three experience factors also advance the understanding of the way people engage with Facebook.

Likewise, the multifaceted concept of users' reaction toward ads was broken down into five factors, which indicated friends' recommendation only plays a role in differentiating users' intention to avoid the ads. This finding reminds the advertisers that the 'like's power in spreading brand information is limited and cannot be relied on as the sole tactic in Facebook advertising. The result of the current research supports the need to consider more variables that interact to make ads more effective on SNSs, such as the product type, brand fan's expertise, the ties of relationship (Chang, Chen & Tan, 2012) and the perceived credibility of the ads.

The factor analyses allowed for a fine-grained assessment of the potential impact of Facebook experience on users' reaction to ads. The results showed a stronger association of the Empowerment experience with multiple Aad variables than the Community-self-worth and Social participation experiences did. It could be argued that although the

different components of Facebook experience are interrelated, reactions to ads have a stronger connection with one factor only.

The findings of this research have a major practical implication for Facebook designer and the advertisers seeking attention and involvement from Facebook users. First, “managing a website involves engineering a set of experiences for the visitors” (Calder, Malthouse & Schaedel, 2009, p329). This research identified three Facebook experience dimensions and showed that a positive experience will carry over to advertising reaction. Facebook managers can use it as a reference when introducing new applications and page designs to create the experience that users are seeking. Facebook can then use the boosted user experience as a way to attract and hold on to advertisers.

On the other hand, advertisers can base their strategies on the users’ Facebook experience. Previous research posited that different advertising strategies have their own goal and means to achieve objectives (Hall & Maclay, 1991; Franzen, 1998; Van den Putte, 2002). Bronner and Neijans’ (2006) summarized four main advertising strategies:

1. Awareness: aims to create top-of-mind awareness by being different, unexpected and unique, which fits best new products promotion.
2. Persuasion: is the strategy trying to convince consumers by communicating product attributes.
3. Sales response: the strategy aims to stimulate sales directly through bargains or special offers.
4. Relationship: trying to establish an emotional tie with consumers.

Bronner and Neijans then suggested that as different media platforms prime different associations between users' experience and their attitude toward ads, advertisers would consider choosing the medium type whose context fits with the advertising strategy. In the case of Facebook, results of the current research suggested that Empowerment contributed most to explain users' Aad and the Empowerment experience mainly related to users' utilitarian and self-improvement needs. In this case it seems the persuasion strategy would be the best match for Facebook ads. Sales would also be effective, if Facebook users view the incentive the advertisers offer as useful tips to facilitate their purchase decisions or being worthwhile to forward to their friends.

### **Limitation and future research**

The conclusions of this research are subject to limitations of the study's methodology. First, the sample was limited to Oklahoma State University and is skewed toward younger respondents. Second, some questionnaires were sent out without any benefit attached so the respondents may not take it as seriously due to the time and comprehension effort it took to complete. As a result of the use of nonprobability sampling the findings of this study are not generalizable. Future research may address this limitation by drawing a random sample from a more diverse and representative population.

Regarding Facebook users' attitude toward ads, the conclusion only goes to the ads as a general group. This research does not differentiate the ads according to product categories or message strategies. In other words, unlike the users' experience with Facebook, which was examined in detail, the exact value of Facebook ads to the users is

unknown. The media context congruency theory suggested that if media users' experience with the media content is consistent with their experience with ads, their attitude toward ads is more likely to be positive (Bronner & Neijans, 2006). For example, ads using a relationship strategy may draw more favorable response from users who have strong social participation experience. This research does not examine Facebook users' experience with ads in detail, hence leaving more space for future study. In the future it is possible to formulate many hypotheses regarding how the congruency of media experience and ads experience would influence Facebook users' attitude toward ads.

In this research, only two individual variables, gender and online shopping time, were controlled while exploring the relationship between Facebook experience and reaction to ads. However, the roles of these individual variables were not fully investigated. Moreover, there might be many other confounding individual factors influencing Facebook users' reaction to ads or moderating the influence of experience on ads reaction, such as age, socio-economic status or computer skills. To sum up, this study pointed toward many interesting directions for future research to elucidate media context effect on ads on social network sites.



## REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorder* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: author
- Alon, A. (2005). *Rediscovering word of mouth: An analysis of word-or-mouth talk in the context of online communities*. Boston, MA: Boston University
- Arndt, J. (1967). Role of product-related conversations in the diffusion of a new product, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 4, 291-95.
- Boyd, D & Ellison, N. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13 (1), article 11
- Brackett, L.K. & Carr, Jr. B. N. (2001). Cyberspace Advertising vs. Other Media: Consumer vs. Mature Student Attitudes , *Journal of Advertising Research*, September .October, 23-32.
- Bronner, A. E., & Neijens, P. C. (2006). Audience experiences of media context and embedded advertising: A comparison of eight media. *International Journal of Market Research* (48), 81-100.
- Brown, S. P. & Stayman, D. M. (1992). Antecedents and consequences of attitude toward the ad: A meta-analysis, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19 (1), 34-51
- Bruner, G.C. II & Kumar, A. (2000). Web commercials and advertising hierarchy-of-effects", *Journal of Advertising Research*, 40(½), 35-42
- Bryan, F.B., & Yarnold, R.R. (1995). Principal components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In Grimm and Yarnold, *Reading and understanding multivariate analysis*. American Psychological Association Books

- Calder, B. J., & Malthouse, E. C. (2008). Media engagement and advertising effectiveness. *Kellogg on advertising and media*, 1-36.
- Calder, B. J., Malthouse, E.C. & Schaedel, U. (2009), An experimental study of Relationship between online engagement and advertising effectiveness, *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 23, 321-331
- Chang, K. T., Chen, W., & Tan, B. C. (2012). Advertising Effectiveness in Social Networking Sites: Social Ties, Expertise, and Product Type.
- Cattell, R.B. (1996). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1(2), 245-276
- Claire E. Norris, A. M. C. (1992). Context Effects on Recall and Recognition of Magazine Advertisements, *Journal of Advertising* 21 (3), 37-46
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 74, 1516-1530.
- comScore. (2012, January 4). People spent 6.7 billion hours on social networks in october. [Online article]. Retrieved from <http://www.comscoredatamine.com/2012/01/people-spent-6-7-billion-hours-on-social-networks-in-october/>
- comScore. (2011, July 26). The Power of Like: How Brands Reach and Influence Fans Through Social Media Marketing. [Online white paper]. Retrieved from [http://www.comscore.com/Insights/Presentations\\_and\\_Whitepapers/2011/The\\_Power\\_of\\_Like\\_How\\_Brands\\_Reach\\_and\\_Influence\\_Fans\\_Through\\_Social\\_Media\\_Marketing](http://www.comscore.com/Insights/Presentations_and_Whitepapers/2011/The_Power_of_Like_How_Brands_Reach_and_Influence_Fans_Through_Social_Media_Marketing)
- Cohen, P., Cohen, J., West, S.G., and Aikin, L.S. (2002). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Chu, S. & Kim, Y. (2011). Determinants of consumer engagement in electronic word of mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites. *International Journal of Advertising*, 30, 37-75
- Dahlén, M. (2005). The medium as a contextual cue: Effects of creative media choice. *Journal of Advertising*, 34(3), 89–98.

- Danah, M. Boyd, N. B. E. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x
- David G Taylor, J. E. L., David Strutton. (2011). Friends, Fans, and Followers: Do Ads Work on Social Networks? How Gender and Age Shape Receptivity. *Journal of Advertising Research* 51(1), 258-275. doi: 10.2501/JAR-51-1-258-275
- De Pelsmacker, P., Geuens, M., & Anckaert, P. (2002). Media context and advertising effectiveness: The role of context appreciation and context/ad similarity. *Journal of Advertising*, 49-61. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4189214>
- Dewey, J. (1896). The reflex arc concept in psychology. *Psychological review*, 3(4), 357-370.
- Ducoffe, Robert H. (1995), How consumers assess the value of advertising, *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 17 (1), 1-18
- Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210-230. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x
- Evans, M. (July 31, 2012). *Maybe Social And Advertising Don't Play Nice Together*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/markevans/2012/07/31/maybe-social-and-advertising-dont-play-nice-together/>
- Facebook key facts. (n.d.). Retrieved April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013, from <http://newsroom.fb.com/Key-Facts>
- Gangadharbatla, H. (2008). Facebook me: Collective self-esteem, need to belong, and internet self-efficacy as predictors of the iGeneration's attitudes toward social networking sites. *Journal of interactive advertising*, 8(2), 5-15.
- Garson, G. D. (2009). *Factor Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/factor.htm>
- Gorsuch, R.L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Gordon, M. E., & De Lima-Turner, K. (1997). Consumer attitudes towards Internet advertising: A social contract perspective. *International Marketing Review*, 14(5), 362-375.
- Guttman, L. (1956). “Best possible” systematic estimates of communalities. *Psychometrika*, 5, 273-275

- Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet?. *Journal of interactive marketing, 18*(1), 38-52. DOI: 10.1002/dir.10073
- Horvath, C. (2004). Measuring television addiction. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Meida, 48*(3), 378-398.
- James Schwab, A.J. (2007). Principal components analysis. Retrieved from [http://www.utexas.edu/courses/schwab/sw388r7\\_spring\\_2007/SolvingProblemsInSPSS/0\\_SolvingProblems\\_Spring\\_2007.htm](http://www.utexas.edu/courses/schwab/sw388r7_spring_2007/SolvingProblemsInSPSS/0_SolvingProblems_Spring_2007.htm)
- Johnson, P. R., & Yang, S. (2009, August). Uses and gratifications of Twitter: An examination of user motives and satisfaction of Twitter use. In *Communication Technology Division of the annual convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication in Boston, MA*.
- Joinson, A. N. (2008, April). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people?: motives and use of Facebook. In Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems (pp. 1027-1036). ACM. doi: 10.1145/1357054.1357213
- Kaiser, W. F, (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 141-151.
- Kamins, M. A. (1990). An investigation into the " match-up" hypothesis in celebrity advertising: When beauty may be only skin deep. *Journal of Advertising, 4*-13.
- Kanungo, R.N., & Pang, S. (1973). Effects of human models on perceived product quality. *Journal of Advertising Psychology, 57* (2), 172-178
- Karson, E. J., & Fisher, R. J. (2005). Reexamining and extending the dual mediation hypothesis in an online advertising context. *Psychology & Marketing, 22*(4), 333-351.
- Kane, G. C., Fichman, R. G., Gallagher, J., & Glaser, J. (2009). Community Relations 2.0. *Harvard business review, 87*(11), 45-50.
- Katz, E., Blummer, J. G., & Gurewitch, M. (1974). Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual. In J. G. B. E.Katz (Ed.), *The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research* (pp. 19-32). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Katz, E., & Foulkes, D. (1962). On the use of the Mass Media As 'Escape': Clarification of a Concept. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 26(3), 377-388.
- Kim, N. Y., & Sundar, S. S. (2012). Personal Relevance Versus Contextual Relevance. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications*, 24(3), 89-101.
- Kim, W., Jeong, O.-R., & Lee, S.-W. (2010). On social Web sites. *Information Systems*, 35(2), 215-236. doi: 10.1016/j.is.2009.08.003
- Klaassen, A. (2007). Facebook's bid Ad plan: If users like you, they'll be your campaign. *Advertising Age*. November 26. [Online magazine article]. Retrieved from <http://adage.com/article/digital/facebook-s-big-ad-plan-users-campaign/121806/>
- Kline, P. (1979). *Psychometrics and psychology*. London: Academic Press
- Korgaonkar, P. K., & Wolin, L. D. (1999). A Multivariate Analysis of Web Usage. *Journal of Advertising Research*. *Advertising Research Foundation, Inc.*, 39(1), 53-68.
- Kuykendall, D., & Keating, J. P. (1990). Mood and persuasion: evidence for the differential influence of positive and negative states. *Psychology and Marketing*, 7(1), 1-9.
- Kwon, O., & Wen, Y. (2010). An empirical study of the factors affecting social network service use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2), 254-263. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2009.04.011
- Lavidge, R. J., & Steiner, G. A. (1961). A model for predictive measurements of advertising effectiveness. *The Journal of Marketing*, 59-62. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1248516>
- Lee, A. Y., & Sternthal, B. (1999). The effects of positive mood on memory. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(2), 115-127. doi: 10.1086/209554
- Lin, K.-Y., & Lu, H.-P. (2011). Why people use social networking sites: An empirical study integrating network externalities and motivation theory. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(3), 1152-1161. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.12.009
- Lord, K. R., Burnkrant, R. E., & Unnava, H. R. (2001). The effects of program-induced mood states on memory for commercial information. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 23(1), 1-15. DOI: 10.1080/10641734.2001.10505110

