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Abstract

Background: Social Media Content consists of characteristics by which have been found by previous research to have an influence on consumers' purchase intention. The social media content can be created by any social media user, who are referred to as content creators, whereby the degree of impact the social media content has on consumers' purchase intention is difficult to predict. There are specifically three social media content characteristics that have been shown to be more strongly related to consumers’ purchase intention than others, which are Usefulness, Informativeness and Interactivity. Previous research suggests that further investigation regarding consumers’ purchase intention in relation to the online context is of relevance to research since social media content is an influential factor regarding consumers’ purchase intention, for an increased explanation of consumers’ purchase intention.

Purpose: The purpose is to explain the relationship between social media content characteristics and consumers’ purchase intention.

Methodology: This explanatory research is using the deductive approach within the quantitative study and following a cross-sectional research design in order to detect patterns from the empirical investigation. Based on a theoretical foundation of previous research, the study presents three hypotheses which by support from the empirical investigation, consisting of 239 responses to a self-completed questionnaire, were either rejected or accepted.

Findings: The acceptance of one out of three hypotheses were based on the authors revealing findings about there being a significantly positive relationship between the social media content characteristic Interactivity and consumers’ Purchase Intention. The findings also provide implications that the relationship has been accepted based on a combination of certain aspects. These are that consumers have a desire to take part in online conversations, they want their voice heard by being able to express opinions and also that they will immerse themselves in a social media platform if they find the content of the platform interesting. These findings allowed for the authors to suggest a new modified research model demonstrating the relationship between the social media content characteristic Interactivity and consumers’ Purchase Intention.

Conclusion: Based on the findings of this study, this research provides a conclusion that there is a significant positive relationship between the social media content characteristic Interactivity and consumers’ Purchase Intention.

Keywords: Social Media Characteristics, Usefulness, Informativeness, Interactivity, Purchase intention.
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1. Introduction

In the introduction chapter a Background, Problem Discussion and Purpose will be presented that introduces the outline of this study.

1.1 Background

The rise of social media has led to a change in the way marketers conduct their marketing strategies (Kotler et al., 2016; Alalwan, 2018). Instead of using a traditional marketing approach, various online platforms such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter are being used as tools for marketers to create material such as advertisement and other marketing activities (Alalwan, 2018). As social media has become such a dominant part of people’s lives (Arli, 2017) the rise of marketers' usage of social media is due consumers tending to rely decisions upon “content” provided on social media (Hutter et al., 2013). Social media allows for any user to take part of the online environment where “content”, as in other words is described as social media content, is considered to be constructed in the form of pictures, comments, ideas, videos, text, opinions, discussions and so on (Khatib, 2016), which can be created by any social media user. The creators of a content, henceforth referred to as content creators, can both be those who directly wish to affect those absorbing the content, such as marketers (Hutter et al., 2013), but they can also be regular people creating content based on their thoughts or opinions without having an underlying intention of directly influencing someone (Alalwan, 2018).

In comparison to the traditional space where marketing previously solely took place, such as through television, newspaper, radio and magazines (Schivinski and Dabrowski, 2016), social media is allowing a two-way interaction between content creators and consumers (Arli, 2017). Research states that this way of communication becomes of higher value for consumers (Alalwan, 2018) since many decisions are based upon influences from the content provided on social media, as previously mentioned by Hutter et al., (2013). Social media content has shown to play an increasing part in consumers Purchase Intention, which in practise is an effect from communication activities on social media (Hutter et al., 2013; Alalwan, 2018; Arli, 2017). The purchase intention is a part of the decision making process,
whereby consumers go through mental stages of absorbing, processing and evaluating social media content to decide upon the possibility for a future purchase of a service or product. The value that the consumer perceives within the social media content generates the extent to which the consumer has been influenced towards a purchase (Hutter et al., 2013). However, it is challenging for content creators to expect a certain degree of what impact social media content has on consumers’ purchase intention due to the fact that not all consumers are affected by the same social media content in the same way (Schlosser et al., 2003; Alalwan, 2018). Nonetheless, there are various characteristics that are embodied within the social media content of what is communicated which influences certain steps within the decision process where some have the ability to specifically influence consumers’ purchase intention (Richard, 2005; Hausman and Siekpe, 2009). This is based upon collected research which states that some characteristics are more strongly related to purchase intention than others, which has shown to be the characteristics of Usefulness (Arli, 2017; Sin et al., 2012; Rauniar et al., 2014), Informativeness (Arli, 2017; Alalwan, 2018; Chu et al., 2013) and Interactivity (Alalwan, 2018; Hajli, 2016).

1.2 Problem Discussion

As previously mentioned, there are many different characteristics within social media content which are of the influential nature (Richard, 2005; Hausman and Siekpe, 2009) but the characteristics of Usefulness (Arli, 2017; Sin et al., 2012; Rauniar et al., 2014), Informativeness (Alalwan, 2018; Chu et al., 2013) and Interactivity (Alalwan, 2018; Hajli, 2016) have been shown to stand out and be of more relevance in regards to consumers’ purchase intention in the online environment. Previous research reveals that purchase intention oftentimes is included when investigating behavioral patterns (Akar and Dalgic, 2018), which is explained to be of relevance in the online context as well due to the fact that the online environment is just another marketplace to investigate regarding consumers’ purchase intentions (Akar and Dalgic, 2018). In addition, as social media content is an influential factor it can be argued that investigating the three characteristics usefulness, informativeness and interactivity is of value for content creators since they are operating within the online environment. It is important to underline that these characteristics have been investigated in previous research for different purposes but have all shown to be of
influential significance and have a positive relationship with purchase intention. There is previous research that has included two of the three chosen characteristics within the same study, but never have all three been investigated together. According to Arli (2017), who includes both usefulness and informativeness into the same study, both characteristics are seen to be of high importance within that study. In comparison, Sin et al., (2012) who only have included usefulness out of the three characteristics state that usefulness is the most dominant characteristic to consider regarding influencing consumers’ purchase intention in that study. Thus, the degree of influential importance becomes questionable for each characteristic as they in past research only have been measured together with other characteristics that appeared to be of less relevance, in that specific study. Thereafter, past research concluded each of the three characteristics to stand out from the other characteristics within that study without providing new research with other “influential” characteristics to compare to. If being measured in another context with other characteristics, it could be assumed that the three characteristics that are considered having a “more strong influential” relationship with purchase intention would provide different values, whereby a gap has been found. Nonetheless, the “most influential” characteristics Usefulness, Informativeness and Interactivity have therefore collectively been put together into another context regarding Purchase Intention, as can be seen in Appendix 1, to contribute with theoretical relevance.

Alalwan (2018) states that content creators find it difficult to be able to predict how consumers will respond to the social media content, which Arli (2017) explains is being due to the lack of knowledge regarding the impact of certain characteristics. Previous research states that social media does in fact impact consumers purchase intention positively (Richard, 2005; Hausman and Siekpe, 2009; Arli, 2017; Akar and Dalgic, 2018), but less is known regarding to what extent consumers purchase intention are influenced by the content characteristics within the social media (Arli, 2017; Alalwan, 2018). For content creators, it becomes of practical importance to provide further research since there is an increased consumer engagement on social media (Kotler et al., 2016; Alalwan, 2018), which is resulting in a change in social media activities (Akar and Dalgic, 2018). Hutter et al., (2013) states that social media has become an important tool for content creators to use whereas a high degree of communication activities are done through various social media platforms. However, only providing general knowledge about the effects social media content has on
consumers during social media activities does not provide any value (Hutter et al., 2013). Schlosser et al., (2003) state that social media can be very effective regarding the aim of influencing consumers' purchase intention. However, it is important to understand to what degree the consumers will be influenced towards a purchase based on the content (Barber et al., 2012). Akar and Dalgic (2018) further argue that gaining practical understanding will enable content creators to better the overall business, by communicating in the most suitable way through the social media platforms and increase the competitive advantage on the marketplace (Akar and Dalgic, 2018). Thus, the practical relevance of this study will not only provide insight into the relationship between social media content characteristics and consumer’s purchase intention, but it will also provide content creators with an increased knowledge about to what degree the relationship actually impacts the purchase intention of consumers.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose is to explain the relationship between social media content characteristics and consumers’ purchase intention.
2. Theoretical Framework

*Under the Theoretical Framework, the social media content characteristics will be presented and described in depth. This will allow the reader to develop a deeper understanding of what the characteristics entail.*

2.1 Usefulness

Usefulness is mentioned to be one of the main and significant characteristics when it comes to social media content. It is also, according to Arli (2017), one of the most fundamental aspects when it comes to the use of technological devices overall (Sin et al., 2012; Arli, 2017). This means that usefulness is one aspect that needs to be considered when it comes to the acceptance of social media (Arli, 2017).

Moreover, the concept usefulness is when the content that is created for social media communication is perceived as relevant for the receiver (Alalwan, 2018). The relevance of the communication on social media can be noticed through interactions with the posts and updates. For example, if the posted content has been observed to have a higher number of likes it is considered to be relevant and if the content has received a lower number of likes it is established to be irrelevant for the audience (Arli, 2017). Social media users make use of social media platforms in many different ways. One of them is to communicate, therefore, it is important to make the communication relevant and useful and design the social media content in a way that matches with the current audience (Alalwan, 2018; Yang and Brown, 2015). This is considered as very important, because if the content does not match the receivers it can result in a negative effect for the social media user’s participation within social media platforms. Therefore, it is extremely important for content creators to add tools, modules or applications that are useful for continuous presence on social media (Rauniar et al., 2014). Furthermore, Alalwan (2018) explains that to be able to match relevant and useful content it is possible to create cookies for the audience which explains social media users' different behaviors. By identifying different behaviors of the audience it becomes easier for the content creator to anticipate what kind of preference and interests the audience might
maintain. Later on, this becomes very helpful when the content is being designed and tailored in order to be perceived as useful and relevant (Alalwan, 2018).

Furthermore, Rauniar et al., (2014) states that when creating useful content, it is important to consider the creation of value which is described as being either of the utilitarian or hedonic characteristic. The utilitarian value of social media is when any social media activities are of a helpful use when accomplishing any functional or practical task in everyday life, and hedonic value is when desires for fun or pleasure motivates the social media user. When creating valuable content, it will contribute to social media users of social media continuing to use social media which means that different platforms are being revisited (Rauniar et al., 2014). Another aspect that also makes social media content to be considered as useful and valuable are the social connections that can arise and be maintained through social media communication (Yang and Brown, 2015). Therefore, creators of content should be reminded that a useful experience is important for the relationship that is wished to be created (Rauniar et al., 2014). Moreover, there are also other aspects that improve the characteristic usefulness, such as quality, which means that the produced information and content on social media does not include any faults or errors. Quality has been investigated to have a positive effect on usefulness and is therefore an aspect that needs to be considered. The audience does not perceive the communication as fully useful until quality is being experienced (Hajli, 2016).

2.2 Informativeness

The informativeness is one of the main characteristics within social media content that attracts the attention of users operating on social media (Arli, 2017; Alalwan, 2018; Chu et al., 2013) which impacts the course of selecting and processing the information within the social media content (Carpentier., 2019; Khatib, 2016). As described by Arli (2017) the informative features on social media that are descriptive information create a more comprehensive and detailed picture about the content provided for the audience. This information is important for social media users as well as the creator of the content. For example, when a company and its offers are pictured in a more comprehensive way on social media it increases users’ attention for that specific company (Arli, 2017). Research further
states that depending on how the information is managed on the social media platform it can affect the outcome into an increased positivity towards the provider of the information (Khatib, 2016; Carpentier et al., 2019). However, research by Carpentier et al., (2019) also states that the information has to be communicated in such ways as if the provider of the information were to be talking to the receiver in a friendly way outside the social media platform. In other words, the informative content on social media needs to be communicated in a personal way by directly addressing the social media user and not in a way that differs the provider with the receiver of the informative content (Carpentier et al., 2019).

Social media offers a wide spread of informative content which social media users can use as a research tool, for example, when searching for relevant information about services or products of interest. The informative content is provided by both other social media users and content creators which enables the social media users to get a hold of a variety of different descriptive content (Alalwan, 2018). The various social media platforms are increasingly used and have become a more valuable access of information in comparison to the more traditional tools for accessing information. This enables a comparison of information about a certain subject of interest on different platforms (Alalwan, 2018; Khatib, 2016; Carpentier et al., 2019). It has been stated in research by Khatib (2016) that the content on social media is attended by social media users in a very selective way, where the information within the content is processed and selected very carefully. It is further stated that the first stage of information exposure is where the social media user is the most selective, and determines what information within the content that is valuable to access among all the information that the social media user is exposed to (Khatib, 2016). However, the informative content provided on social media is significantly important to be valid. False information can affect social media users to create a negative attitude towards the social media content resulting in the social media user not finding the information of valid use during the search process on social media (Chu et al., 2013; Alalwan, 2018). The easy access of information on social media therefore provides both positive and negative aspects regarding the spread of information due to the availability of different information from various sources. For example, previous social media users of an item or service have the ability to provide their opinions about their post-purchases in the form of feedback and comments to peers on social media which is accessible for other social media users in their pre-purchase stages (Khatib,
Moreover, Arli (2017) supportively suggests an example that the opportunities of communicating through social media should be used in an informative manner which allows for customers that are in their pre- and post-purchase stage to post questions or complaints directly to the company without being at the company’s own webpage. For example, being able to use platforms such as Twitter to provide and gain an exchange of information regarding the company and its customers (Arli, 2017).

