

How Does Brand-Related User-Generated Content Differ Across YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter?

Andrew N. Smith, Eileen Fischer, and Chen Yongjian

Abstract

This study tests hypotheses regarding differences in brand-related user-generated content (UGC) between Twitter (a microblogging site), Facebook (a social network) and YouTube (a content community). It tests them using data from a content analysis of 600 UGC posts for two retail-apparel brands (Lululemon and American Apparel) across seven dimensions, which were drawn from a priori reading and an inductive analysis of brand-related UGC. Findings reveal differences along a number of dimensions, including consumer-self promotion, brand centrality, and presence of multiple brands. Results indicate YouTube, as a site, privileges the self at the expense of marketers' brands. This research provides a general framework for comparing brand-related UGC, helps us to better understand how particular social media channels may influence consumer-produced brand communications, and contributes to the discussion on how brand-related UGC relates to eWOM.

Smith, Andrew N., Eileen Fischer, and Chen Yongjian (2012), "How Does Brand-Related User-Generated Content Differ Across YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook?," Journal of Interactive Marketing, 26 (2), 102-113.

Introduction

Interest in social media continues to grow. In 2010, ‘Facebook’ and ‘YouTube’, the web’s most queried terms, were the focus of more than 2.7 billion searches, while 15.6% of all time online – among those 15 and older – was spent on social networking sites (Radwanick 2011). As social media has migrated into the ‘mainstream’, marketers have taken notice: the percentage of companies using social media tools for marketing is expected to reach 88% by 2012, up from just 42% in 2008 (Williamson 2010). Companies are leveraging social media not only for digital advertising and promotions, but also to handle customer service issues, mine innovation ideas, and ‘authentically’ engage with their customers (Solis 2010).

As company participation in social media intensifies, there is much for marketers to master; the domain has grown exponentially since the mid-2000’s, with new platforms and tools being launched monthly. Most of these platforms will never achieve the stature of a Facebook, but many may still successfully serve the needs of particular niches. Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) attempt to make sense of the social media space by constructing a classification of social media types. They demarcate six types of social media along two dimensions: self-presentation and richness. The six categories in their typology are: blogs, collaborative projects (e.g. Wikipedia), social networking sites (e.g. Facebook), content communities (e.g. YouTube and Flickr), virtual social world (e.g. Second Life), and virtual game worlds (e.g. World of Warcraft). While marketing academics have conducted research on many of these social media types, few have incorporated multiple types into a single study. Research that deliberately contrasts how users are engaging with different social media types can enhance our understanding of the variability between social media, and may provide managers with insights on how they should be allocating their resources to particular social media platforms. One form

of consumer engagement that can be compared across social media sites is user-generated content.

User-generated content (UGC) is an important means through which consumers express themselves and communicate with others online (boyd and Ellison 2008); it is what is produced in the moment of being social, as well as the object around which sociality occurs. UGC takes on many different forms, such as blog posts, Twitter tweets, Facebook status updates, videos on YouTube, or digital buildings in Second Life. It is also produced on sites that are not represented within Kaplan and Haenlein's (2010) social media typology. For example, users generate content on sites that host consumer reviews (c.f. Dhar and Chang 2009) or serve as forums for online and brand communities (c.f. Muñiz and Schau 2007). Importantly for marketers, much UGC across various media is brand-related and has the potential, like electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM), to shape consumer brand perceptions.

Casual observation suggests there is a tremendous assortment of brand-related UGC across the different social media types; for example, a YouTube video does not *look* like a Facebook wall post. Gaining deeper understanding of these differences is potentially important to marketers who are concerned with the co-creation of their brands in different social media platforms. As such, this research addresses the following question: *how does brand-related UGC vary across different social media types?* This managerially relevant and theoretically interesting question has not yet been broached in the still nascent (Burmann 2010) research stream on brand-related UGC. To answer the question, we draw on brand-related UGC from three different types of social media – Facebook (a social network), Twitter (a micro-blogging application), and YouTube (a content community). We tests hypotheses using data derived from a content analysis of materials on each site.

This research builds on previous brand-related UGC research to make three primary contributions. First, its content analysis provides a framework that illuminates similarities and differences in the content that consumers create when they produce brand-related posts. Second, it helps us to better understand how specific social media types may influence or shape the brand-related messages that consumers create (c.f. McLuhan 1964). In this way, it can help inform managerial decision making about social media. Third, it contributes to the conversation that seeks to clarify conceptual distinctions between the associated concepts of brand-related UGC and eWOM. In making these contributions, the paper proceeds as follows. It briefly reviews the literature on UGC and the social media sites of interest. Research hypotheses are then developed, and methods are described. Finally, results of the content analysis and a discussion of findings from hypothesis tests are presented.

Literature

Academic research on social media and brand-related UGC has lagged the popular growth of these phenomena. In order to situate this research within the extant literature on social media and brand-related UGC, this section offers a concise review of relevant academic work on user-generated content and the three social media sites under consideration in this study.

User-Generated Content

UGC is published content that demonstrates a degree of creative effort and is “created outside of professional routines and practices” (OECD 2007; Kaplan and Haenlein 2010, 61). It may be individually or collaboratively produced, modified, shared and consumed. However, while UGC “can be seen as the sum of all ways in which people make use of social media,” (Kaplan and Haenlein 2010, 61), it is not intrinsically tied to social media. Kaplan and Haenlein

(2010) link UGC to the beginning of the internet, but the first instances of it date back much further. Jenkins (2002), for example, describes how fan communities that formed around science fiction in the 1920s created amateur publications and contributed to public debates through letters in niche magazines. Undoubtedly, however, the rise of the internet and social media, coupled with increased accessibility to technology, such as computers, smart phones, digital cameras, and video camera, make UGC creation easier (Burgess and Green 2009; Lange 2009). So great is that effect that evidence from China shows that the percentage of internet content in China that is user produced now exceeds that which is produced professionally (Xiaoji 2010).

The most important type of UGC for marketers is that which is brand-related. One thread of brand-related UGC research has concentrated on consumer-generated advertisements and brands. This work considers what motivates consumers to create, what they produce, the quality of their contributions, how the process of co-creation can be facilitated or managed, and the implications for marketers and advertisers (Pitt et al. 2006; Muñiz and Schau 2007; Berthon et al. 2008; Burmann and Arnhold 2009; Burmann 2010). Another theme of brand-related UGC research emphasizes how credible and believable consumers find user-generated posts (Cheong and Morrison 2008; Riegner 2008). Amongst brand-related UGC research, Cheong and Morrison's (2008) is atypical in that it considers content generated on different types of sites: YouTube, blogs, and forums. However, as their focus is on consumer perceptions of brand-related UGC versus producer-generated content, they do not provide a very detailed or systematic comparison of how the consumer-produced content varies across those sites. A third strand of brand-related UGC research focuses on the relationship between consumer-produced content and significant managerial outcomes, such as sales. In this research, brand-related UGC is under study as a predictor (Dhar et al. 2009) or driver (Ghose and Ipeirotis 2010) of these

outcomes. Dhar et al.'s (2009) study on predicting music sales incorporates UGC data from multiple social media types (blogs and social network sites), but again, it does not concentrate on understanding how those types of UGC differ, which is the singular focus of this study.

Marketing academics have also contemplated UGC more generally. For example, they have thought about what the growth of social media and user-generated content means for the practice of market research (Cooke and Buckley 2008; Beer 2008). They have studied UGC, as a type of media source, and how it influences identification with a sports team (Kwak et al. 2010). They have also investigated the functional sources of motivation behind creating UGC, and how they influence attitudes toward the content and propensity to create it (Daugherty et al 2008). Daugherty et al.'s (2008) research also incorporates data about multiple types of UGC, such as videos, pictures, audio, and blogs, whereas most other marketing studies typically examine a single type of UGC, or UGC originating from a particular site. However, as their focus is on motivations to produce UGC, Daugherty et al.'s (2008) research provides limited insight into the distinctive characteristics of UGC that is created in different social media channels; moreover, their focus is not exclusively on brand-related UGC, arguably the form of greatest interest to practitioners and marketing researchers. Consequently, while researchers are beginning to develop a valuable stream of research on user-generated content, the need remains for studies on the content in brand-related UGC and how it varies by social media type.