- Lutz, A., (2012, Feb 22). Re: Gamestop to J.C. Penney Shut Facebook Stores. Retrieved from <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-17/f-commerce-trips-as-gap-to-penney-shut-facebook-stores-retail.html>
- Lutz, Richard J., (1985). *Antecedents of attitude toward the Ad: a conceptual framework, Psychological Processes and Advertising Effects: Theory, Research, and Application*. L.F. Alwitt and A.A. Mitchell, eds., Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lynch, J., & Schuler, D. (1994). The matchup effect of spokesperson and product congruency: A schema theory interpretation. *Psychology & Marketing*, 11(5), 417-445.
- MacInnis, D. J., & Jaworski, B. J. (1989). Information processing from advertisements: Toward an integrative framework. *The Journal of marketing*, 1-23.
- Malthouse, E. C., & Calder, B. J. (2009). Media Engagement is as important as advertising execution. In *Proceedings of the 8th ICORIA International Conference on Research, on CD-Rom*.
- Malthouse, E. C. C., Bobby J. & Tamhane, Aji. (2007). The effects of media context experiences on advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, Vol 36(3), 7-18. doi: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367360301
- Mangold, W. G., & Faulds, D. J. (2009). Social media: The new hybrid element of the promotion mix. *Business horizons*, 52(4), 357-365. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.03.002>
- Mertler, C.A., & Vannatta, R.A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Glendale, CA: Pryczak Publishing.
- McQuail, D. (1983). *McQuail's mass communication theory*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- McLeod, J., Becker, L. (1981). the uses and gratifications approach. In K. S. D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Handbook of Political Communication* (pp. 67-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mitchell, A. A. (1986). The effect of verbal and visual components of advertisements on brand attitudes and attitude toward the advertisement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12-24.
- Muehling, D. & McCann, M. (1993). Attitude Toward the Ad: A Review, *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, Volume 15, Number 2 (Fall, 1993)

- Moorman, M., Neijens, P. C., & Smit, E. G. (2002). The Effects of Magazine-Induced Psychological Responses and Thematic Congruence on Memory and Attitude toward the Ad in a Real-Life Setting. *Journal of Advertising* 31(4), 27-40
- Norris, C. E., & Colman, A. M. (1992). Context effects on recall and recognition of magazine advertisements. *Journal of Advertising*, 37-46. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4188844>
- Olney, T. J., Holbrook, M. B., & Batra, R. (1991). Consumer responses to advertising: The effects of ad content, emotions, and attitude toward the ad on viewing time. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 440-453. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2626838>
- Olson, J. C., & Mitchell, A. A. (2000). Are product attribute beliefs the only mediator of advertising effects on brand attitude?. *Advertising & Society Review*, 1(1).
- Patrick De Pelsmacker, M. G., Pascal Anckaert. (2002). Media context and advertising effectiveness: the role of context appreciation and context/ad similarity. *Journal of Advertising* 31(2), 49-61.
- Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., & Calvert, S. L. (2009). College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30(3), 227-238. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.010
- Pett, M.A., Lackey, M.R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. In *Communication and Persuasion* (pp. 1-24). Springer New York.
- Poh, D. M. H., & Adam, S. (2012, June). An exploratory investigation of attitude toward the website and the advertising hierarchy of effects. In *AusWeb02, the Web enabled global village: proceedings of AusWeb02, the eighth Australian World Wide Web Conference* (pp. 620-631). Southern Cross University. Available from Deakin Research Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30004806>
- Rosenkrans, G. (2009). The creativeness and effectiveness of online interactive rich media advertising. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 9(2), 18-31.
- Richter, A., & Koch, M. (2008). *Functions of social networking services*. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Design of Cooperative Systems