2.3 Interactivity

Research claims that the internet is construed by interactivity (Johnson and Kaye, 2016) and that interactivity is declared as one of the core characteristics within social media content (Alalwan, 2018; Hajli, 2016). Interactivity can be described as the action of social media users interacting with or discussing content produced by content creators and other social media users, which then leads to more interactions taking place (Ariel and Avidar, 2015). The interactive devices that are present on social media have paved a path for social media users to create their own content and interact with the content of others (Johnson and Kaye, 2016). As social media users are now keen on being involved in the conversations taking place online, rather than simply being on the receiving end, interactivity is seen as important to users within social media (Sunder et al., 2014 cited in Alalwan, 2018). This can be due to the fact that social media users appreciate that their voices are heard through interactivity, where they are given the chance to express their own thoughts and opinions (Jiang et al., 2010 cited in Alalwan, 2018). Therefore, content creators can increase other social media users’ urge to take part in interactivity, and can do so by asserting a certain level of trust (Carvalho and Fernandes, 2018). Moreover, social media users are more likely to take part in interactivity if they view the content on social media as reliable (Alalwan, 2018).

Additionally, social media users are the ones determining if they wish to post, like, comment, and share content or not. Thus, they should be seen as the ones controlling the level of interactivity on a platform (Ariel and Avidar, 2015). The level of interactivity for a social media user is of a higher quality when social media users find themselves absorbed in the social media platform they are on and have an interest in the platform. When social media users are fully immersed in the platform and are interested in it, they tend to classify the
interactivity as being positive (Carvalho and Fernandes, 2018). Research has shown that it is beneficial for the level of interactivity to be at an optimum or rather, moderate level for social media users (Fischer and Rueber, 2011). For instance, there are social media users who prefer lower levels of interactivity. Social media users with a lower preference of interactivity may not be very interested in interacting with content, and would rather be the recipients of information on social media (Johnson and Kaye, 2016). There can also be cases where the level of interactivity is too high. When the level is too high, it can also have a negative effect, which is why an average amount of interactivity is seen as best (Fischer and Rueber, 2011).

2.4 Purchase intention

The purchase intention is the primary stage for a consumer’s potential purchase behavior and can thereby predict future sales (Morwitz, 2014). This is further stated by Schivinski and Dabrowski (2016) who mentions that social media communication is a drive-force that impacts certain purchase behaviors and that social media communication strategies can interpret future consumers’ purchase intentions. Thus, Solomon et al., (2010) explains that in some cases, past purchase behavior gives more information than a consumer's purchase intention does (Solomon et al., 2010). However, it is still very common and reasonable that purchase intention is perceived as a dominant factor since it is helpful in order to predict the future demand for a product or service (Morwitz, 2014). In order to gain understanding of potential consumers' purchase intentions it is of importance to gain knowledge about their attitudes. It is of relevance to investigate if the attitudes are strong and positive enough which will lead to consumers fulfilling the intended purchase. This becomes even more important to consider due to the big differences that occur in people's behavior when it comes to purchases. Things that play a role in how different behavior and attitudes can be are how they consume their spare time, different types of habits, money and time spent on appearances and material assets (Barber et al., 2012). According to Solomon et al., (2010) another aspect, connected to behavior, that affects individuals purchase intentions is how they are planning their purchase. Potential consumers can often be grouped into different categories depending on how deeply and long they have planned for the upcoming purchase. For example, planners are people that know how much and what type of brand and product they will purchase, from
before. Partial planners are people that know they need a specific product but have not yet considered what type of brand they are going to purchase, this is something they decide upon when being in the store. Impulse purchasers do not spend any time on planning their purchase. Since there are a lot of decisions that are being made in the process when purchasing, companies are starting to pay attention to the spread of information about their offers and also how it is being presented (Solomon et al., 2010).

Furthermore, social media allows for content providers and other social media users to operate on various social media platforms, such as Facebook, Instagram or Twitter, with the aim of increasing the visibility of the content (Schivinski and Dabrowski, 2016). For instance, the content of a social media platform can be interpreted differently depending on how it is absorbed by the social media user that is operating on the platform (Schlosser et al., 2003; Alalwan, 2018). Research by Richard (2005) suggests that social media users are exposed to influential factors that are communicated through the platform which might affect the purchase intention positively, even though this may or may not result in an actual purchase (Richard, 2005). Schlosser et al., (2006) state that it is important to make the content comprehensive and manageable in such ways that it will not be interpreted differently than intended. If not, potential consumers that operate on these social media platforms will judge the social media content that has been communicated based on their already existing overall perception of the content provider which affects the purchase intention (Schivinski and Dabrowski, 2016). Research by Schlosser et al., (2006) further shows that it is difficult to customize the social media content since the responses from social media users may still differ despite if the interpretations may be similar for every social media user (Schlosser et al., 2006). Hausman and Siepke (2009) further state that the factors which influence purchase intention can be based on various influential aspects that are being received through the social media platform, however, some have a higher impact on the receivers’ responses. For example, the content of the site is more important than the structure and flow of it (Hausman and Siekpe, 2009).
3. Conceptual Framework

Usefulness is defined to be a significant and fundamental characteristic regarding social media content (Sin et al., 2012; Raunair, 2013; Arli, 2017). Sin et al. (2012) also states that usefulness is a key characteristic due to it being essential that social media users consider the content of the communication as convenient, relevant and understandable. If the content within what is being communicated is perceived as useful, it will affect consumers' purchase intention positively and if it is not perceived as useful it is possible that consumers' purchase intention could be affected negatively. It is also important that it does not require a lot of mental effort of consumers to make use of the content that the content creator posts (Sin et al., 2012). The desire of creating long lasting relationships is a recurrent desire when it comes to social media content connected to purchase intention, which makes it very important to add components, such as usefulness, that have a significant influence on consumers purchase intentions (Arli, 2017; Raunair, 2013). This then makes it important to understand if there is a positive relationship between usefulness and consumers’ purchase intention when being measured along with the two other content characteristics that have also been mentioned as significant factors that lead to consumers’ purchase intention. Hypothesis 1 can then be created, and the created Hypothesis is presented below:

H1: The social media content characteristic usefulness has a positive relationship with consumers’ purchase intention.

Informativeness has been explained as one of the main characteristics within social media content (Arli, 2017; Alalwan, 2018; Chu et al., 2013) which will be studied in this research regarding if there is a relationship with consumers’ purchase intention and informativeness. Alalwan (2018) states that informativeness has shown to influence the purchase intention, based on the fact that consumers' motivation for purchase intention increases when the content is considered to consist of valid informative information (Alalwan, 2018). Moreover, Khatib (2016) argues that social media directly influences consumers at various stages within their purchase process, including the purchase intention. It is further discussed that it is
important to explore the influence of the content characteristic informativeness since it is a direct determinant to how users on social media are exposed to the available information within the social media content (Khatib, 2016). Considerably, there are multiple other factors within social media content that have been argued to influence the purchase intention (Alalwan, 2018; Johnson and Kaye, 2016; Arli, 2017), which makes it interesting to measure if there is a positive relationship between the social media content characteristic informativeness and consumers’ purchase intention when being measured with two other significant content characteristics. This then leads to the creation of Hypothesis 2:

**H2: The social media content characteristic informativeness has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.**

As the characteristic of interactivity has been argued to be a core characteristic within social media content (Alalwan, 2018; Hajli, 2016), it will be further studied in this investigation in order to see if there is a positive relationship between the social media content characteristic interactivity and consumers' purchase intention. It can be said that consumers choose to use social media in order to take part in interactivity, as there are interactive devices present on social media platforms that allow for interactivity to take place (Johnson and Kaye, 2016). A study done by Alalwan (2018) found that the characteristic interactivity was a leading predictor of a consumer's purchase intention. This is connected to the fact that consumers view interactivity on social media to be worthwhile and exciting, making them in turn more likely to take part in the content, which leads to a higher intention to purchase (Alalwan, 2018). It is then of relevance for this investigation, to see if there is a positive relationship between interactivity taking place within social media content and purchase intention when being measured along with two other significant content characteristics. This leads to the creation of Hypothesis 3:

**H3: The social media content characteristic interactivity has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.**
3.1 Research Model

The authors of this paper have been able to create a suggested research model explaining the expected relationship that social media content characteristics have with consumers’ purchase intention. The model explains that there is an assumed positive relationship between each content characteristic *Usefulness, Informativeness* and *Interactivity* of social media content and consumers’ purchase intention. Also, to specify further, the presented content characteristics are the content characteristics discussed to be of most significance regarding consumers’ purchase intention based on social media content (Arli, 2017; Sin et al., 2012; Rauniar et al., 2014; Alalwan, 2018; Chu et al., 2013; Hajli, 2016).

To further explain the model found in *Figure 1.*, the three different content characteristics are framed by a rectangular border. The rectangular dotted border demonstrates that the three content characteristics are all being measured together in this study, which has not happened before. The dotted border demonstrates that the content characteristics are different and are being measured separately but that they are also being measured together in the same context. The content characteristics are presented below, and can be found in three different boxes, showing that the three content characteristics are independent variables and that they differ from each other. The three independent variables will be tested with the dependent variable (consumers’ purchase intention) through hypothesis testing. The three arrows that are pointing at the dependent variable and represent the expected outcome of the study, that all three of the social media content characteristics will have a relationship with consumers’ purchase intention. The suggested research model has the aim of making it easier for the reader to understand how the hypothesis testing will be done in this study.
Figure 1. Suggested research model of social media characteristics relationship with consumers’ purchase intention.
4. Methodology

The methodology chapter presented below will allow the reader to gain knowledge of the chosen method. It will also help the reader see how the data was collected and how it will be handled.

4.1 Research Approach

A research strategy is stated by Bryman and Bell (2011) as being the way in which researchers choose to position their research. There are different strategies for researchers to choose from, that show the position of their research. For example, it is important for the researcher to decide whether they will take a deductive or inductive approach, and it is also important for researchers to choose if they will have a quantitative or qualitative study (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Quantitative and qualitative research vary in many different aspects, which is why it is important for researchers to pick the approach that is most fitting for their study. For instance, when deciding what approach to take, researchers should consider what kinds of questions they will be asking in their study as well as who the audience of the research is (Yilmaz, 2013). The authors of this paper have taken the different factors into consideration, which in turn has led to them choosing the appropriate research strategies for this study. The authors have chosen to do a quantitative study with a deductive approach, which will be further discussed under 4.1.1 Deductive Research and 4.1.2 Quantitative Study.

4.1.1 Deductive Research

Bryman and Bell (2011) describe the deductive approach as being the link between existing theory and the research that is being conducted. An important aspect of the deductive approach is that theory comes before the observations take place and the data is gathered. Thus, when using the deductive approach, there is a process to be followed. To begin, theoretical material is collected which then allows for a hypothesis to be deduced by the researchers, based on what they already know about the topic, and the theoretical implications that exist. The hypothesis must consist of concepts that have the ability to be further researched. Moreover, the researcher has the responsibility of translating the concepts
in the hypothesis in order to demonstrate how data can be gathered in a way that connects it to the hypotheses concepts. Once the hypothesis has been deduced, data can then be collected. It is then up to the empirical findings that have been found within the data to determine the hypothesis’ validity. This occurs by either accepting or rejecting the hypothesis, and may possibly lead to the need to revise the gathered theoretical material (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

The deductive approach was a suitable choice for this study due to the authors working process, which suits the theoretical descriptions for a deductive approach. The authors of this paper have written the theoretical framework, based upon prior research, prior to completing observations and collecting data. The authors of this paper used previous research about social media content characteristics and purchase intention in order to complete the theoretical framework. As stated above, when conducting deductive research, the theory comes before the observations, which is one of the reasons why the deductive approach suits this study. Based upon what is known within the theory, the authors were able to transform the information into an operationalization in order to deduct three hypotheses based on the operational terms and connect to the purpose of this study. Thereafter, as the hypotheses were deduced, the authors were able to collect data which was chosen to be done through self completion questionnaires, in the form of the deductive setting of creating relevant questions based on the theory and hypothesis. The hypotheses were thereafter tested, where they were either accepted or rejected. As this study followed a very logical and linear “step-by-step” process of hypothesis testing based on existing theory, it followed the approach described by Bryman and Bell (2011) as deductive approach, which explains the reason behind conducting the approach of this study of the deductive nature.

4.1.2 Quantitative Research

As written in its name, quantitative research highlights the quantification of data, when data is collected from a large quantity of respondents in the process of gathering and analyzing data based on existing research. More specifically, quantitative studies collect data in the form of numbers and employ the deductive approach, as previously mentioned, denoting the fact that existing theories have been tested in this study. The quantity of the respondents
allows for the researchers to present findings that are generalizable for the larger population based on the chosen sample group, based on quantitative variables of measure which has been transformed from numerical data. The quantitative research process has been laid out by Bryman and Bell (2011). First and foremost, the quantitative research process should begin by developing the theoretical framework. This is an important first step due to the theory leading to a hypothesis being deduced. Other important steps from the process that will be applied include:

- Deciding what research design to use
- Operationalizing the created concepts
- Choosing the location in which the study will take place and who the respondents of the study will be
- Processing the studied instruments
- Converting the information into data and then analyzing the given data
- Transcribe the data in a written form to develop the results of the study and write in a conclusive form (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

As the structure of this research regards the investigation of the behavior of a certain group of population by studying a large quantity of data, the quantitative setting is suitable for this research. The authors found that the best way to gather data that would explain the relationship between social media content characteristics and consumers’ purchase intention, was to create a questionnaire as previously mentioned. The authors applied the theoretical framework that was gathered in order to deduce hypotheses, which in turn allowed them to test their hypotheses in order to explain the relationship between social media content characteristics and consumers’ purchase intention.