The emerging body of research on user-generated content also intersects with marketing literature in two other domains: online or brand communities and eWOM. In community-level research, UGC is often conceptualized as being part of a collective consumer process, such as innovation (e.g. Kozinets et al. 2008) or social learning (e.g. Jayanti and Singh 2010). However, UGC content is not a significant focus of community-level studies. UGC relates to research on

eWOM because the two concepts are quite similar; often the object of study in eWOM literature (e.g. consumer reviews) is a form of brand-related UGC (c.f. Chevalier and Mayzlin 2006; Sen and Lerman 2007). eWOM is defined as being “any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, or former customers about a product or company, which is made available to a multitude of people and institutions via the Internet” (Hennig-Thurau et al. 2004, 39). UGC noticeably differs in that it need not necessarily be online or brand-related; however, for that particular type of UGC, clearer delineation would be useful. Cheong and Morrison (2008) argue that the two concepts diverge because UGC refers to the *generation* of content while eWOM, addresses the *conveyance* of content. However, while it is apparent that conveyance can occur without generation (e.g. re-publishing the work of another), it is less clear whether the production of online UGC can occur without conveyance, which is implicit in the act of publishing something on the internet. This suggests that further research discriminating the concepts of brand-related UGC and eWOM is required. Our research, with its focus on the ‘content’ in UGC, takes up this challenge.

Social Media Sites

The universe of social media sites on the internet is vast and growing (c.f. boyd and Ellison 2008). This study focuses on brand-related UGC from three of the most popular sites in terms of consumer usage, marketer interest, and business press coverage: Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube. Each represents a different type of social media.

Twitter is micro-blogging site that was founded in 2006. It allows people to publish, reply to, and forward (retweet) posts (tweet) that cannot exceed 140-characters in length. Posts, which may include hyperlinks to news stories, blogs, pictures, etc., show up in the stream of those who are following that particular individual’s posts; however, most posts are also publically available

and can be accessed using internal or external search engines. Academic research on Twitter has focused on a number of areas, including norms and behaviours (e.g. boyd et. al 2010), how users manage self-presentation when dealing with multiple audiences (Marwick and boyd 2011a), and how people gain influence (Cha et al. 2010). Studies have also investigated why people post and what they are posting about (e.g. Java et al. 2009; Jansen et al. 2009; Naaman et al. 2010).

Tweets commonly share or ask for information and news, share opinions, complaints, or details about daily activities, as well as serve as points of conversation with others; they may also be a part of social games featuring wordplay that leverages Twitter's post tagging function, the hashtag (#) (e.g. Marwick and boyd 2011b). Perhaps most relevant to this study is research that touches on brand-related tweets. Jansen et al. (2009) finds that 19% of tweets are brand-related, but that in almost half of all of those cases the brand is not the primary focus of the post. In the remaining brand-related cases, the tweets focus on expressing opinions about, seeking information on, or providing information about the brand. Collectively, this research on Twitter is helpful in informing the development of this study and its findings.

Facebook is a social network site that was founded in 2004. Facebook users can create profiles featuring personal information, interests, photos, add-on applications, etc. and can 'friend' other users on the site. They can also post status updates and links, write on friends' walls, comment on photos or links posted by others, participate in forum discussions, join groups, 'like' brands, or participate in any number of other activities. Through these activities users engage in social interaction and network building, while also constructing their personal identity. Academic research on Facebook has considered the site's functionality and norms (Papacharissi 2010), as well as how and why people use it (Ellison et al. 2007; Debatin et al. 2009). Facebook allows people to build or maintain social capital, communicate with others,

keep up with what is going on in other peoples' lives, and find out about rumours and gossip. While many perceive it to be an effective tool for managing social capital, research suggests that it's foremost strength is in developing and sustaining weak ties (Ellison et al. 2007; Valenzuela et al. 2009; Lewis and West 2009). Researchers have also studied privacy concerns and risks associated with Facebook (boyd 2008; Lewis et al. 2008; Debatin et al. 2009), and numerous studies have considered identity management and self-presentation, as well as what people infer from on other users' attempts at self presentation (Hewitt and Forte 2006; Stutzman 2006; Zywica and Danowski 2008; Tom Tong 2008; Papacharissi 2010; Labrecque et al. 2011). There is, however, a dearth of research on Facebook that also considers brands (though one exploratory study has investigated branded entertainment on the site: Zhang et al. 2010). Nonetheless, the overall body of literature on Facebook does provide some useful background for this study.

YouTube is a content community that was founded in 2005. It allows users to post, view, comment on and link to videos on the site. Users can also set up personal profiles that display which users they subscribe to, who subscribes to them, general comments from other users, as well as their recent activity, friends, and favourite videos; thus, the site does have a social network component to it as well. While the most viewed videos on the site tend to be professionally produced (Kruitbosch and Nack 2008), the most commented on videos tend to be user-generated (Burgess and Green 2009). The most subscribed channels also tend to be UGC-oriented. A majority of the site's visitors are exclusively viewers, while some also make comments, and an even smaller percentage actually contribute videos (Li and Bernhoff 2008). Although the site hosts user-created content and a community of users, its architecture does not readily facilitate collaborative participation (Burgess and Green 2009). Content producers have created strategies for dealing with this and other perceived functional deficiencies of the site.

Academic studies have focused on this and other user behaviour, as well as the site's community structure, culture, norms and controversies (Benevenuto et al. 2008; Jones and Schieffelin 2009). Research has also considered YouTube's cultural significance and its relationship with the mainstream media (van Dijck 2007; Snickers and Vonderau 2009). As a site where DIY celebrity is perceived to be attainable and users are encouraged to 'broadcast themselves' (Green and Burgess 2009), some academic work has considered this and how people manage their privacy and self-presentation (e.g. Lange 2008). Research on YouTube's content, such as vlogs (Molyneaux et al. 2008) and how UGC videos differ from professionally-produced videos (Cha et al. 2007; Kruitbosch and Nack 2008), has also been conducted. Recent work by Burgess and Green (2009) finds that the most popular user-generated videos on the site are vlogs, UGC music videos (fan videos, anime music videos), live material (performances, 'slice of life'), informational content (reviews, interviews), and scripted performances (sketch comedy, animation). With regards to brand-related UGC, videos often feature: reviews, demonstrations, creative consumption, the 'unboxing' of new products, amateur advertisements, satires and spoofs, brand community storytelling, and the coverage of brand-related events (Pace 2008; Blythe and Cairns 2009). Many of these formats are represented in the sample for this study, which is informed by much of the in-depth research on YouTube already conducted by scholars.

Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube represent different types of social media, and each site has its own unique architecture, culture and norms. Users visit these sites with slightly different intentions, interact in diverse ways, and produce content that, on the surface, often looks quite unique from one site to the next. Studies into brand-related UGC have not systematically investigated how that content varies across social media sites such as these. Does it differ in

ways that are significant for marketers? If so, how does it differ? This study investigates those questions in the context of Twitter, Facebook and YouTube.

Hypotheses

The aforementioned research finds that different social media sites vary in certain ways and that consumers use them for different purposes. It also suggests there has not yet been a systematic study of how UGC is similar, or dissimilar, across some of the internet's most popular social media sites. This research targets that gap by investigating: *how does brand-related user-generated content on Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube vary, or not vary, across those sites?*

To answer that question, it was necessary first to systematically identify a set of dimensions of content that might be present in any brand-related UGC. Based on prior literature, and on a preliminary inductive analysis of UGC by the authors, we identified the following dimensions: (1) Did the UGC self-promote the consumer as well as the brand?; (2) Was the brand central or peripheral to the UGC?; (3) Were multiple brands represented in the UGC?; (4) Did the UGC direct communications toward the marketer?; (5) Did the UGC respond to an a) online, or b) offline marketer action?; (6) Did the UGC present factual information about the brand?; and (7) Did the UGC convey, a positive, negative, or neutral sentiment toward the brand?. All but the last dimension are binary. We now present hypotheses related to each.

Promotional Self-Presentation

Self-presentation is a performance (Goffman 1959): an “effort to express a specific image and identity to others” (Zywica and Danowski 2008, 6). Consumers commonly use possessions, brands, and other symbols to help construct a particular identity and image in both offline and

online contexts (Belk 1988; Thompson and Hirschman 1995; Schau and Gilly 2003). Some overt attempts at self-presentation may be self-promotional.