- Shapiro, S., MacInnis, D. J., & Park, C. W. (2002). Understanding program-induced mood effects: Decoupling arousal from valence. *Journal of Advertising*, 15-26. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4189234>
- Shavitt, Sharon, Lowrey, P., & Haefner, J. (1998). "Public Attitudes Toward Advertising: More Favorable than you might think," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 38 (4), 7-22
- Shimp, T. A. (1981). Attitude toward the ad as a mediator of consumer brand choice. *Journal of advertising*, 9-48.
- Sicilia, M., & Ruiz, S. (2007). The role of flow in web site effectiveness. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8(1), 33-44.
- Soares, A. M., Pinho, J. C., & Nobre, H. (2012). From Social to Marketing Interactions: The Role of Social Networks. *Journal of Transnational Management*, 17(1), 45-62. doi: 10.1080/15475778.2012.650085
- Swanson, D. L. (1992). Understanding audiences: Continuing contributions of gratifications research. *Poetics*, 21(4), 305-328. doi: 10.1016/0304-422x(92)90011-q
- Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). NY: Harper Collins
- Taylor, D. G., Lewin, J. E., & Strutton, D. (2011). Friends, fans, and followers: do ads work on social networks? How gender and age shape receptivity. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 51(1), 258.
- Todi, M. (2008). *Advertising on Social Networking Websites*. Unpublished thesis. Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, United States.
- Raice, S. (2012, Aug 15). Inside Facebook's Push to Woo Big Advertisers. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10000872396390444246904577575351814047494.html>
- Rodgers, S., & Thorson, E. (2000). The interactive advertising model: How users perceive and process online ads. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 1(1), 42-61.
- Rodgers, S., & Sheldon, K.M. (2000). Predicting banner effects by knowing web motives. Working paper, University of Minnesota, School of Journalism and Mass Communication.



- Valenzuela, S., Park, N., & Kee, K. F. (2009). Is There Social Capital in a Social Network Site?: Facebook Use and College Students' Life Satisfaction, Trust, and Participation1. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(4), 875-901. doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01474.x
- Walker, D., & Dubitsky, T. M. (1994). Why liking matters. *Journal of advertising research*.
- Wasko, M. M., & Faraj, S. (2005). Why should I share? Examining social capital and knowledge contribution in electronic networks of practice. *Mis Quarterly*, 35-57.
- Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25148667>
- Weiser, E. B. (2000). Gender differences in Internet use patterns and Internet application preferences: A two-sample comparison. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 3(2), 167-178.
- Wolin, L. D., & Korgaonkar, P. (2003). Web advertising: gender differences in beliefs, attitudes and behavior. *Internet Research*, 13(5), 375-385.
- Wright, E., Khanfar, N. M., Harrington, C., & Kizer, L. E. (2010). The lasting effects of social media trends on advertising. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, 8(11).
- Yaakop, A., Mohamed Anuar, M., Omar, K., & Liaw, A. (2012, December). Consumers' Perceptions and Attitudes Towards Advertising on Facebook in Malaysia. In *World Business and Economics Research Conference, Auckland New Zealand*.

## APPENDIX A: INSTRUMENTS

### Figure A1 *Survey Consent*

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Researcher Title: | Consumer Facebook Engagement and Attitude toward Ad on Facebook  |
| Researcher:       | Xueying Zhang is a Master student in the School of Media and Strategic Communication   |
| Purpose:          | I am interested in examining the Facebook users experience with Facebook and their reactions toward advertisements embedded on Facebook. You will be asked to participate in a multiple choice survey on this topic if you are over 18 and are a Facebook user.                                      |
| Time:             | The study should take around 10-15 minutes to complete.  |
| Voluntary:        | Your participation is voluntary. You may quit at any time and you may decline to answer any question.  |
| Risk:             | There is minimal risk involved in this study.  |
| Confidentiality:  | Participation is completely anonymous. Survey answers will not be connected to participants' names in any way. Only the researcher will have access to the data and once the data has been entered and analyzed, the original files will be destroyed (Approximately 6 months from initial testing). |
| Contact:          | <u>If you have any questions, feel free to contact the researcher, Maria Zhang, at 405-385-2584 or email at maria.zhang@okstate.edu or advisor Derina Holtzhausen email at derina.holtzhausen @okstate.edu</u>   |
| Questions:        | If you have any questions about your rights, contact:  |

Campus IRB  
Oklahoma State University  
219 Cordell North  
Stillwater, OK 74078-1038

Thank you for your participation!