4.2 Research Design

During the construction of an investigation, researchers need to consider the proper research design for the research (Bryman and Bell, 2011). By conducting a research design, it allows for an understanding of how to properly manage the findings that have been discovered through the empirical investigation of a social research and to present truthful facts based on
its relation to already existing theories (Bellamy, 2012). There are various research designs to use in research. However, how effectively certain issues are handled and aims are reached depends on how the plan of action is set and the choice of research design (Leavy, 2017).

Due to the purpose of this research investigation being to explain the relationship between an independent variable (a social media content characteristic) and a dependent variable (consumers’ purchase intention) it is of relevance for the authors of this paper to follow the explanatory research design. This decision is found to be supported by Leavy (2017) who state that explanatory research explains the relationship between variables and experimentally allocate the underlying reasons to how an independent variable affects a dependent variable. It is also important for researchers to create a strong research design which follows the explanatory patterns of this study. Since the authors of this paper had the aim of collecting a large quantity of data in order to explain the relationship of more than one variable, the most proper approach is considered to follow the cross-sectional research design. This is based on that the cross-sectional research design follows the explanatory patterns, as stated by Bryman and Bell (2011), which allowed the authors of this paper to detect patterns from the empirical investigation. This was considered by the authors to be the most appropriate approach to follow based on the chosen research design of the explanatory research nature.

4.3 Data sources

When considering the sources of data, it is important that the sources are reliable, current, appropriate and correct (Rabianski, 2003). This is independent if researchers use primary or secondary data. Primary data is collected and interpreted by the researcher(s) themselves for the specific purpose of answering the current research question (Malhotra, 2020). This means that the material is produced during the ongoing investigation (Belk, 2006). Comparing secondary data that is already collected and interpreted by someone else for another purpose (Malhotra, 2020). This means that the material that often comes in forms of books and articles about a specific area or event but are written afterwards at a later date (Belk, 2006). Moreover, when discussing advantages and disadvantages of the two different versions of
data sources, primary data has the tendency of consuming much more time, and can in the end be more expensive than secondary data (Malhotra, 2020). Based on this, it may seem an easy choice to choose secondary data due to its advantages, however, primary data also contains advantages. Primary data is divided into two different techniques which is the communication technique and observed technique. The communication technique means that the researcher is applying a questionnaire or survey which is either oral or written. The observing technique is more when behavior or different facts are being observed or recorded by the researcher. The communication technique is a smarter choice when it comes to time and costs and is not always more expensive and time consuming than a secondary data technique (Iacobucci and Churchill Jr., 2015).

However, the collection of primary data was the focus in this research due to the structure of gathering information and collecting material for this study and its specific research topic and research problem with a communication technique (Malhotra, 2020; Iacobucci and Churchill Jr., 2015). Primary data is based upon six different steps which includes a problem definition, develop an approach to that specific problem, research design formulation, data collection/fieldwork, data preparation and analysis and finally report preparation and presentation. The most essential step here for this chapter is the step of collecting data and doing the fieldwork, which was implemented directly by the authors of this paper (Malhotra, 2020).

4.4 Data Collection Method

When basing a research on its quantitative elements it is suggested by Bryman and Bell (2011) to continuously follow the quantitative structure as well in regards to the choice of data collection. Within the quantitative structure where patterns were revealed through the relationship of variables, Leavy (2017) claims that linear methods should be implemented in order to receive statistical results off of the collection and analysis of data. There are various ways to collect the data. If the foundation of the research follows the quantitative patterns, as this research did, according to 6 and Bellamy (2012) recommended to use a social survey in the form of questionnaires.
Bryman and Bell (2011) refer to the term of self-completion questionnaire, which is explained to be when respondents answer questions that have been sent to them in order for the respondents to answer the questions without any interviewer asking the questions. This allows for the respondents to answer anonymously, comfortably and at their own pace without any distractions (Leavy, 2017). The authors of this paper therefore used questionnaires as the data collection method due to the convenience for both the authors and respondents. The authors of this paper were able to gather a large quantity of data without spending any resources collecting the data, and the respondents were also able to answer whenever they had the time to do so. The structure of the questionnaire followed the suggestions by Bryman and Bell (2011) and Leavy (2017) which speaks for the advantages of conducting closed questions in the questionnaire. By closed questions with fixed-choice answers, such as a fixed range of Strongly disagree to Strongly agree, the respondents were able to mark the choice that is most suitable for the behavior and beliefs of that respondent (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Leavy, 2017). These questions were designed in such ways that it allowed the authors to test the hypotheses or to answer the chosen research question of the research (Leavy, 2017). The advantage of this method is that within each answer lies a predetermined code whereby the researcher at a later stage is able to measure these codes and draw conclusions for the selected combinations in order to describe the relationship between variables (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

4.5 Data Collection Instruments

The advantages with self-completion questionnaires, as previously mentioned, is that a large quantity can be distributed when sent out to respondents (Bryman and Bell, 2011). There are various options of where to distribute the self-completion questionnaire such as through email, mailed or web-based (Leavy, 2017; Seale, 2011). However, since the questionnaire should be distributed anonymously and cover a large quantity, the most beneficial option is to post it on webpages with easy access for respondents. According to Seale (2011) it does not only suit most questionnaires but since it is anonymous it tends to result in more accurate and reliable answers from the respondents since they can be more honest in their anonymity, making the overall results be less biased (Seale, 2011). This study has therefore been
distributed online, that allowed the respondents to be anonymous, and kept the questionnaire reliable and unbiased. This method allowed for the research to be sent out on social media platforms, such as Facebook, which allowed the authors to reach as many respondents as possible based on the assumption that many respondents of interest operated there. However, Seale (2011) states that there are some disadvantages with choosing this method for distribution. Since the questionnaire was accessible for any respondent who wished to answer the questions, the authors of this paper had no control over if the respondents fit the sample selection most suitable to provide relevant answers that were useful for this study (Seale, 2011). Due to the advantages of choosing an online distribution as well as its convenience for the authors of this paper, the disadvantage was not greatly considered in the distribution process.

4.5.1 Operationalization and Measurement of Variables

The term measurement means that every characteristic or the objects within every characteristic is assigned a number or another type of symbol in regards to specific rules. These rules make it easier for researchers to establish consistent numbers for the characteristics which eliminate the numbers to change over time or for different objects. When assigning a specific number to a characteristic or an object the researcher is creating a scale. For example, if the scale was going from 1 to 100 and the assignment was to measure a setting regarding consumers behavior or attitude and the scale represents the level of favorableness or unfavorableness where 1 is equal to Extremely unfavorable and 100 is equal to Extremely favorable. By doing this the researcher has the possibility of placing the respondents in different categories based on what their attitudes are towards a certain object (Malhotra, 2020). However, the scale used in this study was a likert scale where the possible answers were from 1 to 5, where 1 stood for “Strongly disagree” and 5 stood for “Strongly agree”. Also, there was an exception within the questionnaire, where one question consisted of a scale where 1 instead stood for “Very negative” and where 5 stood for “Very positive” (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Furthermore, when discussing how every variable should be measured, it is important to do the correct work which was done through an operationalization table, what and how the information from every single question could give valuable answers was considered (Seale, 2011). An operationalization table is helpful when transferring different theoretical concepts into measurable concepts. To create a measurement
of a specific concept, an operational definition needs to be established, which also makes it crucial to form indicators that can be used as an indication for each and every concept (Bryman and Bell, 2015; Malhotra, 2020). Another important aspect to remember is that a researcher does not measure a consumer but only a consumer’s opinions, or in this case social media users’ attitudes, intentions and behaviors and other components that may appear as relevant for the specific study (Malhotra, 2020; Iacobucci and Churchill Jr., 2015).

4.5.1.1 Operationalization Table

The operationalization table has been divided into six different columns. In the first column, the “Theoretical Concept” is being presented. It should be noted that the concepts were renamed later on when data was transferred into a statistical data programme, referred to as SPSS, which made it more structured and appropriate in the SPSS program. The next column has been labelled “Item Number”, where the theoretical concepts were given abbreviations. Furthermore, to see exactly what was going to be measured, the column labelled “Indicator” was added. The words presented under each section of indicator are derived from theory which the authors consider as relevant measures to use when investigating each theoretical concept. The indicators presented can be described simply as the questions that the questionnaire measured. To easily understand the responses given from the questionnaire’s questions, the column “Type of Measurement” was added into this operationalization table, which in this study’s case was a likert scale of 1-5. The column, “Description”, was included in the table in order to describe where the questions arose from. The descriptions were taken from the theoretical framework that explained the indicator, and was also the foundation for the final column “Measure on Questionnaire”, where the questions have been presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Concept</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Type of Measurement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measure on Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Usefulness          | Use1:       | Relevant  | Likert scale        | For example, if the posted content has been observed to have a higher number of likes it is considered to be relevant and if the content has received a lower number of likes it is “It is important that social media posts match my preferences in order for me to
|                     | Use1.1      |           | 1 = Strongly disagree| 5 = Strongly agree | - 1.1 comment the post  |
|                     | Use1.2      |           |                     |              | - 1.2 like the post      |
|                     | Use1.3      |           |                     |              | - 1.3 share the          |
### Usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Use2</th>
<th>Valuable: <strong>Utilitarian value</strong></th>
<th>Likert scale 1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree</th>
<th><em>It is important to consider the creation of value. A form of value is utilitarian value. Utilitarian value of social media is when any social media activities are of a helpful use when accomplishing any functional or practical task in everyday life [...] (Rauniar et al., 2014).</em></th>
<th>“It is important that social media posts can help me complete a task”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use3</td>
<td>Valuable: <strong>Hedonic value</strong></td>
<td>Likert scale 1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>* [...] hedonic value is when desires for fun or pleasure motivates the social media user (Rauniar et al., 2014).*</td>
<td>“It is important that social media posts are fun”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Use4: **Use4.1** Use4.2 | Quality | Likert scale 1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree | *Quality is an aspect that has a positive effect on usefulness. In this case quality means that the produced information and content on social media does not include any faults or errors (Hajli, 2016).* | “It is important to me that social media posts are  
- 4.1 have correct spelling  
- 4.2 have high quality pictures” |

#### Informativeness

| Informativeness | Info1: **Info1.1** Info1.2 | Descriptive | Likert scale 1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree | *As described by Arli (2017) the informative features on social media that are descriptive information create a more comprehensive and detailed picture about the content provided for the audience (Arli, 2017).* | “It is important to me that social media posts are  
- 1.1 comprehensive  
- 1.2 detailed” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Info2</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Likert scale 1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td><em>In other words, the informative content on social media needs to be communicated in a personal way by</em></td>
<td>“It is important that social media posts are tailored to me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directly addressing the social media user and not in a way that differs the provider with the receiver of the informative content (Carpentier et al., 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informativeness</th>
<th>Info3</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Likert scale</th>
<th>However, the informative content provided on social media is significantly important to be valid. False information can affect social media users to create a negative attitude towards the social media content resulting in the social media user not finding the information of valid use during the search process on social media (Chu et al., 2013; Alalwan, 2018).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>“It is important that the information provided in a social media post is truthful”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactivity</th>
<th>Int1:</th>
<th>Conversati</th>
<th>Likert scale</th>
<th>As users are now keen on being involved in the conversations taking place online, rather than simply being on the receiving end, interactivity is seen as important to users within social media (Sunder et al., 2014 cited in Alalwan, 2018).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int1.1</td>
<td>Int1.2</td>
<td>Int1.3</td>
<td>Int1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactivity</th>
<th>Int2</th>
<th>Express</th>
<th>Likert scale</th>
<th>[...] social media users appreciate that their voices are heard through interactivity, where they are given the chance to express their own thoughts and opinions (Jiang et al., 2010 cited in Alalwan, 2018).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>“On social media, it is important for me to be able to express my own opinion”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactivity</th>
<th>Int3:</th>
<th>Immerse</th>
<th>Likert scale</th>
<th>The level of interactivity for a social media user is of a higher quality when social media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int3.1</td>
<td>Int3.2</td>
<td>1 = Strongly disagree 5 = Strongly agree</td>
<td>“It is important that social media posts are interesting in order for me to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Int3.3</th>
<th>users find themselves absorbed in the social media platform they are on and have an interest in the platform. When social media users are fully immersed in the platform and are interested in it, they tend to classify the interactivity as being positive (Carvalho and Fernandes, 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase Intention</strong></td>
<td><strong>PI1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase Intention</strong></td>
<td><strong>PI2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase Intention</strong></td>
<td><strong>PI3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.2 Questionnaire Design

When designing a questionnaire, or more specifically a self completion questionnaire, there are certain details that researchers should bear in mind (Bryman and Bell, 2011). As stated before, this study has used an online self completion questionnaire, and therefore it is important to state details that should be followed when designing a questionnaire, as they have been followed by the authors of this paper, see in Appendix 2. The clarity of the questionnaire is of high importance, and the first step in achieving this is by stating the instructions in a clear way. For example, it is important to make sure that the respondents are aware of the questions that need to be answered, and that they know exactly how to answer the questions (Bryman and Bell, 2011). In the beginning of the questionnaire that was used for this study, a descriptive statement was provided by the authors explaining what the questionnaire was about, that the respondents should take their time and carefully answer each question, and other fundamental information. It was also made clear that each question in the questionnaire was obligatory, and the respondents were unable to move on to the next page of the questionnaire if they did not answer all the questions. The questions themselves were clear so that the respondents could understand what it was they were answering, which in turn led to them being able to answer all the questions (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Furthermore, Bryman and Bell (2011) claim that it is often that questionnaires do not get many responses. Some say that a solution to this problem is to make the questionnaire appear that it is of a shorter length. This, however, can lead to the questionnaire looking cramped and unclear. For instance, if the questionnaire is overcrowded in order for it to look shorter, it can turn out looking unattractive and turn potential respondents away. Therefore, it is important for the spacing of a questionnaire’s questions to be spaced a consistent distance from each other in order to look appealing and be clear to the respondents. A solution to this was followed in this study, where the authors presented the questionnaire in the online format of Google Forms. In Google Forms, the authors were able to separate each question in a way that did not overwhelm the respondents. The questionnaire was presented in a clear way, and
that made it appealing to fill out which has been further explained in 4.5.3 *Pre-testing* (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Researchers can also look at previous research and questionnaires in order to get inspiration for their own questions. The questionnaires that researchers should look at are those that were created by skilled professionals, who have had access to valuable resources when creating their questionnaires. This can in turn help researchers to create more precise and clear questions for their questionnaire, in a more efficient way (Krosnick and Presser, 2010).