Research suggests that people engage in self-presentation and impression management practices on all three social media sites (e.g. Marwick and boyd 2011a; Zywica and Danowski 2008; Lange 2008). Self-promotion, in particular, has also been noted by some (e.g. Marwick and boyd 2011a), and it may actually create tensions, depending on the culture of the site; in fact, being labelled self-promotional by others could, in some contexts, be the result of a failed self-presentation strategy. While Twitter is sometimes represented in the mass media as being a site that embraces the mundane details of everyone's existence, blatant self-promotion on the site is often considered inappropriate (Marwick and boyd 2011a). Practically, there are also fewer characters to 'work with' on Twitter, and if a tweet is already brand-related there is little space for self-promotional elements. On Facebook, self-presentation occurs through both the personal profile as well as user-produced content (Zywica and Danowski 2008); however, while the site allows more space for self-presentation through UGC than does Twitter, research suggests that the personal profile and "one's display of friends" (Papacharissi 2010, 210) are the chief ways through which users self-present. As such, the need to self-promote through brand-related UGC may not be as high. For these reasons, no difference is hypothesized to exist between brand-related UGC from Twitter and Facebook on the self-promotion content variable. YouTube, however, is hypothesized to host more self-promotional brand-related UGC than the other two sites. The content community's slogan, 'Broadcast Yourself', encourages users to be the star of their video posts, and its architecture and culture support the development of micro-celebrities (Green and Burgess 2009). While YouTube users still need to negotiate the balance between

self-promotion and community, the site is far more conducive to this type of self-presentation than are Twitter or Facebook. Thus, we posit that:

H1: Brand-related UGC on YouTube is *more likely* than brand-related UGC on Twitter or Facebook to feature consumer self-promotion.

Brand Centrality

Brand centrality refers to the role of the brand in brand-related UGC. Is the brand the focus of the content, or is it more of a supporting prop? While marketing academics' research on brand-related UGC does not explicitly discuss centrality, it often assumes it; yet, recent empirical research on Twitter suggests that further investigation is required (Jansen et al. 2009).

Twitter is commonly used to share news, information, opinions, and complaints, as well as to ask for information and opinions. With the site's 140-character limit, plus hyperlinks, there is comparatively less space on Twitter than on Facebook or YouTube to focus primarily on another subject while also mentioning a brand peripherally. While research suggests that brand-peripheral mentions are a reality on Twitter (Jansen et al. 2009), relative to Facebook, which is more oriented toward facilitating social-connectedness, Twitter is posited to host a greater percentage of brand-central posts. YouTube features a number of video types which would seem to privilege brand-centrality: reviews, demonstrations, 'unboxing' videos, and amateur advertisements; however, other more popular types, such as vlogs and live material, likely do not, and some research suggests that consumers find it hard to recall seeing product-related information on the site, suggesting that brands often play a more peripheral role (Cheong and Morrison 2008). As the dominant culture of the site is one that highlights the self, it is

hypothesized that brands are more likely to be featured peripherally – as identity-supporting props (e.g. Schau and Gilly 2003) – on YouTube than on Twitter or Facebook.

H2: Brands are *most likely* to be central in brand-related UGC on Twitter and *least likely* to be central in brand-related UGC on YouTube.

Multiple Brands

This content variable reflects whether a single brand or multiple brands are mentioned or shown in the brand-related UGC. The presence of multiple brands could denote a product constellation – a grouping of symbolically-related products that help construct, signify or perform a social role (Solomon 1988; Englis and Solomon 1996) – or a less symbolically imbued relationship (e.g. Oprah’s favourite things include Lululemon pants and Kyocera knives).

A Facebook user’s profile page is a space where he is able to project his ‘face’ and tastes (Papacharissi 2010); thus, one would expect to see multiple brands represented there more often than on Twitter than in a single piece of brand-related UGC on the site. However, Facebook still offers more space, or written characters, than Twitter to construct brand-related UGC that features the self and a number of identity-supporting brands. In ‘broadcasting’ on YouTube, the user is often the star, but stars benefits from a cast and props. YouTube offers a richer stage than Twitter and Facebook on which to perform while showcasing multiple products. Thus, we posit:

H3: Multiple brands are *most likely* to be featured in brand-related UGC on YouTube and *least likely* to be featured in brand-related UGC on Twitter.

Marketer-Directed Communication

Many social media sites are channels through which consumers can readily communicate with marketers (Deighton and Kornfeld 2009); this type of brand-related UGC, unlike eWOM, has a non-consumer audience in mind. In brand-related UGC, consumers may pose questions or complaints to marketers, as well as respond to company's questions or comments.

Twitter is a quick and easy-to-use engagement platform for both consumers and companies (Jansen et al. 2009). It has hosted a number of high-profile consumer-marketer exchanges that have attracted media attention (e.g. Deighton and Kornfeld 2010). While Twitter is recognized as being a site on which users ask for information and complain (Naaman et al. 2010) – two reasons consumers might direct content towards marketers – Facebook allows consumers to pose similar content to marketers on their brand pages. Facebook, as the world's most popular site in terms of time-spent (Radwanick 2011), has attracted many marketers. As both sites offer easy access to marketers and low barriers to posting, they are hypothesized to feature a similar percentage of brand-related UGC that is targeted towards the marketer. Producing video, although not comments, to post on YouTube demands comparatively more time, resources, and technical skill; this makes it a less ideal exchange platform both consumers and marketers. Thus, we posit:

H4: Marketer-directed brand-related UGC is *less likely* on YouTube than on Twitter or Facebook.

Response to Marketer Action

This content variable addresses whether or not a brand-related UGC post is a response to a particular marketer action either online or offline. Online marketer actions, such as posing questions to consumers and posting coupons, might reflect particular digital strategies and

tactics, whereas offline marketer actions, such as launching new products and advertising campaigns, might reflect more traditional strategies and tactics. In the case of online marketer action, the marketer is trying to directly elicit a consumer response, while with offline action any response is more likely to be consumer-initiated. Please note that consumer response is not necessarily directed towards the marketer.

It is hypothesized that YouTube – because of its comparatively greater time, resource, and skill demands on both the marketer and consumer – will feature a lower percentage of brand-related UGC that is created in response to either online or offline marketer action. Response to online marketer action is dependent on having something on which to reply. All three sites offer means through which users can regularly receive marketer communications in their information stream. YouTube members can subscribe to a brand’s channel, Facebook users can ‘like’ a brand (enabling marketer information to stream as would any other friend’s information), and Twitter users can follow a brand. As marketer information is potentially available and response is relatively easy on both Facebook and Twitter, it is hypothesized that brand-related UGC that is in response to online marketer action is just as likely to be posted on Facebook as it is to be posted on Twitter. Regarding offline marketer action, response is dependent on information that derives from a broader range of sources. As Twitter is recognised by users as being a good platform for gathering information (Jansen et al. 2009; Naaman et al. 2010), it is hypothesized that brand-related UGC that is in response to offline marketer action is more likely to be posted on Twitter than it is to be posted on Facebook.

H5a: Brand-related UGC is *least likely* to be posted in response to an *online* marketer action on YouTube.

H5b: Brand-related UGC is *most likely* to be posted in response to an *offline* marketer action on Twitter, and *least likely* to be posted in response to an *offline* marketer action on YouTube.

Factually Informative About the Brand

In brand-related UGC, brands may be mentioned for numerous reasons: symbolism, as the focus of opinions or complaints, or as objects of interest. Social media users may also reference brands as they share information about them. This content variable reflects whether or not a unit of brand-related UGC contains factual information. Factual information, which may be included in everything from tweets to video reviews, is that which is objectively verifiable: the colour or style of particular clothes, a price, the location of a store, etc.

With regards to brand-related UGC, none of the sites are hypothesized to differ. Twitter is frequently used to share information and news, but it is also a popular way to spread opinions and let others know about the minutia of daily life; in addition, it offers fewer characters with which to share information. Facebook is more focused on social connectedness, but talking about brands, and their specifications, is one way connections may be formed and fortified. With Facebook brand pages, marketers also have a permanent space on the site from which to provide information and about new products, events and coupons that consumers can draw on in their conversations, as well as a place where those conversations can happen. YouTube's stronger 'self' focus suggests a more peripheral brand presence, and some of the site's more popular formats (e.g. vlog) privilege the sharing of opinions; however, even amongst these opinions, if only in the video notes, and amongst other video formats (e.g. product reviews), factual

information is shared. YouTube also offers a comparatively richer and longer format, which should make it easier to highlight aspects of brands even if the brands are just props for the star.

H6: Brand-related UGC on Twitter, Facebook or YouTube *is equally* likely to feature brand-related factual information.