Figure A2: *Questionnaire*

**HOW DO YOU EXPERIENCE FACEBOOK AND HOW STRONGLY YOU FEEL ENGAGED WITH IT?**

In this section you are asked about your experience using Facebook. Click the box that best represents the intensity of your experience. Please answer as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. For the following statements about experiences when using Facebook, please check the most appropriate box on the scale provided.

1. Using Facebook inspires me in my own life.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

2. Facebook is one of the sites I always go to anytime I am surfing the web.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

3. Facebook is a big part of getting my news for the day.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

4. Facebook makes me a more interesting person.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

5. Some stories I read from Facebook touch me deep down.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

6. I bring up things I have seen on Facebook in conversations with many other people.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

7. Facebook often gives me something to talk about.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

8. I use things from Facebook in discussions or arguments with people I know.

|                      |          |                      |           |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Slightly<br>Disagree | Undecided | Slightly<br>Agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

9. Logging on to Facebook is part of my routine.

|          |          |          |           |          |       |          |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|----------|
| Strongly | Disagree | Slightly | Undecided | Slightly | Agree | Strongly |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|----------|

Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Agree

10. I often feel guilty about the amount of time I spend socializing on Facebook.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

11. I should probably cut back on the amount of time I spend on socializing on Facebook.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

12. Using Facebook makes me feel like a better citizen.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

13. Using Facebook makes a difference in my life.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

14. I use Facebook to reflect my values.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

15. Facebook makes me more a part of my community.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

16. I'm a better person for using Facebook

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

17. Using Facebook is a treat for me.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

18. Overall, the visitors to Facebook are pretty knowledgeable about the topics it covers so you can learn from them.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

19. I give advice and tips to people I know based on things I've read through Facebook.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

20. I do quite a bit of socializing on Facebook.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

21. I contribute to conversations on Facebook.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

22. Going to Facebook improves my mood.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

23. I like to kick back and wind down with Facebook.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

24. Facebook makes me think of things in new ways.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

25. Facebook stimulates my thinking about lots of different topics.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

26. While I am on Facebook, I don't think about other websites I might go to.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

27. Using Facebook makes me a happier person.

|                   |          |                   |           |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Undecided | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|----------------|

28. Facebook helps me make good purchase decisions.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

29. I learn how to improve myself from using Facebook.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

30. Facebook provides information that helps me make important decisions.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

31. Facebook helps me better manage my money.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

32. Facebook helps me to get my day started in the morning.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

33. I've gotten interested in things I otherwise wouldn't have because of others on Facebook.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

34. I'd like to meet my friends who regularly visit Facebook.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

35. A big reason I like Facebook is what I get from other users.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

36. Facebook does a good job of getting its visitors to contribute or provide feedback.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

37. I like to go to Facebook site when I am eating or taking a break.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Slightly  
Disagree

Undecided

Slightly  
Agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

## YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD ADS ON FACEBOOK

**Instructions:** This section asks you to respond to statements about your reaction to the advertisements you would possibly see on Facebook, including sponsored brand information and friend recommended ads. Please respond by clicking the appropriate box on the scale provided. Please answer as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers.

### *Attitude toward sponsored brand information*

Please respond to statements about your reaction to the sponsored brand information, including the advertisements you see on the right side bar of Facebook or brand information appeared in your newsfeed because you “Like” them before. **However, it does not include brand information forwarded by your friends**, such as “Your friend Jackson likes Samsung Mobile USA” or “Your friend Shannon shares a link of a deal”. Please respond by clicking the appropriate box on the scale provided.