Looking at other questionnaires is especially helpful for students, as the expertise of designing a questionnaire comes with the more questionnaires one has designed, which students may have a lack in (Malhotra, 2020). During the creation of this questionnaire, the authors looked at past research articles to get inspiration. However, this was not the main source of help when constructing the questions for this questionnaire, rather it was a way of seeing how studies in the past have formulated their questions. It is also important for researchers to make sure that the questions they are asking will be of use to the research that is taking place, and if a question is deemed to be unuseful, it should be removed from the questionnaire. The questions that were asked in this study were based on different indicators found from the theoretical framework. All of the questions were thus of importance, as they were measuring the various indicators that were related to social media content characteristics and purchase intention (Malhotra, 2020).

Moreover, Bryman and Bell (2011) state that the questionnaire itself should be clear to the reader so that they feel obligated to answer all the required questions. The questionnaire should be cohesive with the fonts used for headings, questions, answers, etc. so that the reader can easily navigate through the questionnaire without distractions or confusion. The questionnaire in this study had the same font for all of the headings, questions, and answers, making it easy for the respondents to fill out the questionnaire without getting distracted by any changes. Furthermore, it is imperative that the selection of answers are also presented in a cohesive manner. They can either be presented in a vertical or horizontal manner, however it is important that the chosen manner is consistent throughout the entire questionnaire to minimize confusion among the respondents. All of the answers in this questionnaire, apart
from the control questions, were presented in a horizontal manner. The authors felt that by doing this, there would be less confusion for the respondents (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Furthermore, in questionnaires, the questions being asked can come in different forms, such as open ended or closed questions (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Using closed questions, or what Malhotra (2020) refers to as structured questions, gives respondents various options of pre-made answers, where they do not have to write in their own response (Malhotra, 2020). These types of questions can be beneficial and less time consuming, as they have the ability to be pre-coded. The authors of this paper chose to use closed questions for their study, with one exception when asking the respondents to fill in what country they currently live in, which in turn saved the authors time when sorting the data results in the SPSS analysis. It also made it easier and less time consuming for the respondents to complete, and as the authors wanted to get many responses, it was important for the questionnaire to be designed in a way that was easy for the respondents (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Malhotra, 2020).

4.5.3 Pre-testing

To implement the stage of pretesting the web-based questionnaire is to increase the quality of the primary questionnaire. The authors of this paper were given feedback from the pre-test sample, which Presser et al., (2004) explains helps to learn how respondents can be faced with possible problems such as hesitations, confusion or discomfort in order to enable researchers to fix these problems (Presser et al., 2004). This improves the resulting response rate, meaning that when bettering the questionnaire more respondents are willing to answer the questionnaire, giving a higher quantity of answers (Faux, 2010). Bryman and Bell (2011) further explain that to pretest the questionnaire is to ensure that all research instruments within the questionnaire are functioning well, which for example could be wrong choice of wording, missing response options or groundless assumptions (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Presser et al., 2004). Especially in regards to self completion questionnaires, due to there being no interviewer to interact and control the situation it is important to implement a pre-test beforehand to notice and clear up possible issues before the final questionnaire is sent out (Bryman and Bell, 2011). However, when conducting a pre-test, it only speaks for identifying the problems, but it does not propose any solutions to the problem. The questions need to be revised and tested again in order for the researchers to be able to measure and
compare the behavioral responses. For greatest affect it is suggested that the sample for the pre-testing method should be randomly selected for both the primary and secondary pre-testing (Presser et al., 2004). However, these respondents should according to Bryman and Bell (2011) not be within the sample selection that have been chosen to answer the final questionnaire. It is argued that by doing so there is a risk that more accurate data will go to “waste” since the respondent might choose different answers than he or she would have if the respondent have already answered the same questionnaire before (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

The first pre-test was done on a smaller group of people consisting of five respondents. When the authors received the feedback, radical changes were implemented to the entire questionnaire. Every question was adjusted in order to make each measurement clear. When it comes to the second pre-test that the authors conducted, a questionnaire was sent out to ten respondents who did not participate in the actual questionnaire later on due to the authors not wanting to waste any accurate answers, which was previously mentioned. The respondents gave feedback about the questions which was valuable and made it possible for the authors to adjust the questionnaire. The received feedback concerned mostly the control questions. Questions that popped up were if three control questions were enough and in turn the authors received the tip to add questions regarding where the respondents are currently living and about what their main occupation is. This was brought up with the explanation for it being relevant to add to be able to measure geographical differences within the study. The authors also received comments on the question regarding age. The comment concerned that it is considered to be unethical to direct questionnaires to respondents under the age of 18 years which made the authors change the age range immediately from 15-24 to 18-24.

4.6 Sampling

In quantitative research, an aspect that a researcher is likely to come across is choosing a sample. Bryman and Bell (2011) claim that the sample of a study represents a portion of the population that has been chosen to be further investigated. When sampling, it is important for researchers to be aware of who their study will be representing, or if their study will be representing anyone at all. If the study needs to represent a certain group, then the sample
must pertain to that group. Additionally, researchers must know if their study should be generalizable to a population. The different factors that have been stated make it of great importance for the correct sampling approach to be used, in order to gather the correct sample for a study. Different factors that lead to choosing a sample can be, for example, the amount of resources that is available to a study. Along with the accessibility and availability of the sample that is trying to be reached (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

4.6.1 Sampling Frame

A sampling frame is described by Bryman and Bell (2011) as the list of people that a study uses in order to choose its sample, in which the people are found within the given population. There are various approaches to selecting the sampling frame, one of which being a non-probability sample. When using non-probability samples, there are people within the given population who have a greater chance of being chosen for the sample than others. This in turn makes the sample much less random than, for example the probability sampling method. There are different strategies of selecting the sample within the non-probability sample, one of which being the convenience sample (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Convenience samples are mainly used due to them being of easy reach and availability to the researcher of the given study, and are able to be used in research involving hypotheses (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Malhotra, 2020). Furthermore, this sampling strategy can help researchers save both time and money as it is a cheap and time efficient strategy (Malhotra, 2020).

However, there are also flaws involved with the convenience sampling strategy. Due to the researcher not being aware of who and what the people within the sample population are representing, the results of the study are not able to be generalized to a population (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Malhotra, 2020). This sampling strategy can also lead to selection bias, as the researcher has reached out to people that are available to them (Malhotra, 2020). That being said, the amount of respondents taking part in the questionnaire is likely to be satisfactory, for one of the same reasons, the authors of this paper have chosen a sample of people that are reachable to them (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

For this study, the authors used the convenience of their Facebook accounts in order to reach out to their Facebook friends. Each of the three authors posted a link to the questionnaire on
their Facebook accounts, which then made it possible for their Facebook friends to take the questionnaire in an easy fashion. This was a less costly way to get the results, due to the authors not having any monetary means to put into this investigation. Although this type of sample can be seen as biased, the authors felt that it was the most effective method for them, and by using this method they were able to get more responses than they had initially aimed to receive. For these reasons, the convenience sampling method was very satisfactory for the authors.

4.6.2 Sample Selection and Data Collection Procedure

A challenging aspect that is common for researchers is knowing how large of a sample they should have. This can be difficult for researchers due there not being a simple explanation of how large a sample should be. Other aspects, such as limited resources available for conducting the study, are also aspects that can affect the sample size. A way that the level of accuracy can rise in a study is to increase its sample size. A larger sample size does not mean that the study will be completely accurate, rather that the sampling error will be lower. However, at a certain point the accuracy will not become significantly better as the sample size increases, rather it just becomes a waste of resources. It is therefore important for the researchers of a study to beware of the resources available in order to conduct the research (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Green (1991) cited in VanVoorhis and Morgan (2007) states that when determining the amount of respondents to have in a study, researchers should follow a certain formula. The formula is expressed as: \( N > 50 + 8m \). In the formula, \( N \) represents the amount of respondents that a study should have, which will be determined from the equation. Next, \( 50 \) represents the base number of respondents there should be, as the number of respondents in this type of study should never be lower than 50. Lastly, \( m \) symbolizes the number of independent variables that are present in the study, which should then be multiplied by the number 8 (Green, 1991 cited in VanVoorhis and Morgan, 2007).

As this study has three independent variables, the formula to be followed when determining the sample size is: \( N > 50 + 8(3) \), which gives the result of \( N > 74 \) (Green, 1991 cited in VanVoorhis and Morgan, 2007). Therefore, in this study the number of respondents should be no less than 74. However, the aim is to reach numbers similar to previous studies that
have been done within the same area as this. The articles that have been used in this study have large differences when it comes to the number of respondents, it ranges from 200 respondents (Carpentier et al., 2019) to 1267 respondents (Johnson and Kaye, 2016). Based on this the authors aimed to receive 200 responses, though, as mentioned before, not settle for less than 74 responses. Also, the article with the study that included 200 respondents was implementing hypothesis testing, as well as found the sample through convenience sampling, and used a questionnaire in order to collect their data (Carpentier et al., 2019). The authors of this paper have also made these choices, which signals that this was a relevant number of respondents for the authors to aim for. The number of responses that the questionnaire received was 245. However, out of the 245 responses, four were incomplete, so they were in turn disregarded. Also, two of the respondents selected the “No” option when asked if they operated on one or more social media platforms, therefore, those two responses were also disregarded. In the end, that means that the number of responses that were able to be used for this study was 239.

4.7 Data Analysis Method

4.7.1 Data Entry, Coding and Cleaning

When the data has been collected and the researcher moves on to the next step, one can ask themselves what is actually going on in the data? In order to gain meaning and understanding from the collected data actions need to be made (Iacobucci and Churchill Jr., 2015). First of all, when deciding how to design the questionnaire it is necessary to consider how the data will be collected and how it most easily and smoothly will be able to be transferred into, for example, SPSS. This can be done for instance by changing every answer into a number in order to easily enter the data into the statistical software program (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

Furthermore, when the data has been transferred into the program the responses need to be coded (Bryman and Bell, 2015). The definition of coding is when each question and potential answer is being allocated a specific code which often comes in form of a number. A questionnaire can also be pre-coded if the questions are designed as closed questions they are already allocated with a specific number. For example, if the question is “Do you currently
have a valid passport?” the respondent will have the options “1. Yes” and “2. No” which means that 1 means “Yes” and 2 means “No” in the coding process and is something that already is determined (Malhotra, 2020). Coding is considered to be time-consuming especially when it comes to open questions. However, as previously mentioned, the questions for this study and questionnaire had the design of being closed questions (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

Moreover, when it comes to cleaning the data it is of importance to consider consistency checks and implement solutions for lacking responses. Consistency checks means that data that is inconsistent and has extreme values has to be carefully examined. If the data is inconsistent the respondent may have answered, for example, that he or she usually makes payments with a credit card but has answered no to the question if he or she owns a credit card. Thereby, this is something that can be discovered as an inconsistency within the data. Furthermore, when considering missing responses, the researchers have to be aware that some answers might be missing and that the data then will be including missing values for a variable. There are different ways of handling this problem. The first solution that is presented is to assume that the response that is lacking would be the mean response to that specific variable and that the researcher is filling in the mean response themselves even if it is unclear what the respondent would have answered exactly. A second solution could be to proceed from the pattern from the available answers. Another solution is to completely remove the respondents that have not fulfilled the questionnaire and thereby exclude them from the analysis. The last offered solution to the problem of missing responses is to include what the respondents have answered and work with the answers that have been given (Malhotra, 2020).

For this study, it was necessary to rename the different concepts to different item numbers when entering the data into SPSS in order to make it as clear as possible. The variables regarding usefulness were renamed to: Use1.1, Use1.2, Use1.3, Use2, Use3, Use4.1 and Use4.2. The variables regarding informativeness were renamed to the item numbers: Info1.1, Info1.2, Info2 and Info3. The variables representing interactivity were also renamed to different item numbers which were: Int1.1, Int1.2, Int1.3, Int1.4, Int2, Int3.1, Int3.2 and Int3.3. Lastly, the variables that stand for purchase intention were renamed as: PI1, PI2 and...
The data was later on transferred from an excel sheet to a SPSS sheet. The answers were also coded from actual words into numbers to make it as clear as possible. When it comes to cleaning the data, it was a step where the authors looked over if there were any questions that were lacking answers. In this case it was necessary to exclude four respondents from this research due to that they had not completed the questionnaire. The reason for completely excluding those respondents was due to the fact that they only had answered the very first question and it would thereby be extremely hard to estimate what the respondents might have answered to the remaining questions. Moreover, the questionnaire was designed with a control question regarding if the respondents were using social media on a daily basis, which was the only requirement for this study, making it very easy for the authors to see which respondents had to be excluded for that specific reason. For this reason, the authors had to exclude two respondents since it was a requirement that the respondents had to use social media in order to be included in this research.

