Why Do You Engage with Brand on Instagram? Consumer Motivations for Engaging with Global Brands

Jung Hwa Choi (iD)
University of South Alabama, U.S.A.

Mihyun Kan (iD)
Eastern Connecticut State University, U.S.A.

Tae Rang Choi (iD)
Texas Christian University, U.S.A

To cite this article:

Why Do You Engage with Brand on Instagram? Consumer Motivations for Engaging with Global Brands

Jung Hwa Choi, Mihyun Kan, Tae Rang Choi

Article Info	Abstract
	The primary goal of this research is to provide the social and psychological motivational factors that lead consumers to engage with commercial brands on SNS. Specifically, this study addresses consumers' motivations in terms of why they follow a brand's account on Instagram, helping us to understand what specific motives and needs consumers have regarding their use of the Instagram platform. Within the theoretical framework of U&G, this study found that individuals who follow Instagram brand accounts have seven social and psychological motives: *Social Interaction, Brand Love, Affinity for Instagram, Brand Admiration, Entertainment, Decision Making, And Information* that lead consumers to engage with commercial brands on Instagram. To further investigate the relationship between identified motives and consumer involvement in SNS brand accounts, Study 2 measured involvement outcome variables such as eWOM frequency, attitude toward brand, brand trust, brand satisfaction, pass along intention, and willingness to buy. The overall findings of this research point to the importance of applying social presence theory to understanding consumer behavior in the Instagram context. Brand account followers' intrinsic motivations may reduce the psychological distance that they perceive between themselves and the brand they are following.

Introduction

Advertising practitioners are skillfully utilizing social media, especially Instagram along with Facebook and Twitter, as marketing platforms to enhance consumer-brand relationships based on a variety of communication strategies. According to the 2015 State of Social Marketing Report, Instagram led the list of social media platforms being used by 85 brands of the Best 100 Interbrands, followed by YouTube, Twitter, and Facebook (Shively 2015). As evidence of that trend, 86% of marketers currently view social media channels as critical components of their marketing initiatives (Stelzner 2013) and have embraced branded content in social media to augment their marketing strategies and enhance consumers' brand experience (eMarketer 2013). Especially dramatic has been the high adoption rate of Instagram by global brands, a phenomenon that comes as no surprise given users' own highly personal engagement with Instagram as a tool for sharing photographs and videos with family, friends, and anonymous people all around the world.

In the world of social media, Instagram is representative of a mobile-based social network application for photo and video-sharing based on Instagram's mission to "Capture and Share the World's Moment." By comparison, Twitter is representative of a text-based social network service that allows users to issue brief text messages limited to 140-characters. Continuing its extraordinary growth rate, in 2013 Instagram nearly doubled its number of unique visitors (Nielsen 2014). Then from 2013 to 2015, Instagram once more doubled users and active usage (Weise 2015). As a result, the Instagram community has grown to more than 500 million Instagrammers (Instagram users), more than 300 million of whom use Instagram daily (Instagram 2016). In the U.S., 28% of the total population uses Instagram (Mediakix Team 2016), and more than half of all millennials use Instagram daily (Duggan et al. 2015).

Social media is not limited to everyday users. Marketers are also paying close attention to social media to support promotions, increase sales, enhance customer service, build relationships with consumers, and use social media for human resource tactics (Ashley and Tuten 2015; Sung, et al. 2010). Especially, Instagram has been highlighted for marketing purposes. For example, Instagram is used by 48.8% of U.S. brands, while the adoption rate among the top 100 the Best Global Brands is 85% (Parker 2016). So far, Instagram has out-performed other social media. According to Instagram Advertiser Statistics, 80% of Instagram users follow at least one business brand (Osman 2017), and 75% take action, such as posting a Like for a brand, leaving a comment, or visiting the brand's website after looking at an Instagram post (Parker 2016).

Globally, in near future Instagram is expected to become the one of the marketing tools that promises to change today's marketing environment. However, to the best of the author's knowledge, academic research on this new Social Network Site (SNS) platform is limited compared to other SNSs, such as Facebook and Twitter. Therefore, the primary goal of this study is to provide the social and psychological motivational factors that lead consumers to engage with commercial brands on SNS.

Uses and Gratifications Theory

Before brand managers invest substantial resources into SNS marketing, they seek to understand why and how consumers are using a particular platform and why that platform will serve as an effective marketing strategy. The Uses and Gratifications theory (U&G) is often used to explain why and how people use certain media based on the assumption that people communicate or use technology, including SNSs, to gratify their needs and wants. The major premise of U&G deals with the assumption that motivations to use media are good predictors of an individual's media use behavior (e.g., Blumler 1979; Ruggiero 2000). Therefore, researchers rely on U&G to understand consumer motivations for using not only traditional mass media, such television, but also new media such as the Internet as well as mobile and social media (Palmgreen and Rayburn 1979; LaRose, Mastro and Eastin 2001; Stafford et al. 2004; Leung and Wie 2000; Muntinga, Moorman and Smit 2011).