1. I always pay attention to ads on Facebook.

|                               |                   |                               |                    |                            |                |                            |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| -----<br>Strongly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Disagree | -----<br>Slightly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Undecided | -----<br>Slightly<br>Agree | -----<br>Agree | -----<br>Strongly<br>Agree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|

2. I fully ignore ads on Facebook.

|                               |                   |                               |                    |                            |                |                            |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| -----<br>Strongly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Disagree | -----<br>Slightly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Undecided | -----<br>Slightly<br>Agree | -----<br>Agree | -----<br>Strongly<br>Agree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|

3. Ads make me less willing to use Facebook.

|                               |                   |                               |                    |                            |                |                            |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| -----<br>Strongly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Disagree | -----<br>Slightly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Undecided | -----<br>Slightly<br>Agree | -----<br>Agree | -----<br>Strongly<br>Agree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|

4. Ads on Facebook are very boring.

|                               |                   |                               |                    |                            |                |                            |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| -----<br>Strongly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Disagree | -----<br>Slightly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Undecided | -----<br>Slightly<br>Agree | -----<br>Agree | -----<br>Strongly<br>Agree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|

5. Ads are necessary for funding Facebook.

|                               |                   |                               |                    |                            |                |                            |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| -----<br>Strongly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Disagree | -----<br>Slightly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Undecided | -----<br>Slightly<br>Agree | -----<br>Agree | -----<br>Strongly<br>Agree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|

6. Ads add value to my use of Facebook.

|                               |                   |                               |                    |                            |                |                            |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| -----<br>Strongly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Disagree | -----<br>Slightly<br>Disagree | -----<br>Undecided | -----<br>Slightly<br>Agree | -----<br>Agree | -----<br>Strongly<br>Agree |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|

7. I often click through the ads and check out information.

|                   |                   |                   |                    |                   |                |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| -----<br>Strongly | -----<br>Disagree | -----<br>Slightly | -----<br>Undecided | -----<br>Slightly | -----<br>Agree | -----<br>Strongly |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|

Disagree Disagree Agree Agree

8. I would forward the ads to my friends.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Agree Agree Agree

***Attitude toward friends' recommended ads***

Please respond to statements about your reaction to the friends' recommended ads, including brand information forwarded by your friends, such as "Your friend Jackson likes Samsung Mobile USA" or "Your friend Shannon shares a link to a special deal". Please respond by clicking the appropriate box on the scale provided.

1. I never really pay attention to friends' recommended ads.

Strongly Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Agree

2. I fully ignore friends' recommended ads.

Strongly Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Agree

3. Friends' recommended ads make me less willing to use Facebook.

Strongly Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Agree

4. Friends' recommended ads are very boring.

Strongly Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Agree

5. Friends' recommended ads are necessary for funding Facebook.

Strongly Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Agree

6. Friends' recommendation of ads adds value to my use of Facebook.

Strongly Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Agree

7. I often click through Friends' recommended ads and check out information

Strongly Disagree Slightly Undecided Slightly Agree Strongly  
Disagree Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Agree



8. I would forward the friend recommended ads to my other friends.

-----  
Strongly  
Disagree

-----  
Disagree

-----  
Slightly  
Disagree

-----  
Undecided

-----  
Slightly  
Agree

-----  
Agree

-----  
Strongly  
Agree

### TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF...

Listed below are a few demographic questions about you and your organization that will help us understand your answers. Please respond by clicking the appropriate box. Please answer as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Please select your gender:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Male  
\_\_\_\_\_ Female

2. What is your age?

3. What is your student status?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Freshman  
\_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore  
\_\_\_\_\_ Junior  
\_\_\_\_\_ Senior

4. What is your major? \_\_\_\_\_

5. On a typical day, about how much time do you spend on Social Network Sites?

- \_\_\_\_\_ No time at all  
\_\_\_\_\_ Less than 10 min  
\_\_\_\_\_ 10-30 min  
\_\_\_\_\_ More than 30 min, up to 1 hour  
\_\_\_\_\_ More than 1 hr, up to 2 hrs  
\_\_\_\_\_ More than 2 hrs, up to 3 hrs  
\_\_\_\_\_ More than 3 hrs

6. How often do you shop online?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Every day  
\_\_\_\_\_ Two to three times a week  
\_\_\_\_\_ Once a week  
\_\_\_\_\_ Two to three times a month  
\_\_\_\_\_ Once a month  
\_\_\_\_\_ Once every several month  
\_\_\_\_\_ I seldom shop on line  
\_\_\_\_\_ I never shop on line