4.7.2 Descriptive Statistics

When discussing descriptive statistics there are two different aspects that need to be considered to be able to analyze the data. The first aspect is dispersion. Dispersion can be measured through different ways. One way of how dispersion can be measured is by the range that goes from the maximum value to the minimum value (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Moreover, dispersion can also be measured and calculated through the standard deviation. The standard deviation is defined by an average of the variation around the mean. When comparing this way of measuring with the measurement through the range this entails a more complicated calculation. The standard deviation is also influenced by outliers, however, the influence is not as significant compared to the calculation with the range due to that when calculating for the standard deviation the numbers are divided by the number of values in the distribution (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

Furthermore, another aspect that is being considered when it comes to descriptive statistics is central tendency. When it comes to central tendency the researcher is searching for identifying an average for a distribution. Within quantitative methods there are three different kinds of averages. The first average is the arithmetic mean which is being calculated by adding all the values in a distribution and later on dividing it by the number of values.
The second kind of average is the median which is explained as being the middle point in a distribution of values. This is selected by lining up all the numbers in a distribution from the smallest to the largest number to be able to discover what number that is the middle point. This implicates that the median is not as sensitive to outliers as the mean is. The third way of discovering the central tendency is the mode. The mode is explained as the value that is occurring most frequently in a distribution (Bryman and Bell, 2015). Within descriptive statistics, the kurtosis for a curve can also be measured. Kurtosis distributions determine if the value stands for if the curve is symmetric, meaning that the values are equal on both sides of the distribution or more specifically that the mean, median and mode are the same on both sides. The skewness distribution also determines if a value is skewed. If a value is skewed, it means that the values are not equal on both sides of the distribution. The level of skewness should lay between the range of -1 and 1, the most desired level of skewness is 0 which means that the skewness level is lower and also that the distribution is symmetric (Malhotra, 2010). Moreover, descriptive statistics can measure the kurtosis of a value. The kurtosis demonstrates the curve of a distribution. When the kurtosis has a normal distribution, it equals zero, and based on if the kurtosis is positive or negative, the curve will change. To be more specific, the curve will be higher than the normal distribution if it has a positive kurtosis or lower than the normal distribution curve if it is a negative kurtosis (Malhotra, 2020). However, the changes of a curve cannot be outside the range of -2 to 2 since kurtosis values are only acceptable within that specific range (George and Mallery, 2003).

4.7.3 Correlation and Regression Analysis

When there is a need for investigating relationships between two or more variables it is of relevance to consider correlation and regression analysis. Cohen et al., (2003) describe that in any observed relationship, such as when investigating hypothesis testing, where an independent variable and a dependent variable are observed can be characterized based on the strength of the correlation relationship between the variables (Cohen et al., 2003). These analysis methods refer to techniques used for both correlation and regression analysis. These two terms are often used together with each other but maintain two different purposes, described further below.
Correlation analysis is measuring how close two different variables are related, or in other words the strength of a relationship between two variables within a quantitative study where the question of “Is X correlated with Y?” is considered (Iacobucci and Churchill Jr., 2015). This type of analysis method sums up to what kind of linear relationship two different variables maintain (Taylor, 1990). The relationship can also be shown in a specific model where arrows are being drawn from the independent to the dependent variable. Correlation can further be explained as when two variables are correlated with each other but it can never be anticipated that one variable depends on the other variable. Basically, correlation measures only correlation and not causality (Malhotra, 2020). Moreover, Cohen et al., (2003) explain that there is a linear relationship between variables, if a value of one of the variables has the tendency to either increase (positive relationship) or decrease (negative relationship) as the value from the other variables increases. To interpret the degree of relationship between two variables might be problematic as the variables can be measured in different units. By converting the value scores into a measure of distance from their mean it provides more proper estimates of the measure in order to better compare values. The degree of the relationship between two variables can vary on a range between -1 and +1, showing a perfect negative linear relationship (-1) or a perfect positive linear relationship (+1). As one might assume, a value of 0 means that there is no correlation between variables (Cohen et al., 2003).

Regression analysis is explained as being used as a technique for calculating and explaining the relation of a dependent variable to one or several independent variables, for example, “Is X useful in predicting Y?” (Iacobucci and Churchill Jr., 2015). Furthermore, regression analysis is being defined as a powerful and flexible tool to use since it can be used for different purposes. These different purposes can be to determine if a relationship between two variables exists, the strength of a relationship, a mathematical equation that relates the dependent and independent variables, the prediction of values for the dependent variable and maintaining control for different independent variables when considering the contributions of a specific set of variables (Cohen et al., 2003). Cohen et al., (2003) further refer to regression analysis as where regression coefficients are linear estimates of how Y relates to X, or in other words calculates the steepness of the regression slope in order to measure how Y rises or falls as X increases along the horizontal x-axis (Cohen et al., 2003). However, one
important aspect to remember is that researchers may never assume that regression analysis indicates causation even if the independent variables may define the change in the dependent variable (Malhotra, 2020).

When analyzing the results from the regression, in regards to hypothesis testing, the regression coefficient will provide a calculated accuracy of the strength of the relationship between variables, referred to $R^2$. The common determination of $R^2$ is that the value range lies between 0-1 (Cohen et al., 2003; Liu et al., 2003). In a regression model, there will most likely be a variance of values along the regression line representing the mean of all values. Within a set of data there will be multiple variables with different mean values providing a rather scattered data. $R^2$ is thereby used to generate a representation of what proportion of the total variation in $y$ (the sum of all means) that is described within the linear model and can be estimated from another variable, meaning that the percentage of variance of a dependent variable can be predicted by an independent variable. The strength of the variables is based on how strong the prediction of the relationship is on a scale of 0-100 percent, or as previously stated the range of 0-1 (Cohen et al., 2003). However, since the $R^2$ are regression coefficients from a given sample it might result in biased estimates of the population. By implementing adjusted $R^2$ in the research process, the bias within the $R^2$ estimate can be reduced (Liu et al., 2003; Cohen et al., 2003). According to Liu et al., (2003) the adjusted $R^2$ are always equal to or less than $R^2$, which is due to the fact that it adjusts based on the amount of useful variables there are within the model. More useful variables result in an increase of the adjusted $R^2$, and vice versa (Liu et al., 2003; Cohen et al., 2003). To further test the accuracy of the hypothesis testing, the statistic $F$ is also used to evaluate the overall significance of the regression model to see the fit of the model. The value of the F-statistic provides information on whether the null-hypothesis can be rejected, or in other words if the stated hypothesis can be accepted (as in this study), based on whether the means of two variables in the same setting are significantly different meaning the difference did not happen by chance. This provides a further understanding of the variance. If the mean values within the measure are closely together relative to the overall variability, the F-value is low and the variability is low. Moreover, if the mean values within the measure are far apart relative to the overall variability, the F-value is high and the variability is high as well. In order to be able to reject the null hypothesis, or accept the hypothesis, the F-value within the test should
be higher than the F-statistic (Cohen et al., 2003). After these measures, the researcher should also include the p-value to decide whether the overall results of the statistic are significant to reassure that all variables are significant, whereby the effect of all individual variables are compared jointly. The p-value is compared with the level of significance, which most commonly is at significance level 0.05. In order to get significant results and be able to accept the hypothesis the independent variables can be looked at independently to interpret the effect of the variables, whereby the hypothesis can be accepted (null-hypothesis rejected) if the p-value is below the significance level of 0.05. This provides support that the relationship between the independent and dependent variable is significant (Cohen et al., 2003). Furthermore, standard error of estimates is helpful when calculating and assuming how accurate the predicted values are. Basically, it helps the researcher to understand how much the actual values differ from the predicted values (Malhotra, 2020). This is a calculation that is taken into consideration when it comes to how confident and certain a researcher can be about the findings of an investigation (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Another aspect that is also included in the regression model are the degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom are established through a calculation where the “total number of observations minus the number of estimated parameters” (Hair et al., 2019, pp.261). Estimated parameters can be explained as constraints on the received data where the data is established to be collected from a specific population (Hair et al., 2019).

4.8 Quality Criteria

In research designs, there are certain criteria of Validity and Reliability (Bryman and Bell, 2011; 6 and Bellamy, 2012). In the research society, the creators of a research are expected to argue for these criteria within their findings by discussing, with confidence, their valid and reliable reasons for carrying out the process of research (6 and Bellamy, 2012). Moreover, this shows not only the quality of the actual findings but also how well-conducted the entire research process was, resulting in the quality of the overall research (Heale and Twycross, 2015). The concept validity refers to how well a research actually presents what it is aimed to do. This term is explained by consisting of three aspects (I) Content Validity (II) Construct Validity and (III) Criterion Validity which will be further discussed below. The concept reliability refers to the degree of stability of measurements of the research process and how
consistent these measured results are (6 and Bellamy, 2012), which also will be further developed below. Since this research is conducted with likert scale in the operationalization during the collection of data, the authors of this paper find it important to also discuss the quality of this specific choice of method. Bryman and Bell (2011) discuss that one way to test the internal reliability, or in other words the internal consistency, is the use of Cronbach’s alpha as further discussed below.

4.8.1 Content Validity

Content validity is explained by how the measures of content within a concept or item actually demonstrates what was aimed to be captured within a questionnaire (6 and Bellamy, 2012). This term is an important measurement tool to establish when creating a measure of validity, according to researchers within the research community (Rossiter, 2008). If the validity of a measure fails to measure what it was intended to, a conclusion cannot be made on the basis of the theoretical and empirical collection of data. It is therefore argued that it is highly important to critically measure validity in order to present valid research that is derived from a quantitative collection of data which represents the theoretical concepts of measure (Ding and Hershberger, 2002). It is further suggested by Malhotra (2020) that the content validity can be ensured through the opinions of other respondents, who should be chosen based on their similarities of those that will conduct the final questionnaire, that are able to take a subjective stand from the research, or the questionnaire, is of advantage to go over the content of the questionnaire to ensure the validity of the research. There are various aspects that can be improved, such as content, structure, difficulty, instructions and wordings (Malhotra, 2020). Based on this, the authors of this study discussed and reviewed the content validity with an expert within the field, whereby the authors adjusted the questionnaires conducted from this research. A collected sample group of 15 respondents with similar characteristics to those respondents within the final sample group were chosen to answer the pre-test, whereby the authors were able to correct the questionnaire once more after receiving the respondents feedback to strengthen the content validity before being able to present the final version.
4.8.2 Construct Validity

There is another form of validity known as construct validity (Rossiter 2008), and according to (Bolarinwa, 2015) there are different aspects within the construct validity which measures the strength of the validity of the questionnaire. However, specifically regarding research including hypothesis testing, where a relationship between variables are measured, construct validity is highly relevant to use in order to define whether the questions within the questionnaire actually represent what it has claimed to present (Bolarinwa, 2015; Thomas, 2007). It is therefore further suggested by Thomas (2007) that the items of measure within the questionnaires should present how measures and items are related within the influence of the researcher (Thomas, 2007). Since this study measured various variables, it was important to show the actual results as they are without assuming a certain outcome before the final results are received. A correlation analysis was done in this study in order to test the validity of the research and to make sure that the chosen items do in fact impact each other without being too closely related, as can be seen in section 5.2.1.