Brand Sentiment

Brand sentiment, or valence, is a popular measure for marketers to consider in evaluating the success of social media initiatives (Hoffman and Fodor 2010). This content variable captures whether or not the over-riding brand sentiment towards the focal brands in brand-related UGC differs systematically between Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube. Content can be simplistically differentiated as being positive, negative, neutral, or unclear.

Sentiment towards brands in brand-related UGC is hypothesized to be similar across all three social media platforms. Twitter is associated with types of content that typically could be thought of as being neutral (information, ‘slice of life’), negative (complaints), and potentially positive (opinions). On Facebook, social posts could be driven by either positive or negative brand perceptions or experiences, as well as more neutral impetuses, such as questions. On YouTube, peripherally located brands may be associated with neutral sentiments; however, reviews and vlogs could also frame the brands in more positive or negative ways.

H7: Sentiment towards brands in brand-related UGC on Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube is similar across all three social media sites.

These seven hypotheses, which draw on previous literature, seek to test how brand-related UGC is similar or different across three distinct types of social media: a microblogging site, a

social network site, and a content community. Methods used to test these hypotheses are now described.

Method

This study compares UGC across three social media sites. A necessary first step in the process was to conduct a content analysis that would allow for comparisons. Content analysis is a widely accepted method for systematically evaluating the content of recorded communications (Kolbe and Burnett 1991). It has been used for decades by marketing and consumer researchers interested in examining communication such as advertisements, media stories, and web sites (Kassarjian 1977; Roznowski 2003; Yun et al. 2008). A content analysis is an appropriate method for this study because the research question is focused on observing characteristics of the content itself, and the method offers a systematic and objective way to conduct such an analysis for a large sample. As described above, the dimensions were drawn from a combination of reading a priori literature and an inductive analysis of a brand-related UGC sample by the authors. In the interests of page length, this initial phase is not described in detail here.

Sampling

The unit of analysis under study was the individual brand-related UGC posting; a posting was considered to be brand-related if the brand was mentioned or displayed in the posting. Postings were screened to ensure that they were, indeed, produced by consumers and that they did not have an apparent commercial objective. As the question of interest in the study was how brand-related UGC differs, or not, across different types of social media sites, brand-related UGC was sampled from three distinct types of social media sites. Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube were selected as the sampled sites because they are among the most popular social

media sites on the internet and are of interest to marketers. Sampling was limited to three sites – one from each type – and two brands – from the same category – in order to manage the scope of the project. The brand category, retail-apparel, was selected because it is involving enough to elicit the production of brand-related UGC across multiple types of social media. The particular brands, Lululemon and American Apparel, were chosen because they are popular and offer some interesting points of comparison.

Lululemon Athletica is a fast growing yoga-inspired clothing designer and retailer that was founded in 1998; its 124 stores (as of Jan. 2010) are mostly located in North America (Google Finance). Lululemon's marketing approach is very community-oriented, and the brand has received little negative attention since its founding. American Apparel is a vertically-integrated manufacturer, wholesaler and retailer of basic fashion apparel. The company, founded in the early 1990s, was growing rapidly until it was slowed by financial concerns in 2010; its 281 stores (as of Dec 2009) are located in approximately 20 countries (Google Finance), but the company prominently advertises its choice to manufacture in downtown Los Angeles. The brand has received negative scrutiny because of its controversial founder, Dov Charney, its provocative advertising and its deteriorated financial health (Hill 2010). Lululemon and American Apparel thus differ in their marketing approach and the negative attention that they have received.

In order to reduce the scope of the sampling frame further, but still capture a reasonably representative sample of brand-related UGC for these brands, a restricted time frame was established: only posts published between June 1, 2010 and January 25, 2011 were collected. The posts were sampled between December, 2010 and January, 2011. Posts were selected at random from the date restricted Google search results for: 'brand' on 'site:' (e.g. Facebook.com). On the first page of search results one post was randomly selected, and then every 10th result was

sampled until 100 posts were collected for each brand on each social media site. In total, 600 brand-related UGC posts were collected. Posts represented the range of UGC types found on each site. For example, on Twitter, tweets, retweets, and replies were all collected. On Facebook, status updates, wall posts, forum contributions, pictures, and videos were all collected. On YouTube, videos and comments were both collected.

Coding Categories

Prior to coding, operational definitions and categories were developed for each dimension.

Promotional Self-Presentation. Content was coded as ‘yes’ on this form of self-presentation if the poster was mentioned, referenced, or featured in the content in a way that was self-promotional; otherwise, it was coded ‘no.’ For example, a tweet was coded ‘yes’ if it read, ‘I just bought this Lululemon jacket and it looks great on me,’ while a YouTube video was coded as ‘no’ if it showed a yoga event in a park where a panned shot revealed that people were wearing Lululemon clothes.

Brand Centrality. Content was coded ‘yes’ for brand centrality if the brand was the focus of the content, rather than peripheral in it; otherwise, it was coded ‘no.’ For example, a post on Lululemon’s Facebook wall was coded ‘yes’ if it read, ‘If I shop at Lululemon online do I still get the reusable bag?’. A YouTube video was coded ‘no’ if it featured a consumer showing off her outfit of the day, and she was wearing Lululemon along with nine other brands, and she only mentioned Lululemon by name, along with the other brands, in the video notes.

Multiple Brands. Content was coded ‘yes’ if at least one other brand was mentioned or shown in the UGC; otherwise, it was coded ‘no.’

Marketer-Directed Communication. Content was coded ‘yes’ if a post was clearly directed towards Lululemon or American Apparel; otherwise, it was coded ‘no’. For example, a consumer reply to a Lululemon tweet or a post on Lululemon’s Facebook wall asking about product availability was coded ‘yes’, while a vlog post on YouTube which criticizes Lululemon’s sourcing practices was coded ‘no.’

Response to Marketer Action. Content was coded ‘yes’ if it was in response to a specific marketer action a) online or b) offline; otherwise, it was coded ‘no.’ For example, an @reply to the marketer on Twitter was coded ‘yes’ for online response, while a Facebook post declaring, ‘I love your clothes!’, was coded ‘no’ for online response. A response does not necessarily need to be directed towards the marketer; it could, for example, be directed towards other consumers. With regards to offline response, a vlog commentary on a new American Apparel ad campaign was coded ‘yes’ for offline response, while a tweet sharing information about American Apparel’s financial well-being was coded ‘no’ for offline response.

Factually Informative About the Brand. Content was coded ‘yes’ if it contained objective brand information, such as a price, a location, or hours of operation; otherwise, it was coded ‘no.’ For example, a tweet that says ‘I’m at the Lululemon store at 4th and Main St.’ was coded ‘yes’ because it identifies the location of a store, while a Facebook status update that proclaims ‘American Apparel’s advertisements are vulgar’ was ‘no’ because it conveys a personal opinion.

Brand Sentiment. Content was coded as ‘positive’, ‘negative’, or ‘neutral’ based on the over-riding sentiment of the post. If sentiment was ambiguous, content was coded as ‘unclear.’

Coding

Data coding was manually conducted by an independent coder, who had no knowledge of the research hypotheses, as well as one member of the research team. The independent coder was given an explanation of the codes and also conversed with one member of the research team to seek clarification after coding an initial proportion of the sample. Intercoder reliability, as calculated using Perreault and Leigh's (1989) formula, was approximately 0.9, falling within the accepted range of 0.8 to 1.0; any discrepancies in coding were examined and adjudicated by another member of the research team. Following coding, category frequencies were tabulated and statistical differences were assessed using Chi-square tests. This will be discussed next.

Results

Analysis of the data reveals some interesting differences and consistencies between brand-related UGC from the three social media sites. However, prior to testing for differences in UGC across the sites, Chi-square analyses were run on the tabulated data (Tables 1 & 2) to determine if there were significant differences between the data from each brand (Table 3). The results of the tests indicate that brand differences exist on each dimension ($p < 0.05$), except for 'self-promotion' and 'response to marketer action (offline).' Possible explanations for these differences will be posited throughout this section and in the discussion.

[--- Please insert Tables 1, 2, & 3 approximately here ---]

As results were found to differ significantly on most dimensions by brand, tests of how brand-related UGC differ across social media sites were conducted separately for each brand. For these analyses, Chi-square tests were first conducted across all three sites for each dimension. If these tests yielded a significant Chi-square statistic, one which corresponded to a p-value of 0.05 or lower, additional tests were run in order to establish which specific site

relationships (e.g. Twitter-Facebook or Twitter-YouTube) were contributing significantly to that statistic. If the initial cross-site Chi-square statistic was not significant, indicating similarity between the brand-related UGC of Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube on that dimension, no further analyses were carried out. For a summary of these results, please refer to Table 4.