**Thank you for participating in this study!**

## APPENDIX B: IRB DOCUMENTATION

Figure B1: IRB Application Approval

### Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Thursday, February 28, 2013  
IRB Application No AS1322  
Proposal Title: Facebook Experience and Attitude Towards Ads

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

**Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 2/27/2014**

Principal Investigator(s):

|                      |                      |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Xueying Zhang        | Derina Holtzhausen   |
| S42 Univ Pl Apt 10   | 206 Paul Miller Bldg |
| Stillwater, OK 74078 | Stillwater, OK 74078 |

---

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval. Protocol modifications requiring approval may include changes to the title, PI, advisor, funding status or sponsor, subject population composition or size, recruitment, inclusion/exclusion criteria, research site, research procedures and consent/assent process or forms.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Dawnett Watkins 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, dawnett.watkins@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Shelia Kennison, Chair  
Institutional Review Board

Figure B2: Approved Script for Introduction of Survey

## Appendix B Questionnaire of Facebook use and Attitude toward Ads

This questionnaire is composed of a series of questions about Facebook use and attitude toward ads. Your responses to the questionnaire will remain completely anonymous. Thank you, in advance, for completing this questionnaire and contributing to the growth of the media profession.

Informed consent statement: This research is being conducted by Maria Zhang, a master student from the School of Media and Strategic Communications, Oklahoma State University, 208 Paul Miller Building, Stillwater, OK 74078. Your responses will remain confidential to the extent provided by law. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer, and you have the right to withdraw consent at any time without consequence. There are no anticipated risks associated with your participation in this research and you will receive no compensation for your participation. If you have any questions concerning the procedures used in this study, you may contact the principle investigator at e-mail address [maria.zhang@okstate.edu](mailto:maria.zhang@okstate.edu) or by calling (405)-385-2584. Questions or concerns about your rights as a participant can be directed to the Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board at 405-744-3377

|                   |
|-------------------|
| Okla. State Univ. |
| IRB               |
| Approved 2-28-13  |
| Expires 2-27-14   |
| IRB# PS-13-22     |

Figure B3: Approved Consent Document

APPENDIX C  
Consent Form

Researcher Title: Consumer Facebook Engagement and Attitude toward Ad on Facebook

Researcher: Xueying Zhang is a Master student in the School of Media and Strategic Communication

Purpose: I am interested in examining the Facebook users experience with Facebook and their reactions toward advertisements embedded on Facebook. You will be asked to participate in a multiple choice survey on this topic if you are over 18 and are a Facebook user.

Time: The study should take around 10-15 minutes to complete.

Voluntary: Your participation is voluntary. You may quit at any time and you may decline to answer any question.

Risk: There is minimal risk involved in this study.

Confidentiality: Participation is completely anonymous. Survey answers will not be connected to participants' names in any way. Only the researcher will have access to the data and once the data has been entered and analyzed, the original files will be destroyed (Approximately 6 months from initial testing).

Contact: If you have any questions, feel free to contact the researcher, Maria Zhang, at 405-385-2584 or email at maria.zhang@okstate.edu or advisor Derina Holtzhausen email at derina.holtzhausen @okstate.edu

Questions: If you have any questions about your rights, contact:

Campus IRB  
Oklahoma State University  
219 Cordell North  
Stillwater, OK 74078-1038

Thank you for your participation!

|                          |
|--------------------------|
| Okla. State Univ.<br>IRB |
| Approved 2-29-13         |
| Expires 2-27-14          |
| IRB # AS-13-22           |

VITA

Xueying Zhang

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: FACEBOOK USERS' EXPERIENCE AND ATTITUDE TOWARD  
FACEBOOK ADS

Major Field: Mass Communication

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Mass Communication at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December, May, 2013.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics at Beijing Studies University, Beijing, China in June, 2006.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Teaching Chinese as a Second Language at Beijing Foreign Studies University, Beijing, China in 2003.

Experience:

Chinese Teacher in Stillwater Chinese School, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 2011.8-2012.12

Editor and Reporter in sports community of CCTV.com (CNTV.cn), Beijing, China 2008.4 – 2010.6

Copy writer in Advertisement Department of International finance Newspaper, Shanghai, China 2007.10 – 2008.1

Office Leasing Assistant in Beijing Guohua Realstate Co.Ltd, Beijing China 2006.7 – 2007.9