4.8.3 Criterion Validity

This aspect of validity is described as when there is a relationship between variables, or if variables impact each other somehow, determined by the scores based on a certain criterion of relationship. It determines how well findings from a questionnaire supports or predict for other indicating variables (Bolarinwa, 2015). 6 and Bellamy (2012) state that one can refer to trust in the same way as referring to validity, explained by the strength of a relationship. Moreover, as score results show that there is a relationship (or impact) of variables the results should be backed up with theoretical findings as well in order to present validity within the measurements and the conceptual construction (DePoy and Gitlin, 2016). Since this study measured the relationship between variables which was based upon theoretical research, the criterion validity was applied in this research study as well due to the structure of the process. The questions conducted in the questionnaire shown in 4.5.1.1. Operationalization Table, was based on the predictions that there is a relationship between the variables of interest. All questions were backed up with theoretical support and the hypotheses that were created were based on the same conditions in order to increase the validity of this research.
4.8.4 Reliability

The term of reliability is explained by Bryman and Bell (2011) to refer to the degree of consistency within a measure of interest, or in other words how the researcher goes about the measures (6 and Bellamy, 2012). The degree of reliability is shown through the consistency as the same data is measured it provides the same results. Moreover, if two researchers measure the same set of data and follow the same structure of procedure they should receive the same results. As this process is redone multiple times the degree of reliability increases for each time the same results are provided (6 and Bellamy, 2012). However, another way for detecting the degree of reliability is not based on the ability to reproduce results, but more regarding the coherency of related variables. This is referred to Internal Reliability and is used whenever there are multiple variables or measures which together with respondents' answers form the results of an overall score. For example, the use of questionnaires. It is important to make sure that the measures within the questionnaire are coherent and relate to one another. If not, some items within the measure might be better indicators for other measures (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Cronbach’s alpha is commonly used to test the internal reliability of social studies (Bryman, 2012), where the consistency of a scale will lie between 0 and 1, whereas an alpha level of 0.7 is normally considered reliable (Bryman, 2012; Taber, 2018). However, not all researchers agree that a value of 0.7 is the only value that should be accepted. Taber, (2018) presents arguments for a wide range of descriptives interpreting the strength of alpha values, going from “excellent” alpha values of (0.93–0.94) to low (0.11). An alpha value of (0.45–0.98) and above are according to the researcher considered “acceptable” values. Taber (2018) further states that there is no clear decided agreement across scholars of what values should be accepted, making any values above (0.45–0.98) to be indicators for accepted reliability (Taber, 2018). As this investigation studies the underlying behavior (purchase intention) of the respondents to the questionnaire, Cronbach’s alpha provides value to the research by measuring the relevance of the measured instruments within the scale (Taber, 2018). The importance of implementing a reliability test like Cronbach’s alpha is, according to Tavakol and Dennick (2011), to avoid presenting a research that provides false findings and also decrease the risk of being criticized for providing an unreliable research (Tavakol and Dennick, 2011). The results from Cronbach’s alpha provided in this study are presented in 5.2.2 Test of reliability: Cronbach’s Alpha.
4.9 Ethical Considerations

An important aspect to consider when conducting research is the well being of the study’s respondents and if their well being is affected by the study in any way. This brings in the question of ethics, where it is important to take good care of the respondents and be aware of the limits. Bryman and Bell (2011) claim there are various ethical principles that should be followed by researchers when conducting research. One principle to be brought into question is if respondents are harmed by a study. Clearly a study is looked down on if it brings harm to its respondents. However, it is essential to know exactly what causing harm entails. Harm can be unnecessary stress on the respondents, lowering their confidence level, or perhaps even putting their future in harm's way. Thus, it is the researcher’s task to take every measure necessary in ensuring that the likelihood of harm is nonexistent or as minimal as possible. This can be done by keeping the respondents of a study unidentified, which is a simpler task in quantitative studies (Bryman and Bell, 2011). The authors of this paper were very cautious when conducting their study, because they did not want to cause harm to the respondents in any way. The authors were able to prevent the respondents being harmed by keeping the questionnaire anonymous. The authors made it very clear in the questionnaire’s description that the responses given by the respondents would be kept anonymous, and that their responses would only be used for academic purposes. The questionnaire also did not consist of any personal questions that would reveal the identity of the respondents, so the respondents did not have to worry about their identities being revealed through the responses they gave. By going through these measures, the authors were able to ensure that the respondents would not be harmed, which in turn kept the present study ethical.

Another ethical principle that researchers must not abuse is deceiving the respondents in any way. Deception in a study takes place when researchers have falsely informed the respondents about the study in any way. For example, if the researchers tell respondents that the research is about something it is not. That being said, deception may occur in a more ethically sound way if researchers choose to provide only a small amount of information regarding the study, if they feel the respondents reply in a more honest way. However, it is still important to ensure that the respondents are not being lied to (Bryman and Bell, 2011).
The authors of this study were very honest with the respondents of their questionnaire, because they did not want to deceive them in any way. In the questionnaire’s description, the authors gave a short description of what they were researching, because they did not want to mislead the respondents in any way. The authors provided information regarding why they were conducting the questionnaire in the first place. The level of honesty that the authors had with the respondents of their questionnaire prevented the respondents from being deceived, keeping the present study ethically sound.

4.10 Societal Issues

When conducting research, it is important to include implications of how societal issues might rise as an effect of the research, which should be considered before it is developed. Societal issues can be seen as difficult to determine as there are countless aspects that can be applied to different types of studies, and there are no clear criteria to follow (Bornmann, 2012). However, it is important for researchers not to put the feelings and principles that people have in jeopardy. If a study could possibly result in those aspects being jeopardized, it should be put to an end. This is because the trust that society has in researchers can be broken as a result, which would be detrimental to a study as mutual trust is a crucial factor that needs to exist in research (Bryman and Bell, 2011). In this case there are some risks that societal issues may arise. Due to the fact that this research is providing results on how characteristics within the content of social media is related to consumers’ purchase intention the result may be used by content creators to intentionally impact consumers’ purchase intention, leading to increased purchases of offers, products and services. A high demand from consumers might cause the overall prices to rise, which in turn might affect the overall economy. An increased demand for consumer goods can also result in the production of goods increasing requiring more resources. To have a higher demand for goods than there are resources to create the goods will impact the society and the environment negatively. However, in order for this study to be of direct impact to the overall economy is not very likely since this study regards purchase intention, meaning that there is no prediction for the actual purchase, but only the intention for a purchase. Although, it is important to still take this into consideration since consumers' purchase intention is within the process of deciding upon a purchase. This can
also be considered to be positive for marketers since this paper can be used to better the content within the social media content that is used within their marketing strategies. By focusing on certain characteristics which are related to consumers’ purchase intention, there is no need to spend resources on creating content that might not have the same effect on consumers’ purchase intention. By using the results of this study, it can help marketers and other content creators to focus their marketing strategies considering consumers’ purchase intention. Therefore, this study can lead to positive societal effects as well and not only regarding negative societal issues.
5. Results

This chapter presents the found results from the hypothesis testing and the collected data. The results include descriptive statistics and discussions about the correlations, reliability and validity quality of the findings within this study.

5.1 Descriptive statistics

Out of the 245 people that responded to the questionnaire, 239 of the responses could be used. This is because four of the respondents did not fill out the questionnaire entirely, making any of the answers they provided invalid. Moreover, two respondents did not make it past the control question, “Do you operate on one or more social media platforms”, as they filled in the answer, “No”, meaning that those two responses were also considered invalid. It was important that the respondents answered “Yes” to the control question, “Do you operate on one or more social media platforms”, because in order for the questions to be answered accurately, the respondents themselves must have a social media account. Once the invalid responses were discarded, the authors put the 239 valid responses into the statistical software SPSS, where they were able to analyze the data. As stated, it was important to only include the responses of respondents who answered “Yes” to the control question, “Do you operate on one or more social media platforms”. Therefore, 100% of the respondents did in fact operate on one or more social media platforms. The majority of respondents who took the questionnaire were female, covering 66.9% of all responses. That then left the amount of males who responded to the questionnaire to be 33.1%. Now to discuss the age range of respondents that took the questionnaire, the majority of respondents were between the ages of 18-24, which consisted of 48.9% of all respondents. There were zero respondents under the age of 18, 23% of respondents were between the ages of 25-34, 5.9% of respondents were between the ages of 35-44, 15.9% of respondents were between the ages of 45-54, and 6.3% of respondents were over 54.

Table 2, presented below is a representation of the descriptive statistics for the present study. Descriptive statistics was first used to calculate the central tendency, which more specifically means that it was used to calculate the mean, median and mode of the independent and
dependent variable(s) of the study. The central tendency consisted of a number between 1-5, as the responses in the questionnaire were measured through the numbers 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The highest mean was found in the item Info3, which had the mean of 4.42. The lowest mean out of all the items was found in item PI3, which had a mean of 2.10. This indicates that the mean of all other items was between the numbers 2.10 and 4.42. The median of all of the items mostly consisted of 3’s and 4’s. However, there were two items that had a median of 5, and those items are Info3, and Int3.3. There were also three items that had a median of 2, and those items are Intl1.1, Intl1.3 and PI3. Now moving on to the last measure of central tendency, the mode. There were four items that had a high mode of 5, and those items were Use1.1, Use1.3, Info3, and Int3.3. Furthermore, item PI3 had the lowest mode of 1. Table 2., also represents the dispersion, which has been calculated through standard deviation. The item that had the lowest standard deviation was Info3, which had the standard deviation of 0.841. The item that had the highest standard deviation was Intl1.4, which had the standard deviation of 1.198. Furthermore, when it comes to the shape of the curve, skewness and kurtosis were considered. Table 2., demonstrates the skewness and kurtosis of every item. The skewness determines if the value is skewed or not and as mentioned in 4.7.2 Descriptive Statistics a value is skewed if it is not equal on both sides of a distribution. For this specific data, there are a lot of negative values and some values are further away from the desired value which in this case was 0. There are some specific values that fall outside the range of -1 to 1, those items are Use1.3 (-1.285), Info3 (-1.731), Int3.1 (-1.272) and Int3.3 (-1.489). This means that for these items the curve is highly skewed. It was also one value that is completely symmetric which was Intl1.4 (0.001). Moreover, when it comes to the values of kurtosis it is explained that a normal distribution is equal to zero. The values also need to be within the range of -2 to 2 in order to be accepted. As seen in Table 2., all values were accepted, however, there were 14 out of 22 items that possessed a negative value which means that their curves will be lower than the normal distribution. The 8 remaining items possessed a positive value which indicates that their curves will be higher compared to the normal distribution.
Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the independent and dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use1.1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>-0.604</td>
<td>-0.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use1.2</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>-0.973</td>
<td>1.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use1.3</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>-1.285</td>
<td>0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use2</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use3</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use4.1</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>-0.694</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use4.2</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info1.1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info1.2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>-0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info3</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>-1.731</td>
<td>-0.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int1.1</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>-0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int1.2</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>-0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int1.3</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>-0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int1.4</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int2</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>-0.570</td>
<td>-0.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int3.1</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>-1.272</td>
<td>1.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int3.2</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>-0.781</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int3.3</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>-1.489</td>
<td>1.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>-0.863</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI3</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>-0.663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Quality Criteria

5.2.1 Test of Validity: Correlation Analysis

In Table 3., presented below, a correlation analysis was conducted in order to test the relationship between the three independent variables in this study Usefulness, Informativeness and Interactivity. The variables all fall within the numbers -1 and +1, showing that relationships can be found between the variables. There was a negative relationship found between Usefulness and Informativeness where the value was -0.057, making it the lowest value found. The highest value was between Usefulness and Interactivity, with a value of 0.213. It should also be noted that the correlations between Usefulness and Interactivity, and Informativeness and Interactivity were found to be significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 3. Test of Validity: Correlation analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Informativeness</th>
<th>Interactivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informativeness</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>0.213**</td>
<td>0.193**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

5.2.2 Test of Reliability: Cronbach’s Alpha

In order to understand and see the consistency and relationship within the measures of this study, it was necessary to conduct a test of the internal reliability which is called Cronbach’s Alpha. The level of reliability that the authors of this paper wanted to achieve was 0.7 since that is the alpha level that is considered to be reliable. The authors were aware that some values indicate a lower reliability, for example Informativeness with a value of 0.684 and Purchase Intention with a value of 0.614. However, levels that are between 0.45–0.98 are still being accepted due to the fact that values within that range are considered to be usable. Within the variable Usefulness the authors made the decision of excluding the items Use1.2,
Use2, Use3, Use4.1 and Use4.2 in order to increase the alpha level to 0.708. Also, within the variable Informativeness some items, more precisely Info2 and Info3, were excluded in order to reach a higher alpha level, which ended up being a value of 0.684. Furthermore, it was found that the variable Interactivity had an alpha level of 0.754 which is aligned with the level that the authors desired to reach. The variable, Purchase Intention, was shown to have an alpha level of 0.614 which is accepted, however it is important to remember that a value under 0.7 the reliability is considered to be less reliable even if it is still acceptable (Taber, 2018).

Table 4. Test of Reliability: Cronbach's Alpha.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informativeness</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Hypothesis Testing: Regression Analysis

A regression analysis was used in order to test the three hypotheses. First, the control variables were tested. Out of the four control variables, there were two that were seen as significant. Control variable 1 which represented gender proved to be significant in Models 1 through 5 at the p < 0.001 significance level with a p-value at 0.000. Control variable 2 which represented age was also shown to be significant in Models 1, 2, and 4. Control variable 2 was significant at the p < 0.05 significance level, with significance levels of 0.011, 0.014 and 0.011. The regression analysis also led to H3 being accepted, as H3 was found to be significant at the p < 0.01 significance level, with a significance level of 0.02. The significance level was less than 0.01, demonstrating that it was significant at the 99% confidence level.
Table 5. Hypothesis Testing: Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp. sign</th>
<th>MODEL 1 Control Variables</th>
<th>MODEL 2</th>
<th>MODEL 3</th>
<th>MODEL 4</th>
<th>MODEL 5 All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (CQ1)</td>
<td>-0.380*** (0.102)</td>
<td>-0.374*** (0.102)</td>
<td>-0.386*** (0.101)</td>
<td>-0.331*** (0.101)</td>
<td>-0.338*** (0.102)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (CQ2)</td>
<td>-0.213* (0.047)</td>
<td>-0.205* (0.047)</td>
<td>-0.231 (0.047)</td>
<td>-0.206* (0.046)</td>
<td>-0.217 (0.046)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation (CQ3)</td>
<td>0.104 (0.105)</td>
<td>0.118 (0.106)</td>
<td>0.094 (0.105)</td>
<td>0.107 (0.102)</td>
<td>0.105 (0.103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country (CQ4)</td>
<td>-0.074 (0.039)</td>
<td>-0.079 (0.039)</td>
<td>-0.076 (0.039)</td>
<td>-0.108 (0.038)</td>
<td>-0.109 (0.038)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Usefulness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: The social media content characteristic usefulness has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.069 (0.048)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026 (0.048)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informativeness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: The social media content characteristic informativeness has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.128* (0.061)</td>
<td>0.089 (0.061)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**H3:** The social media content characteristic interactivity has a positive relationship with consumers’ purchase intention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of the Estimates</td>
<td>0.70116</td>
<td>0.70081</td>
<td>0.69622</td>
<td>0.68280</td>
<td>0.68249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Value</td>
<td>10.013***</td>
<td>8.265***</td>
<td>8.991***</td>
<td>11.198***</td>
<td>8.322***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom (df)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< 0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, N=195

S.E. (standard error) is presented in parentheses for each of the independent variables, following below the Beta value.
5.4 Hypothesis Results

Table 6. displays the outcome of the hypothesis testing. As seen in Table 6., two out of three hypotheses were rejected, more precisely H1 and H2 were rejected. However, one of the hypotheses, H3, was accepted. This was presented in a Table 6., in order to display the result in a clear and consistent manner.