[--- Please insert Table 4 approximately here ---]

Promotional Self-Presentation

Consistent with H1, brand-related UGC on YouTube (75%; 76%) was more likely than that on Facebook (30%, 33%) or Twitter (13%, 9%) to feature consumer self-promotion; this hypothesis was emphatically supported for both brands ($p < 0.000$). (Please note, when two numbers are presented in a bracket separated by a comma, the first number refers to data for Lululemon (hereafter LLL), while the second number refers to data for American Apparel (hereafter AA)). Interestingly, brand-related UGC from Facebook was also more frequently self-promotional than that from Twitter ($p < 0.003$, $p < 0.000$); this was not hypothesized. Prior research suggests that self-presentation and promotion on Facebook would primarily occur through the construction of one's profile, but this finding suggests that UGC might play a supporting role in this process as well.

Brand Centrality

The results on brand centrality intuitively align with those on self-promotion: the higher the self-focus, the lower the brand-focus. As posited in H2, brand centrality was observed least often in brand-related UGC on YouTube (42%, 25%; $p < 0.001$ or lower). Regarding Twitter (76%, 70%) and Facebook (66%, 57%), Twitter was hypothesized to host more brand-central content because of its space restrictions. While trending in that direction, the difference between

Twitter and Facebook's brand-related UGC was not actually significant at a 95% confidence level ($p < 0.119$, $p < 0.056$). Results were consistent across both brands.

Multiple Brands

Consistent with H3, YouTube (47%, 72%) was also most likely to host brand-related content that features multiple brands ($p < 0.000$). It appears that while brands may not star in YouTube videos, they serve as useful props. It was also hypothesized that multi-branded UGC would be more prevalent on Facebook (8%, 37%) than on Twitter (7%, 13%). Interestingly, this premise was supported at a 95% confidence level for AA ($p < 0.000$), but not for LLL ($p < 0.788$), which posted a comparatively lower score on Facebook; LLL also had comparatively fewer multi-brand posts on YouTube. One speculative explanation for these differences relates to AA's products, which tend to be fashion basics that can be paired and layered with other clothes; this could encourage the production of more multi-brand posts where space permits such content to be produced.

Marketer-Directed Communication

H4 posited that marketer-directed brand-UGC would be lowest for YouTube (0%, 0%); this was supported for Lululemon ($p < 0.000$), but not for American Apparel, which failed to register any marketer-directed communication across Twitter, Facebook or YouTube. Post-hoc observation of both brands' social media activities suggests that this finding may reflect AA's strategy on some of these sites. For example, AA has only one Facebook page to which it posts information. Users do post some information and photos to the brand's Facebook wall; however, rarely do they receive a response from the brand. In comparison, LLL has tens of Facebook pages set up, most of them for individual stores, and regularly responds to consumer posts. On Twitter, AA occasionally broadcasts information about promotions and employment

opportunities, but does not publicly respond to followers. In contrast, LLL uses its Twitter account to ask and answer questions, offer tips, provide product information, etc. Thus, AA creates fewer opportunities, on Facebook, for consumers to communicate, as well as less reason, on Facebook and Twitter, for consumers to “reach out” to the marketer. Our sample indicates that this is something LLL consumers routinely do on both Facebook (38%) and Twitter (36%).

Response to Marketer Action

This dimension refers to brand-related UGC created in response to some marketer action either online or offline. H5a posited that response to online marketer action would be lowest for YouTube (0%, 2%). H5a was supported for LLL ($p < 0.000$), but not for AA, as no statistical differences were found between Twitter (3%), Facebook (6%) and YouTube (2%) for AA. The generally subdued response to AA’s online actions may, again, reflect the nature of its content or users’ motivations to respond to it. Daugherty et al. (2008) find that two functional motivations associated with UGC attitudes and creation are ego-defensiveness and sociality. AA’s propensity to ignore consumer posts on Facebook and Twitter might threaten the egos of users, dissuading response; it certainly would not buoy the social motivations of potential UGC producers. Additionally, while its content of promotions and job postings is potentially valuable for facilitating social interaction, it is less rich than the content supplied by LL on these sites.

Moving away from the marketers’ online content, H5b relates to consumer response to offline marketer actions; this hypothesis was partially supported. For both brands, brand-related UGC response was lowest for YouTube (10%, 9%; $p < 0.042$ or lower). For AA ($p < 0.000$), Twitter (43%) was more likely than Facebook (19%) to feature a UGC response, consistent with H5b; however, no statistical difference was found between Twitter (31%) and Facebook (30%) for LLL ($p < 0.878$). While tweets for both brands focused on product, AA had additional

Twitter posts which centered on the brand's controversies: advertising, Dov Charney, its poor financial condition. These types of posts were also posted on Facebook for the brand, while LLL's posts on the site dealt more with product and in-store experience. This content-focus is hardly surprisingly given that LLL's posts also tended to be hosted more frequently on the brand's many Facebook pages, as opposed to unaffiliated parts of the site.

Factually Informative About the Brand

H6 posited that factually informative brand-related UGC would be equally common across the social media sites. The hypothesis was supported for AA ($p < 0.594$), although not for LLL ($p < 0.007$), because Facebook (14%) scored significantly lower than Twitter (29%; $p < 0.010$) or YouTube (32%; $p < 0.002$) on the dimension.

Brand Sentiment

H7 posited that UGC brand sentiment would be consistent across the three social media sites; this hypothesis was not supported by the data ($p < 0.000$). For LLL, YouTube (49%) was the outlier, mostly because of its higher percentage of neutral mentions (Twitter: 17%; Facebook: 26%). A slim majority of product-focused content, regardless of the site, was valenced either positively or negatively; however, three styles of videos found for LLL – amateur exercise videos, live event videos, and 'what I'm wearing' videos – tended to be more neutral in their sentiment, shaping these results. Negatively valenced posts were consistent, and low, across sites for LLL.

For AA, UGC sentiment differed across all three sites. Twitter (22%) hosted fewer positive mentions than Facebook (49%) or Twitter (52%). YouTube UGC (4%), which was more product-focused and did not feature news and commentaries on the brand's controversies, hosted fewer negative mentions than did Facebook (24%) or Twitter (16%).

Between the two brands, it was the UGC results for Twitter than differed most visibly. Positive mentions (LLL: 64% vs. AA: 22%) were higher for Lululemon, while negative (LLL: 4% vs. AA: 24%) and neutral (LLL 17% vs. AA: 39%) mentions were higher for AA. It is also interesting to note that the number of mentions coded ‘unclear’ were highest for Twitter.

Discussion

This study offers both a framework for comparing the brand-related UGC found on different types of social media sites, and some conceptual insights into the ways that different sites foster content with different characteristics. Perhaps the most significant findings pertain to YouTube. True to its tagline, YouTube really is focused on broadcasting the self. While brands may play a role in this presentation of face (Goffman 1959), it is likely to be a supporting one. A seeming corollary of this arrangement is that multiple brands are more likely to be featured together on YouTube, possibly as constellations that support particular social roles. However, this does not mean that brand-related UGC on YouTube is devoid of brand information: it still shows the potential to be factually informative. Also, the site seems to offer a haven from negative sentiment, in comparison to Facebook and Twitter which more readily support and encourage link sharing, for brands that are being criticized. As a site that demands more of its contributors, and that is less conducive to linking, YouTube is not a natural medium on which consumers can easily communicate with marketers if they wish to do so.

Twitter, with its ‘micro’ (category) prefix, is in many senses at the opposite end of the spectrum from YouTube. In spite of popular press coverage on Twitter’s propensity to feature mundane rhythms of everyday life, brand-related UGC on the site is least likely to feature consumer self-promotion; people are more often asking questions and spreading news. Fittingly then, brand centrality also trends highest for UGC on the site, while multi-brand mentions – at

least for American Apparel – are less probable. Yet, Twitter is certainly not a Utopian dream for marketers either, as some business cases have pointed out (e.g. Deighton and Kornfeld 2010). It requires social investment. For brands less actively engaged in social media, such as AA, organically created marketer-directed content should not be expected, nor should a high-level of response to any online marketer action. Furthermore, Twitter appears to be a particular point of vulnerability for brands receiving critical attention, yielding less positive content, and more neutral and negative content for a troubled brand like AA.