Table 6. Results from hypothesis testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>ACCEPTED/REJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: The social media content characteristic usefulness has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.</td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: The social media content characteristic informativeness has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.</td>
<td>Informativeness</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: The social media content characteristic interactivity has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.</td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Discussion of the Results

This chapter presents a discussion based on the results from SPSS in regards to the hypothesis testing. A discussion of the most relevant findings is included for each hypothesis that has been rejected or accepted. In addition, a model of the accepted hypothesis is presented.

6.1 Hypothesis Discussion

6.1.1 Hypothesis 1 Discussion: Usefulness

In regards to the items within the concept Usefulness, it showed to provide relatively high mean values. The three items (Use1.1, Use1.2 and Use1.3) connected to the indicator “Relevant” stood out and had the highest mean value above 3.7 within Usefulness. In connection to social media content, the values provide information that it is considered important that the useful content within social media needs to be perceived as relevant for the receiver (Alalwan, 2018). The Utilitarian value (Use2) and Hedonic value (Use3) showed to be of less importance as the mean value for each item was below 3.3, whereas the indicator of “Quality” showed a mean value above 3.7. It can therefore be argued that the quality is considered to be of higher importance within social media content (Hajli, 2016) than the actual value the content provides (Rauniar et al., 2014) in order to consider the content to be of the useful character. Interestingly enough to discuss, the mode value of Use1.3, explains that in order for consumers to share a social media post the content needs to contain relevant content, show to have the highest mean along with the highest mode of 5 in comparison to the other items within Usefulness. This indicates that if receiving the choice of either liking, commenting or sharing a social media post that contains relevant content the receivers are most likely to want to share the post. More importantly, the high value implies that it is considered important for consumers that the content actually is relevant in order to share the post. These values can be supported by Sin et al., (2012) who argues that it is essential that the content within the communication on social media is perceived as relevant for the consumer in order to affect the Purchase Intention. It can be further assumed that providing
relevant content makes consumers more likely to share the post which influences the Purchase Intention for those being in contact with the content.

The test of validity whereby Usefulness was measured together with other independent variables showed that there is a negative linear correlation between Usefulness and Informativeness of -0.057 and a positive linear correlation of +0.213 with Interactivity. Moreover, the negative linear correlation between Usefulness and Informativeness were also shown to not be significant at the 0.01 level, meaning that there is lack of support to show upon a correlation between the variables. As stated by Malhotra (2020) measuring correlations does not indicate that one variable is dependent on another, it merely provides information about how they are correlated. The statistics show that there is a stronger correlation between Usefulness and Interactivity, however the correlation is not strong and likely to be unimportant. Nonetheless, the correlation between Usefulness and Informativeness provides information about an almost non-existing correlation meaning that there is almost non existing relationship between the variables (Cohen et al., 2003). However, despite that none of the variables have a strong correlation they still fall within the range of -1 and +1, which is argued to prove for an existing correlation between variables (Cohen et al., 2003). Thereby, it can be deduced that useful social media content has a positive correlation to Interactivity but not on Informativeness. This can also be supported by Arli’s (2017) suggestion that useful social media content is important for users operating on social media in regards to how they will interact with the social media content.

This alone however does not provide information about the reliability of the measures, whereby the values of Cronbach’s alpha is discussed. As all items within Usefulness originally were measured, the data consisted of low values of Cronbach’s alpha, which according to Taber (2018) provide a lower reliability since the values of Cronbach's alpha should lie closely to 0.7 or higher in order to be seen as reliable measures. By only accepting two items (Use1.1 and Use1.3) instead of including all items, the Cronbach’s alpha showed more reliable values to analyze, making the consistency for those measures be considered as reliable. However, received values under 0.7 are theoretically accepted (Taber, 2018) but getting rid of items was by the choice of the authors to avoid presenting false findings and to
provide an increased reliability for what has been researched, as suggested by Tavakol and Dennick (2011).

Furthermore, it is inevitable to discuss how strongly the independent variable of Usefulness is when being tested along with the dependent variable Purchase Intention, all the independent variables and control variables. When looking at Model 5 (all model) of the Regression analysis (found in Table 5), the Beta value of Usefulness was not significant at $p < 0.05$ or $p < 0.01$, resulting in the authors rejecting H1: *The social media content characteristic usefulness has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention*. In other words, this indicates that there is no significant positive relationship between the social media content characteristic Usefulness and consumers’ Purchase Intention. In addition, the testing of H1 where the independent variable was solely tested with the dependent variable of Purchase Intention and the control variables, shown in Model 2, the Beta value was shown to not be significant at $p < 0.05$ or $p < 0.01$ level. This result was surprising due to the argumentation of Sin et al. (2012) stating that Usefulness within social media content is an important element within the communication process which most likely will affect consumers’ Purchase Intention. However, since Usefulness has not been shown to provide a convincing correlation or relationship when being tested with other independent variables or the dependent variable, it can be assumed that the theoretical foundation cannot be strongly advised for all populations when Usefulness is being investigated. Therefore, the social media content characteristic Usefulness has proven to not have a significant positive relationship with consumers’ Purchase Intention.

6.1.2 Hypothesis 2 Discussion: *Informativeness*

Considering the items within the concept *Informativeness*, the strongest mean value of all measures within this study were provided by the item *Info3* which interestingly enough also had the highest value of 5 regarding both median and mode. In connection to social media content, this result indicates that the most agreed upon factor of importance is that the social media content consists of valid information. The theoretical findings by Chu et al., (2013) and Alalwan (2018) can arguably support this result as they state that social media users’ (consumers amongst them) attitude towards the content is affected by the degree of valid
information, whereby it can be assumed that consumers’ Purchase Intention might also be affected. This section will be further discussed below in relation to Cronbach’s alpha.

The result of the strength of the linear correlations between the independent variables Informativeness and Usefulness have been discussed above in 6.1.1 Hypothesis 1 Discussion: Usefulness. The correlation between Informativeness and Interactivity was shown to be both positive and significant at the 0.01 level. Furthermore, in regards to Cronbach’s alpha the item Info3 did not show upon reliable values and was therefore taken away from the study. The reason for this can be argued to be due to that the values did not include a specific variety of values. Cohen et al., (2003) state that values should lie with a variance in relation to the regression line, if not, the responses are likely to be biased, which most likely is the case in this scenario. A biased measure does not contribute to a reliable study. Similarly, the item Info2 was also taken away from the data in order to maintain reliability (Taber, 2018). However, two items (Info1.1 and Info1.2) were kept which provided the study with reliability due to the alpha being at the value of 0.684 which lies closely to 0.7, making them acceptable values (Taber, 2018).

When examining the independent variable of Informativeness in Model 5 (all Model) of the Regression analysis (found in Table 5), it was shown that Informativeness was not significant. The Beta value of Informativeness was not significant at the p < 0.05 or p < 0.01 level, which exemplifies that there was no significance presented. Due to the Beta value being insignificant in Model 5, H2: The social media content characteristic informativeness has a positive relationship with consumers’ purchase intention, was rejected. Thus, there is not a significant positive relationship between Informativeness and consumers’ Purchase Intention. However, when testing the independent variable Informativeness with the dependent variable Purchase Intention and the control variables, as shown in Model 3, H2 was found to have a positive relationship, making the Beta value significant at the p < 0.05 level. This could mean that in this specific study when Informativeness was tested along with Usefulness and Interactivity, it proved to be insignificant. However, if Informativeness was tested with other variables or by itself, the results could have been different, and the Informativeness of social media content could have been a predicting factor of consumers' Purchase Intention. Nevertheless, this study did not prove that Informativeness was a
predicting factor in consumers’ Purchase Intention, which goes against the findings of a previous study. In Alalwan’s (2018) study, it was found that Informativeness was a driving aspect that could lead to a consumers’ Purchase Intention increasing (Alalwan, 2018). However, the findings of the present study goes against those findings, due to Informativeness being insignificant when it is tested along with Usefulness and Interactivity. Therefore, the social media content characteristic Informativeness has proven to not have a positive relationship with consumers’ Purchase Intention.

6.1.3 Hypothesis 3 Discussion: Interactivity

When looking into the descriptive characteristics of the independent variable Interactivity, there are some points that stand out. For example, the mean of the two items (Int3.1 and Int3.3) were the only items connected to Interactivity that had a mean over 4. Both of the items were connected to the indicator “Immerse”, and the high mean values reveal that it is important for social media users to find social media posts interesting in order for them to immerse themselves in the post by commenting or sharing (Cavalho and Fernandes, 2018). The item Int3.3 also had a high mode of 5, and median of 5, which in comparison to all of the other items is quite high, as there was only one other item that had a median of 5, and only three other items that had a mode of 5. This further indicates that it is not only important but also a common opinion among the respondents that it is important to find social media posts interesting in order to immerse themselves in the post by commenting or sharing (Cavalho and Fernandes, 2018). There were also two items within the independent variable Interactivity that had a low mean, median and mode in comparison to the other items. The items were Int1.1 and Int1.3, and were both connected to the indicator “Conversation”. As the mean, median, and mode were all lower than 3 for items Int1.1 and Int1.3, it should be noted that it is not important for social media users to be involved in conversations on social media through commenting or sharing posts (Sunder et al., 2014 cited in Alalwan, 2018). This goes against theory by Sunder et al., (2014) cited in Alalwan (2018) who argues that taking part of conversations on social media makes Interactivity an important factor within social media content. It can be assumed, however, that the Interactivity itself along with other factors of Interactivity is more important rather than how interactive conversations take place.
The result of the strength of the linear correlations with the other independent variables of Usefulness and Interactivity have been discussed above in 6.1.1 Hypothesis 1 Discussion: Usefulness, as well as the linear correlations between Informativeness and Interactivity, discussed in 6.1.2 Hypothesis 2 Discussion: Informativeness. However, the Cronbach's alpha value for the independent variable Interactivity was 0.754, which is an accepted level (Taber, 2018), thus there were no items taken away from Interactivity. It should also be noted that Interactivity had the highest Cronbach's alpha value, which signifies that this independent variable is reliable (Bryman, 2012; Taber, 2018). Also, the high values implicate a decreased risk of the study being criticized in regards to reliability and truthful findings. In practical sense, this further indicates that all measures within Interactivity are relevant to study in regards to predicting how the Interactivity within social media content influences consumers Purchase Intention (Taber, 2016; Tavakol and Dennick, 2011).

Moreover, when examining the independent variable in Model 5 (all Model) of the Regression analysis (found in Table 5) it was shown that the Beta value of Interactivity was significant at the p < 0.01 level (with a p-value of 0.002). Due to the Beta value being significant when tested with all the other variables, H3: The social media content characteristic interactivity has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention, was accepted. Thus, the acceptance of H3 proves that the content characteristic Interactivity on social media does in fact have a positive relationship with consumers' Purchase Intention. As the Beta value was positive and found to be significant (Beta was found to be significant at p < 0.01 level), it also shows that there was a positive relationship between Interactivity and Purchase Intention when tested in Model 5. This in turn means that the social media content characteristic Interactivity increases consumer's Purchase Intention. H3 was the only hypothesis that was accepted, which in turn means that Interactivity was the most significant (and only significant) variable out of Usefulness, Informativeness and Interactivity when it comes to there being a positive relationship with consumers’ Purchase Intention. This finding supports the results of a previous study done by Alalwan (2018), where his findings show that, “[...] interactivity was the most significant factor predicting purchase intention” (Alawanan, 2018, pp. 72). Due to H3 being accepted, it also proves that consumers have a desire to be a part of conversations that occur on social media (Sunder et al., 2014 cited in
Alalwan, 2018) as well as that consumers want their voices to be heard by expressing their views and beliefs on social media (Jiang et al., 2010 cited in Alalwan, 2018). Lastly, it should be noted that the acceptance of H3 also means that consumers will immerse themselves in a social media platform if they find themselves interested in the platform's content (Cavalho and Fernandes, 2018). Therefore, if all of these stated aspects are followed collectively, the results of the accepted H3 show that the social media content characteristic Interactivity does have a positive relationship with consumers’ Purchase Intention as well as increase consumers’ Purchase Intention.

Additionally, there are other parts of the Regression analysis (Table 5) that brought interesting findings. First, it is worthy to note that the F-value for Models 1-5 were seen to be significant at the p < 0.001 level. Furthermore, when looking at the R² of all the independent variables and the dependent variable, it was shown that the R² value was 0.201. This means that the independent variables (Usefulness, Informativeness and Interactivity) make up 20.1% of the dependent variable (Purchase Intention). However, as Cohen et al., (2003) and Liu et al., (2003) state, the R² value can give biased estimates of the population, which is why it is important to also look at the adjusted R², due to the adjusted R² resulting in more useful values. When looking at the adjusted R², the value becomes smaller. The adjusted R² value was 0.177, meaning that the independent variables (Usefulness, Informativeness and Interactivity) make up 17.7% of the dependent variable (Purchase Intention). As the adjusted R² is a more useable value (Cohen et al., 2003; Liu et al., 2003), it can be concluded that 17.7% is the most accurate percentage to look at when wanting to know the impact that the independent variables (Usefulness, Informativeness and Interactivity) have on Purchase Intention (dependent variable). The adjusted R² value for the independent variable Interactivity presented in Model 4 was 17.6%, which was very close to that of the adjusted R² found in Model 5, 17.7%. The values may be close, due to Interactivity being connected to H3, which was the only accepted hypothesis in the study.
6.2 Modified Research Model

After receiving results and discussing the findings, it was confirmed that the only accepted hypothesis was H3: *The social media content characteristic interactivity has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention.* Based on this, a new model was created to support the accepted hypothesis, showing the relationship between the social media content characteristic Interactivity and consumers’ Purchase Intention as shown in Figure 2.

*Figure 2: Model explaining the positive relationship between the social media content characteristic Interactivity and consumers’ purchase intention.*
7. Conclusion

As the aim was set out to explain the relationship between social media content characteristics and consumers’ purchase intention, this research provides a conclusion that there is a significant positive relationship between the social media content characteristic interactivity and consumers’ purchase intention. It was also concluded that there were two social media content characteristics that did not have a significant positive relationship with consumers’ purchase intention, which were the independent variables of usefulness and informativeness. Based on the findings of this study, the acceptance of H3: The social media content characteristic interactivity has a positive relationship with consumers' purchase intention also provides a further explanation that there is a desire for consumers to take part in conversations on social media by being able to express their views and beliefs. Moreover, it is further implicated that consumers are more likely to immerse themselves with a social media platform if the content within the platform is perceived as interesting for the consumer. The combination of these aspects of interactivity is the construction for the accepted relationship.

7.1 Theoretical Implications

Within this study there are theoretical implications to be presented. Previous studies have provided implications regarding that there are certain characteristics within social media content which influences consumers’ purchase intention, which are Usefulness (Arli, 2017; Sin et al., 2012; Rauniar et al., 2014), Informativeness (Arli, 2017; Alalwan, 2018; Chu et al., 2013) and Interactivity (Alalwan, 2018; Hajli, 2016). These previous research also state that each of these characteristics have a stronger relationship with consumers’ purchase intention in comparison to other characteristics, but did not however, provide any specific advice for the relationship in this specific context of social media content as in this study or in what way they influence the purchase intention (Arli, 2017; Sin et al., 2012; Rauniar et al., 2014; Alalwan, 2018; Chu et al., 2013; Hajli, 2016). As the previous studies were conducted they all were measured in different contexts together with different variables and concepts resulting in different values. Based on this, results from this study provide new theoretical implications
presenting that in the context of social media content the characteristic of interactivity is the only aspect that could be considered significantly important to include in regards to consumers’ purchase intention. As previous research mentions that consumers’ purchase intention will be “influenced” by the social media content characteristics (Hutter et al., 2013; Alalwan, 2018; Arli, 2017) but not presenting the meaning behind “influenced”. This present study can add that the existing relationship will influence consumers in such ways that their purchase intention will increase if the content consists of the characteristic interactivity as a result from the significant positive relationship between interactivity and consumers’ purchase intention. However, the influential aspect can only be considered within this specific context of social media content and should not be assumed to be an advice for all future research in regards to social media content and consumers’ purchase intention. Moreover, this study cannot contribute with any support for the findings of previous studies considering the characteristics usefulness and informativeness in relation to consumers’ purchase intention as previously discussed in 6.1.1 Hypothesis 1 Discussion: Usefulness and 6.1.2 Hypothesis 2 Discussion: Informativeness.

7.2 Practical Implications

There are practical implications that can be suggested based on the results of this study. The implications can benefit content creators, which as stated previously can include anyone from marketers to regular social media users. The implications can be seen as beneficial to content creators who are interested in knowing the relationship between consumers’ purchase intention as well as how consumers’ purchase intention is increased through social media content. The content characteristic that proved to be significant when increasing a consumer's purchase intention was interactivity. Therefore, it is recommended that content creators take the results of this study into consideration and apply interactivity to their social media content. One way that content creators can implement Interactivity into their content is by involving consumers in conversations on social media through comments, likes, shares, and posts. Another way that content creators can implement interactivity is by making their posts interesting so that consumers want to comment, like or share the post in order to implement interactivity. Lastly, content creators should allow for consumers to express their own opinions through social media content if they wish to apply interactivity to their content. If
content creators follow the various ways to employ interactivity to their social media content, then, based on the findings of the present study, content creators can in turn increase purchase intention.
8. Limitations & Recommendation for Future Research

This section presents the Limitations along with Recommendation for Future Research based on the findings from this study.

8.1 Limitations

There are some limitations that are worth mentioning when it comes to this study. Regarding the collected data from the quantitative research process, there is a limitation regarding the aim of providing generalizable results whereby this study is non-generalizable. This is due to the number of respondents, which was 239, making it impossible to do some kind of generalization of this study to a larger population. As previously discussed in section 4.1.2 Quantitative Research the authors of this research state that a high quantity of respondents allows for findings to be generalizable for a larger population when doing a quantitative study. However, despite this study being of the quantitative nature this study is not generalizable. This is due to that as the respondents were sampled through non-probability sampling of convenience sampling, this provides the limitation for generalization since the results were provided based on the convenience of the authors. Since the authors posted the questionnaire on their individual Facebook accounts it might have resulted in that the sample did not appear to be as diversified as the authors thought it would be. Furthermore, the authors are in the same ages and have the same gender, which might also have impacted the range of diversity of the respondents since the authors are within a similar demographic whereby a large quantity of the respondents are within that same demographic as well. Therefore, when posting the questionnaire on the authors Facebook pages, it resulted in a large percentage of their Facebook friends conducting the questionnaire being females as well as the majority of respondents being within the ages of 18-24. This further leads to the limitation of not having a diversity of respondents nor being able to generalize the responses. When choosing a non-probability sampling method and in this case convenience sampling there is a risk that the sample may occur to be much less random than a probability sampling method. However, the authors of this investigation have not used any monetary resources which creates a limitation of expanding the choices of sampling methods further. This in turn results in the findings produced by convenience sampling to not be able to generalize for an
entire population. Therefore, the findings are only applicable for this specific sample and context.

8.2 Recommendation for Future Research

As recommendations for future research the authors encourage other researchers to consider that the results and measurements for the current characteristics of this study are only valuable for this specific research. For example, if one hypothesis is being rejected in this research it might be accepted in another research since everything depends on what characteristics are being measured together in the same context. More specifically, in this study, informativeness was significant when being tested alone with purchase intention and the control variables. However, it showed not to be significant when it was tested together with all of the other variables. This is interesting for future researchers to keep investigating and combining different social media content characteristics with each other. The authors recommend to keep research within this area since there are many different characteristics for social media content that influences consumers’ purchase intention and by testing different characteristics together that have not been tested before within the same context, the outcome may differ from previous research. Another recommendation would be to choose a probability sampling method in order to end up with a more diverse sample. If future researchers within this area possess better resources, a probability sampling method would more likely to contribute to a diverse sample. It would also increase the chances of being able to generalize the outcome of the research.
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**Explanations for the articles supporting the three chosen concepts**

The articles presented below are considered to be in need of an explanation for their use in this research. The articles that are not argued for are considered to clearly be stating the direct influence to consumers’ purchase intention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rauniar et al., (2014)</td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Raunair et al., (2014) does specifically regard his study to the online environment of Facebook, which the authors of this paper are referring to as one of the platforms where social media content are created, making this narrow study to be accepted. Questionably, the article does not specifically discuss any characteristics influence on consumers’ purchase intention. However, based on this article's argumentation that usefulness is an important determinator for an online user's behavior on social media based on the fact that creating useful content is of both value and a need for online users, the article is relevant since usefulness is considered as an important characteristic of social media content. This article does not specifically mention that usefulness is the *most* important characteristic to consider within social media content, but it does however support the fact that usefulness is an important characteristic in regards to providing value, which Hutter et al., (2013) argues will impact the degree to which a consumer have been influenced towards a purchase. Therefore, to be of supportive value this article is considered relevant for this research regarding usefulness.
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<th>Article</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arli (2017)</td>
<td>Usefulness + Informativeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arli, (2017) states that both usefulness and informativeness have a high significance for a positive consumer attitude in regards to social media. Therefore, Arli (2017) is used to
support the importance of both usefulness and informativeness. This article does collectively compare two out of the three “most influential” characteristics in this research. But since they have not been measured together within the same context as the third characteristic interactivity it is relevant to use Arli, (2017) as a supportive source. Arli, (2017) does however state that the characteristic of entertainment is the *most important feature* of social media, but considering the argumentation “[...] Entertainment has the strongest impact on consumers’ attitudes toward a brand’s social media.” (Arli, 2017, pp. 531), entertainment is specifically important regarding brands. Since this research does not specify in brands the authors discard entertainment in this research. Also, Arli (2017) does not directly state that usefulness and informativeness have a direct relationship with purchase intention specifically, but instead refer to a relation to consumers’ attitude. However, the research describes clearly that purchase intention is influenced by a consumers’ attitude, whereby the authors of this paper argue that Arli (2017) is of relevance to support the characteristic of usefulness and informativeness.

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alalwan (2018)</td>
<td>Informativeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alalwan (2018) are including both informativeness and interactivity, which both are investigated characteristics within this research, but since the researcher presents informativeness to be of less relevance in comparison to interactivity, we will discuss the reasoning behind choosing this article. Alalwan (2018) argues that informativeness is the “second strongest factor predicting customers’ purchase intention” (Alalwan, 2018, pp. 72). Since informativeness is presented as having a direct relationship with purchase intention on social media as well as have been mentioned in other articles to be of importance, the article is of relevance for this paper. However, regarding that Informativeness is considered the second strongest characteristic does not matter in this research since the authors of this paper measure those characteristics that are *more strongly* related to purchase intention and not specifically the characteristics that are considered having the *strongest* relationship to purchase intention.
Chu et al., (2013) argue for the importance of truthful information on social media ads which resultively will affect consumers’ attitude toward the content provided on social media. He also states that depending on how informative content is provided, for example when giving information about a product, it is a good predictor of the resultive attitude towards the social media content whether the attitude is positive or negative. This alone does not not provide a strong argument for how this article can be used to support the relevance of investigating informativeness in relation to purchase intention since it is not clearly stated that informativeness has a direct impact on purchase intention. However, in the theoretical framework of our research, Barber et al., (2012) state that it is important to study whether a factor impacts an attitude towards the positive or negative character, due to that this in turn will impact the purchase intention. Since Chu et al., (2013) argue for the impact informative content has on attitude, the authors of this study find it relevant to include this article as a supportive argumentation for the characteristic of informativeness in relation to purchase intention.

The article provided by Hajli (2016) does not specifically argue that Interactivity has a direct impact on consumers’ purchase intention. However, the authors of this paper do still use this source to support the importance of interactivity due to the argumentation that interactivity influences usefulness, which in turn have been argued to influence consumers’ purchase intention (Arli, 2017). Hajli (2016) states; “The results of the empirical research show that social media interactivity significantly influences credibility and usefulness of information” (Hajli, 2016, pp. 808), which can be used as supportive argumentation for the relevance of
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<th>Article</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
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<td>Chu et al., (2013)</td>
<td>Informativeness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hajli (2016)</td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
</tr>
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</table>
This article is however not considered a major contribution for the investigation regarding the degree of influence that interactivity has on consumers’ purchase intention, but is used as supportive argumentation for other articles regarding interactivity.
Social Media Survey

Hello!

We are three Marketing students studying our final year at Linnaeus University in Växjö, Sweden. We are currently writing our bachelor thesis and have now reached the step of collecting data. The collected data will only be used for academic purposes, and it is completely anonymous to participate in this survey. Your answers will not identify who you are in any way, and will strictly be used for this investigation. The survey will not take any longer than 4 minutes to complete.

This study has been created to investigate the relationship between social media content characteristics and a consumer’s purchase intention. The social media content refers to all the content that you see on any social media platform, such as pictures, comments, updates, ads and other content, which in this survey is referred to as posts. For each question, you will be asked to rate your answer on a scale between 1-5 where 1= Strongly disagree and 5= Strongly agree.

Please read every question carefully and try to answer the questions as truthfully as possible.
Thank you for helping us with our bachelor thesis!

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact any of us:

Agnes Ahlman, aa224hu@student.lnu.se
Elin Jansson, ej223dl@student.lnu.se
Natalie Bosiacki, nb222jk@student.lnu.se
Social Media Survey

* Required

Social Media Survey

Before you begin, we would like you to answer some basic questions about yourself.

Gender? *
- Female
- Male
- Other
- Prefer not to say

Age? *
- Younger than 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- Older than 54
What is your main occupation? *

- Student
- Employed
- Unemployed
- Other

What country do you currently live in? *

Your answer

Do you operate on one or more social media platforms? *

- Yes
- No
It is important that social media posts match my preferences in order for me to *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment on the post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to me that social media posts *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have correct spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have high quality pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to me that social media posts are *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is important for me to be involved in conversations on social media through *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commenting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important that social media posts are interesting in order for me to *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment on the post</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the post</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share the post</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Media Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important that social media posts are tailored to me</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that social media posts are fun</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that social media posts can help me complete a task</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that the information provided in a social media post is</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On social media, it is important for me to be able to express my own opinion *

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

I have previously been influenced by a social media post that has made me want to purchase an offer *

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree

My attitude towards a social media post that includes an offer is often *

1 2 3 4 5

Very negative 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Very positive

When I see an attractive social media post about an offer, I usually purchase the offer immediately *

1 2 3 4 5

Strongly disagree 〇 〇 〇 〇 〇 Strongly agree