Facebook, with its myriad of UGC content types, seems to fall somewhere in between YouTube and Twitter. Consumer self-promotion features more prominently on Facebook than on Twitter, but less so than on YouTube. Brand-related UGC that highlights the brand centrally is also more likely on Facebook than on YouTube. As with Twitter, it seems that the medium requires regular marketer attention: marketer-directed content and response to marketer actions appear to be related to the nature of marketer engagement and marketer-generated content.

Thus, these findings have significant implications for marketers investing in social media. Particular media, such as Twitter and Facebook, seem to be more appropriate for highlighting brands as unique entities. Yet, marketers need to invest appropriately on these sites in order to maximize their returns. They need to provide a space where conversation can occur, not only with them, but also with other consumers. They also need to ‘entice’ consumers to participate, through relevant and valuable content, as well as ‘validate’ their participation by responding to them. Engagement requires constant marketer effort, but it can also act as a defense mechanism for marketers. Sites such as Twitter may be a source of both threats and opportunities for brands experiencing unfavourable exposure. Twitter is a medium in which news and information spreads fast. However, monitoring the site and addressing potentially problematic posts may be

one way marketers can dampen potential issues; as such, being active in providing information, listening, and participating in the social give-and-take on Twitter may be a priority for marketers. At the same time, ignoring YouTube may not be prudent for marketers either. In particular, those seeking a subtle life-world placement and association with a particular constellation of brands might be well-advised to target YouTube as a social media priority.

This research can also contribute to scholarly work seeking to clarify distinctions between the associated concepts of brand-related UGC and eWOM. Offline word-of-mouth (see Kozinets et al. 2010 for a brief summary) research has conceptualized the process as being one of transmitting marketing messages and meanings *to consumers*. In transitioning to an online context, Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) that definition was revised to include *any* statement *about* a brand made online by a consumer in a public forum. Thus, the concept expanded immensely in terms of both *content* and *audience* in its shift online. However, this research highlight that some online “statements” about brands are difficult to reconcile with the concept of word-of-mouth. Neither a consumer posting an @reply message to a brand on Twitter, nor one creating a 5-minute video on YouTube in which she briefly mentions eighteen different brands of nail polish, seems to be engaging in word-of-mouth advertising as it was conceptualized by Dichter (1966). Dimensions in our UGC content framework, such as marketer-directed communication (*audience*), brand centrality (*focus*), and multiple brands (associated with brand centrality), support the view of those who argue that not all brand-related UGC should be regarded as word-of-mouth communications. Cheong and Morrison (2008) believe *the* difference between brand-related UGC and eWOM lies in the distinction between *generation* and *conveyance* of content. While this distinction does help us to differentiate the concepts, because eWOM need not necessarily be created by the transmitter, it is arguably not the only difference. Concepts derived

from our brand-related UGC framework, such as *audience* and *focus*, might also serve as appropriate criterion for helping to discriminate the concepts. For example, if the implied audience of the brand-related content is not the consumer, perhaps UGC should not be regarded as eWOM. Similarly, if the brand is not focal in the UGC, it might be regarded as something other than eWOM. While our research cannot resolve the question of how eWOM overlaps with UGC, it does provide some concepts to consider in furthering this conversation.

Future research on brand-related UGC could explore a number of other directions as well. Studies could extend this research into additional social media categories (e.g. collaborative projects, virtual social worlds, and virtual game worlds), which seem to vary considerably from the ones examined. Analysis could consider other dimensions (e.g. response to other consumers, requests for information, etc.) that might be useful for comparing and contrasting types of social media. It could examine how some of the studied dimensions associate with traditional metrics that are important to marketers, such as sales, as well as with others that are becoming more important to social media marketers (c.f. Hoffman and Fodor 2010). Work could also seek to understand how some of these dimensions relate to consumer meanings derived from the UGC (e.g. how do derived consumer meanings differ when one brand is central vs. when a brand is peripherally included in a constellation of similar brands?). Future research could also work to address limitations of this study, such as its narrow scope on one category: retail-apparel.

We close by acknowledging other limitations of this research. One relates to how the data was gathered for the study. The data was pulled using Google search results between December 2010 and January 2011. Google's results draw on Twitter's archive, but Twitter deletes the number tweets it publically archives over time (as does Facebook). For example, on August 1 2010, Twitter may have archived 500 tweets from July 1, 2010, but by December 1,

2010, there may only be 200 tweets archived for July 1. There is no way of knowing whether or not this deletion is systematically biasing the sample of Tweets (and Facebook posts) collected. This suggests that the results from this study should only be extrapolated beyond this sample with extreme caution. Further reinforcing this caveat is the fact that this UGC sample draws from only two brands, both targeting mostly female consumers. As such, most of the UGC for both brands was created by females, and research with more diverse samples is clearly warranted. Nevertheless, this study raises a useful set of implications for managers and provides a number of possibilities for future research.

Tables

Table 1. Content Frequencies: Lululemon

Code	Social Media Site			Total
	Twitter	Facebook	YouTube	
<i>Self-Promotion</i>				
Yes	13	30	75	118
No	87	70	25	182
<i>Brand Centrality</i>				
Yes	76	66	42	184
No	24	34	58	116
<i>Multiple Brands</i>				
Yes	7	8	47	62
No	93	92	53	238
<i>Marketer-Directed Communication</i>				
Yes	36	38	0	74
No	64	62	100	226
<i>Response to Marketer Action (Online)</i>				
Yes	19	23	0	42
No	81	77	100	258
<i>Response to Marketer Action (Offline)</i>				
Yes	31	30	10	71
No	69	70	90	229
<i>Factually Informative</i>				
Yes	29	14	32	75
No	71	86	68	225
<i>Brand Sentiment</i>				
Positive	64	58	47	169
Negative	4	9	4	17
Neutral	17	26	49	92
Unclear	15	7	0	22

Table 2. Content Frequencies: American Apparel

Code	Social Media Site			Total
	Twitter	Facebook	YouTube	
<i>Self-Promotion</i>				
Yes	9	33	76	118
No	91	67	24	182
<i>Brand Centrality</i>				
Yes	70	57	25	152
No	30	43	75	148
<i>Multiple Brands</i>				
Yes	13	37	72	122
No	87	63	28	178
<i>Marketer-Directed Communication</i>				
Yes	0	0	0	0
No	100	100	100	300
<i>Response to Marketer Action (Online)</i>				
Yes	3	6	2	11
No	97	94	98	289
<i>Response to Marketer Action (Offline)</i>				
Yes	43	19	9	71
No	57	81	91	229
<i>Factually Informative</i>				
Yes	38	32	38	108
No	62	68	62	192
<i>Brand Sentiment</i>				
Positive	22	49	52	123
Negative	24	16	4	44
Neutral	39	30	43	112
Unclear	15	5	1	21

Table 3. Differences in Brand-Related User-Generated Content by Brand

Content Category	χ^2 (df)	p-value
Self-Promotion	0 (1)	p = 1.000
Brand Centrality	6.926 (1)	p < 0.008
Multiple Brands	28.219 (1)	p < 0.000
Marketer-Directed Communication	84.411 (1)	p < 0.000
Response to Marketer Action (Online)	19.889 (1)	p < 0.000
Response to Marketer Action (Offline)	0 (1)	p = 1.000
Factually Informative	8.562 (1)	p < 0.003
Brand Sentiment	21.181 (3)	p < 0.000

Table 4. Differences in Brand-Related User-Generated Content by Social Media Site

Content Category	Total χ^2 (df), p-value	Twitter-Facebook χ^2 (df), p-value	Facebook-YouTube χ^2 (df), p-value	Twitter-YouTube χ^2 (df), p-value
<i>Self-Promotion</i>				
Lululemon	86.022 (2), p<0.000	8.562 (1), p<0.003	40.602 (1), p<0.000	78.003 (1), p<0.000
American Apparel	96.582 (2), p<0.000	17.360 (1), p<0.000	37.282 (1), p<0.000	91.847 (1), p<0.000
<i>Brand Centrality</i>				
Lululemon	25.750 (2), p<0.000	2.428 (1), p<0.119	11.594 (1), p<0.001	23.894 (1), p<0.000
American Apparel	42.914 (2), p<0.000	3.646 (1), p<0.056	21.166 (1), p<0.000	40.602 (1), p<0.000
<i>Multiple Brands</i>				
Lululemon	63.472 (2), p<0.000	0.072 (1), p<0.788	38.144 (1), p<0.000	40.589 (1), p<0.000
American Apparel	72.969 (2), p<0.000	15.360 (1), p<0.000	24.700 (1), p<0.000	71.223 (1), p<0.000
<i>Marketer-Directed Communication</i>				
Lululemon	49.223 (2), p<0.000	0.086 (1), p<0.770	46.914 (1), p<0.000	43.902 (1), p<0.000
American Apparel	0.000 (2), p=1.000	-	-	-
<i>Response to Marketer Action (Online)</i>				
Lululemon	25.083 (2), p<0.000	25.083 (1), p<0.000	0.482 (1), p<0.487	20.994 (1), p<0.000
American Apparel	2.454 (2), p<0.293	-	-	-
<i>Response to Marketer Action (Offline)</i>				
Lululemon	15.536 (2), p<0.000	0.024 (1), p<0.878	12.500 (1), p<0.000	13.500 (1), p<0.000
American Apparel	33.803 (2), p<0.000	13.464 (1), p<0.000	4.153 (1), p<0.042	30.042 (1), p<0.000
<i>Factually Informative</i>				
Lululemon	9.920 (2), p<0.007	6.666 (1), p<0.010	9.146 (1), p<0.002	0.212 (1), p<0.645
American Apparel	1.042 (2), p<0.594	-	-	-
<i>Brand Sentiment</i>				
Lululemon	38.705 (2), p<0.000	7.011 (1), p<0.072	17.129 (1), p<0.001	33.119 (1), p<0.000
American Apparel	44.367 (2), p<0.000	18.042 (1), p<0.000	12.271 (1), p<0.000	38.893 (1), p<0.000

References

- Beer, David (2008), "Researching a Confessional Society," *International Journal of Market Research*, 50, 5, 619-629.
- Belk, Russell W. (1988), "Possessions and the Extended Self," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 2, 139-168.
- Benevenuto, Fabricio, Fernando Duarte, Tiago Rodrigues, Virgilio Almeida, Jussara Almeida and Keith Ross (2008), "Understanding Video Interactions in YouTube," in *Proceedings of the 1st ACM International Conference on Multimedia Information Retrieval*, Vancouver, BC: Association for Computing Machinery, October 26-31, 2008.
- Berthon, Pierre, Leyland Pitt and Colin Campbell (2008), "Ad Lib: When Customers Create the Ad," *California Management Review*, 50, 4, 6-30.
- Blythe, Mark and Paul Cairns (2009), "Critical Methods and User Generated Content: the iPhone on YouTube," in *Proceedings from the Annual Conference on Computer-Human Interaction*, Boston, MA: Association for Computing Machinery, April 4-6, 2009.
- boyd, danah (2008), "Facebook's Privacy Trainwreck: Exposure, Invasion and Social Convergence," *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 14, 1, 13-20.
- boyd, danah m. and Nicole B. Ellison (2008), "Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 210-230.
- boyd, danah, Scott Golder and Gilad Lotan (2010), "Tweet, Tweet, Retweet: Conversational Aspects of Retweeting on Twitter," in *Proceedings of the 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, Kauai, HI: IEEE Computer Society, January 5-8, 2010. Accessible at: <http://www.danah.org/papers/TweetTweetRetweet.pdf> (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Burgess, Jean and Joshua Green (2009), *YouTube (Digital Media and Society Series)*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Burmann, Christoph and Ulrike Arnhold (2009), *User Generated Branding: State of the Art of Research*. Germany: Lit, Münster.
- Burmann, Christoph (2010), "A Call for 'User-Generated Branding'," *Journal of Brand Management*, 18, 1, 1-4.

- Cha, Meeyoung, Haewoon Kwak, Pablo Rodriguez, Yong-Yeol Ahn and Sue Moon (2007), "I Tube, You Tube, Everybody Tubes: Analyzing the World's Largest User Generated Content Video System," In *Proceedings from the Internet Measurement Conference*, San Diego, CA: Association for Computing Machinery, October 24-26, 2007.
- Cha, Meeyoung, Hamed Haddadi, Fabrício Benevenuto and Krishna P. Gummadi (2010), "Measuring User Influence in Twitter: The Million Follower Fallacy," in *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*, Washington: Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, May 23-26, 2010. Accessible at: http://an.kaist.ac.kr/~mycha/docs/icwsm2010_cha.pdf (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Cheong, Hyuk Jun and Margaret A. Morrison (2008), "Consumers' Reliance on Product Information and Recommendations Found in UGC," *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8, 2.
- Chevalier, Judith A. and Dina Mayzlin (2006), "The Effect of Word of Mouth on Sales: Online book Reviews," *Journal of Marketing Research*, XLIII, August, 345-354.
- Cooke, Mike and Nick Buckley (2008), "Web 2.0, Social Networks and the Future of Market Research," *International Journal of Market Research*, 50 (2), 267-292.
- Daugherty, Terry, Matthew S. Eastin, and Laura Bright (2008), "Exploring Consumer Motivations for Creating User-Generated Content," *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8, 2, 16-25.
- Debatin, Bernhard, Jennette P. Lovejoy, Ann-Kathrin Horn and Brittany N. Hughes (2009), "Facebook and Online Privacy: Attitudes, Behaviors, and Unintended Consequences," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 15, 83-108.
- Deighton, John and Leora Kornfeld (2009), "Interactivity's Unanticipated Consequences for Marketers and Marketing," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23, 1, 4-10.
- Deighton, John and Leora Kornfeld (2010), *United Breaks Guitars* (Harvard Business School Case: 9-519-057). Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Dhar, Vasant and Elaine A. Chang (2009), "Does Chatter Matter? The Impact of User-Generated Content on Music Sales," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23, 4, 300-307.
- Dichter, Ernest (1966), "How Word-of-Mouth Advertising Works," *Harvard Business Review*, 44 (6), 147-166.

- Ellison, Nicole B., Charles Steinfield and Cliffe Lampe (2007), "The Benefits of Facebook 'Friends': Social Capital and College Students' Use of Online Social Network Sites," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12, 1143-1168.
- Englis, Basil G. And Michael R. Solomon (1986), "Using Consumption Constellations to Develop Integrated Communications Strategies," *Journal of Business Research*, 37, 183-191.
- Ghose, Anindya and Panagiotis Ipeirotis (2010), "The EconoMining Project at NYU: Studying the Economic Value of User-Generated Content on the Internet," *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management*, 8, 2/3, 241-246.
- Goffman, Erving (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hennig-Thurau, Thorsten, Kevin P. Gwinner, Gianfranco Walsh, and Dwayne D. Gremler (2004), "Electronic Word-of-Mouth Via Consumer Opinion Platforms: What Motivates Consumers to Articulate Themselves on the Internet?," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18, 1, 38-52.
- Hewitt, Anne and Andrea Forte (2006), "Crossing Boundaries: Identity Management and Student/Faculty Relationships on the Facebook," in *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, Banff, AB: Association for Computing Machinery, November 4-8.
- Hill, Amelia (2010), "The Rise and Fall of American Apparel," *The Guardian*, August 25.
 Accessible at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2010/aug/25/rise-fall-american-apparel>
 (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Hoffman, Donna L. and Marek Fodor (2010), "Can You Measure the ROI of Your Social Media Marketing?," *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 52, 1, 41-49.
- Jansen, Bernard J., Mimi Chang, Kate Sobel, and Abdur Chowdury (2009), "Twitter Power: Tweets as Electronic Word of Mouth," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60, 11, 2169-2188.
- Java, Akshay, Xiaodan Song, Tim Finin and Belle Tseng (2009), "Why We Twitter: Understanding Microblogging Usage and Communities," in *Advances in Web Mining and Web Usage Analysis from the 9th International Workshop on Knowledge Discovery on the Web (WebKDD 2007) and 1st International Workshop on Social Networks Analysis (SNA-*

- KDD 2007), San Jose, CA: Association for Computing Machinery, August 12, 2007, 118-138.
- Jayanti, Rama K. And Jagdip Singh (2010), "Pragmatic Learning Theory: An Inquiry-Action Framework for Distributed Consumer Learning in Online Communities," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36, April, 1058-1081.
- Jenkins, Henry (2002), "Interactive Audiences? The 'Collective Intelligence' of Media Fans," in Dan Harries (ed.), *The New Media Book*. London: British Film Institute.
- Jones, Graham M. and Bambi B. Schieffelin (2009), "Talking Text and Talking Back: 'My BFF Jill' From Boob Tube to YouTube," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 1050-1079.
- Kaplan, Andreas M. and Michael Haenlein (2010), "Users of the World, Unite! The Challenges and Opportunities of Social Media," *Business Horizons*, 53, 59-68.
- Kassarjian, Harold H. (1977), "Content Analysis in Consumer Research," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 4, June, 8-18.
- Kolbe, Richard H. And Melissa S. Burnett (1991), "Content Analysis Research: An Examination of Application with Directives for Improving Research Reliability and Objectivity," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18, 2, 243-250.
- Kozinets, Robert V., Andrea Hemetsberger and Hope Jensen Schau (2008), "The Wisdom of Consumer Crowds: Collective Innovation in the Age of Networked Marketing," *Journal of Macromarketing*, 28, 4, 339-354.
- Kozinets, Robert V., Kristine de Valck, Andrea C. Wojnicki, and Sarah J. S. Wilner (2010), "Networked Narratives: Understanding Word-of-Mouth Marketing in Online Communities," *Journal of Marketing*, 74, March, 71-89.
- Kruitbosch, Gijs and Frank Nack (2008), "Broadcast Yourself on YouTube – Really?," in *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Workshop on Human-Centered Computing*, Vancouver, BC: Association for Computing Machinery, October 31, 2008, 7-10.
- Kwak, Dae Hee, Yu Kyoum Kim, and Matthew H. Zimmerman (2010), "User- Versus Mainstream-Media-Generated Content: Media Source, Message Valence, and Team Identification and Sport Consumers' Response," *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 3, 402-421.

- Labrecque, Lauren I., Ereni Markos, and George R. Milne (2011), "Online Personal Branding: Processes, Challenges, and Implications," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 25, 1, 37-50.
- Lange, Patricia G. (2008), "Publically Private and Privately Public: Social Networking on YouTube," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 361-380.
- Lange, Patricia G. (2009), "Videos of Affinity on YouTube," in *The YouTube Reader*, Pelle Snickars and Patrick Vonderau, eds., 70-88. Lithuania: Logotipas.
- Lewis, Jane and Anne West (2009), "'Friending': London-Based Undergraduates' Experience of Facebook," *New Media & Society*, 11, 7, 1209-1229.
- Lewis, Ken, Jason Kaufman, Nicholas Christakis (2008), "The Taste for Privacy: An Analysis of College Student Privacy Settings in an Online Social Network," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 79-100.
- Li, Charlene and Josh Bernoff (2008), *Groundswell: Winning in a World Transformed by Social Technologies*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- MacLuhan, Marshall (1964), *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Mentor: New York.
- Marwick, Alice E. and danah boyd (2011a), "I Tweet Honestly, I Tweet Passionately: Twitter Users, Context Collapse, and the Imagined Audience," *New Media & Society*, 13, 1, 114-133.
- Marwick, Alice and danah boyd (2011b), "Tweeting Teens Can Handle Public Life," *The Guardian*, February 15, 2011. Accessible at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/feb/15/tweeting-teens-twitter-public-privacy> (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Molyneaux, Heather, Susan O'Donnell, Kerri Gibson and Janice Singer (2008), "Exploring the Gender Divide on YouTube: An Analysis of the Creation and Reception of Vlogs," *American Communication Journal*, 10, 2. Accessible at: <http://nparc.cisti-icist.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/npsi/ctrl?action=shwart&index=an&req=5765247&lang=en> (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Muñiz, Albert M. (Jr.) and Hope Jensen Schau (2007), "Vigilante Marketing and Consumer-Created Communications," *Journal of Advertising*, 36, 3, 35-50.
- Naaman, Mor, Jeffrey Boase and Chih-Hui Lai (2010), "Is it Really About Me? Message Content in Social Awareness Streams," in *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM Conference on*

- Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, Savannah, GA: Association for Computing Machinery, February 6-10, 2010, 189-192.
- OECD (2007), *Participative Web and User-Created Content: Web 2.0, Wikis, and Social Networking*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Pace, Stefano (2008), "YouTube: An Opportunity for Consumer Narrative Analysis?," *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 11, 2, 213-226.
- Papacharissi, Zizi (2010), "The Virtual Geographies of Social Networks: A Comparative Analysis of Facebook, LinkedIn and ASmallWorld," *New Media & Society*, 1, 1/2, 199-220.
- Perreault, William D. Jr. And Laurence E. Leigh (1989), "Reliability of Nominal Data Based on Qualitative Judgments," *Journal of Marketing Research*, XXVI, May, 135-148.
- Pitt, Leyland F., Richard T. Watson, Pierre Berthon, Donald Wynn and George Zinkhan (2006), "The Penguin's Window: Corporate Brands From an Open-Source Perspective," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34, 2, 115-127.
- Radwanick, Sarah (2011), "U.S. Digital Year in Review 2010: A Recap of the Year in Digital Media," *ComScore Inc. White Paper*, February. Accessible at: http://www.comscore.com/Press_Events/Presentations_Whitepapers/2011/2010_US_Digital_Year_in_Review (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Riegner, Cate (2008), "Wired China: The Power of the World's Largest Internet Population," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 48, 4, 496-505.
- Roznowski, JoAnn L. (2003), "A Content Analysis of Mass Media Stories Surrounding the Consumer Privacy Issue 1990-2001," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 17, 2, 52-69.
- Schau, Hope Jensen and Mary C. Gilly (2003), "We Are What We Post? Self-Presentation in Personal Web Space," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (December), 385-404.
- Sen, Shahana and Dawn Lerman (2007), "Why Are You Telling Me This? An Examination into Negative Consumer Reviews on the Web," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 21, 4, 76-94.
- Snickars, Pelle and Patrick Vonderau (eds.) (2009), *The YouTube Reader*. Lithuania: Logotipas.
- Solomon, Michael R. (1988), "Mapping Product Constellations: A Social Categorization Approach to Consumption Symbolism," *Psychology & Marketing*, 5, 3, 233-258.
- Solis, Brian (2010), *Engage!* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Stutzman, Frederic (2006), "An Evaluation of Identity-Sharing Behavior in Social Network Communities, in *Proceedings from the iDMAa and IMS Code Conference*, Oxford, OH: International Digital Media and Arts Association, April 6-8, 2006.
- Thompson, Craig J. and Elizabeth C. Hirshman (1995), "Understanding the Socialized Body: A Poststructuralist Analysis of Consumers' Self-Conceptions, Body Images, and Self-Care Practices," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22, 2, 139-153.
- Tom Tong, Stephanie, Brandon Van Der Heide, Lindsay Langwell and Joseph B. Walther (2008), "Too Much of a Good Thing? The Relationship Between Number of Friends and Interpersonal Impressions on Facebook," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, 531-549.
- Valenzuela, Sebastián, Masu Park and Kerk F. Kee (2009), "Is There Social Capital in a Social Network Site?: Facebook Use and College Students' Life Satisfaction, Trust, and Participation," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 875-901.
- van Dijck, José (2007), "Television 2.0: YouTube and the Emergence of Homecasting," in *Proceedings from Media in Transition (MIT) 5: Creativity, Ownership, and Collaboration in the Digital Age*, Boston: MA: Massachusetts, April 27-29, 2007.
- Williamson, Debra Aho (2010), "How Much Will You Spend on Social Media-Marketing Next Year?," *Ad Age Digital*, December 8. Accessible at: <http://adage.com/article/digitalnext/social-media-marketing-spend-year/147544/> (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Xiaoji, Qiang (2010), "User Generated Content Online Now 50.7% of Total," *China Daily*, July 23, 2010. Accessible at: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/business/2010-07/23/content_11042851.htm (last accessed March 1, 2010)
- Yun, Gi Woong, Sung-Yeon Park and Louisa Ha (2008), "Dimensions on Online Interactive review Feature Implementations: A Comparison of Korean and U.S. Retail Web Sites," *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 22, 3, 40-50.
- Zhang, Jie, Yongjun Sung and Wei-Na Lee (2010), "To Play or Not to Play: An Exploratory Content Analysis of Branded Entertainment in Facebook," *American Journal of Business*, 25, 1. Accessible at: <http://www.bsu.edu/mcobwin/majb/?p=613> (last accessed March 1, 2010)

Zywica, Jolene and James Danowski (2008), "The Faces of Facebookers: Investigating Social Enhancement and Social Compensation Hypotheses; Predicting Facebook and Offline Popularity from Sociability and Self-Esteem, and Mapping the Meanings of Popularity with Semantic Networks," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, 1, 1-34.