U&G assumes that media users are active and goal-directed in their behavior, and thus, aware of their needs and select the appropriate media to gratify their needs (Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch 1974). Previous studies that examined psychological and behavioral aspects of Internet usage motivations have demonstrated that people use

SNSs mainly to maintain relationships and to satisfy professional advancement needs, whereas most people watch television for entertainment purposes (Sheldon 2008; Smock et al. 2011). For example, SNS users adopt LinkedIn to post their resumes and/or other work-related items as well as to network with professional contacts because they believe that platform helps to support their professional advancement (Smock et al. 2011).

The rapid growth of the Internet has strengthened the applicability of U&G because social media requires users to exercise a higher level of interactivity compared to traditional media (Ruggiero 2000). Four types of gratifications have been identified as being broadly applicable to all types of media: information, entertainment, personal identity, and social interaction (McQuail 1983). According to McQuail (1983), information-seeking is the principal motivation for consumers in media gratification. As a sub-group of motivations, Muntinga et al. ascertained that consumers seek information to reduce uncertainty to obtain advice and opinions, to survey their environment, and to follow events or circumstances (2011). A secondary motivation, entertainment, includes escape from current situations, relief from boredom, and relaxation (Muntinga et al. 2011; Quan-Haase and Young 2010; Hou 2011). The third main motivation is for individuals to use social media to establish and maintain their personal identity in order to strengthen their own beliefs, explore their self-concepts, establish their individual values, and gain acknowledgement among their peers (Muntinga et al. 2011). The fourth motivation is identified as social interaction and includes sociability as well as maintaining social connection such as linking up with friends, establishing friendships, seeking emotional encouragement, and fitting in with others (Muntinga et al. 2011; Quan-Haase and Young 2010).

Consumer Motivations for Following Brands on Instagram

Several U&G studies have examined the motivational dimensions of social media; however, to date, the current study is the first to examine the motivations that prompt consumers to engage with photo-sharing social media sites, in particular, Instagram. Considering that each type of media is assumed to offer its own distinct uses and gratifications that match users' needs and wants, it is valuable to understand what motivates consumers to follow postings on Instagram. In addition, it is important to investigate the relationships between consumer motivations and important involvement related consumer outcomes such as electronic word of mouth (eWOM), attitude toward the brand, brand trust, brand satisfaction, intention to pass along a brand's postings, and willingness to buy the brand. As such, the following two additional research questions will be examined:

RQ1: What are the motivations for that lead consumers to participate in virtual brand communities on Instagram?

RQ2: How are consumer motivations related to consumer outcomes?

Method

Generation of Motivation Items

A two-step process was employed to develop a list of scale items for individuals' motivations to follow a brand's account on Instagram. Step one focused on items derived from prior studies. Topics of those studies focused on virtual brand communities (Dholakia, Bagozzi and Pearo 2004; Ouwersloot and Odekerken-Scroder 2008;

Sheldon and Bryant 2016; Sung, et al. 2010) as well as benefits users derived from engaging in relationships with brands (Gwinner, Gremler and Bitner 1998), on SNSs such as Facebook, Twitter, and Pinterest. From those studies, a total of 50 motivations were identified as being relevant to Instagram users. Many of the motivations overlapped; therefore, a decision was made to reduce the total number to those items applicable to Instagram users. Therefore, 24 items were eliminated, leaving 26 motivation items that were adopted for the current study.

In step two, consumers who follow brand accounts were interviewed in order to identify motivations relevant to the context of Instagram. In order to produce spontaneous answers, informal interviews were conducted in a public area. Respondents were recruited in a major metropolitan city in the Southwestern U.S. based on questions about their use of Instagram, their following of brand accounts, and their willingness to participate in the study. Age, gender and ethnicity were recorded with interviewees' consent and understanding that the responses would be used only for academic purposes. The interviewees included 17 Instagram users (6 men, 11 women) ranging in age from 18 to 32 years who had been using Instagram for 8 to 60 months. Interviews began with a brief explanation of the purpose of the study followed by questions about the number and names of brands interviewees were following on Instagram. Next, interviewees were asked why they followed brands on Instagram.

Individual respondents were following, on average, 20 brand accounts on Instagram that included global brands (e.g., BMW, Seven Eleven, Loccitane, Wholefoods, Canon, Anthropology, Lush Cosmetics, etc.) as well as local brands (e.g., Alamo Drafthouse, Lady Bug, etc.). In response to the "why" question, the respondents listed a total of 23 motivations. Some items overlapped with items identified from literature, but 13 new items were derived from the interviews and combined with those from the literature producing a total of 39 motivations for individuals to engage with brand accounts on Instagram

Data-Collection

Because the goal of the study was to examine the motivations of consumers who follow brand accounts on Instagram, participants were drawn from Amazon Mechanical Turk and a large university in the U.S. The data was collected during a one-month period. Based on the goal of this study, participants were limited to brand account followers on Instagram only.

Measures

eWOM

Electronic Word-of-Mouth frequency was measured by asking respondents to answer the following questions while thinking about all brands they are following on Instagram. The following are the four items that respondents answered: "How often do you '**Like**' a brand's posting on Instagram?" "How often do you leave a **comment** about a brand's posting on Instagram?," "How often do you '**repost**' a brand's posting on Instagram?," and "How often do you use '**send to**' to forward a brand's posting to your friends on Instagram?" Response options consisted of "Rarely", "Less than once a month," "A few times a month," "Once a week," "A few times a week," "Once a day," and "Several times a day."

Attitude toward Following Brands

To measure respondents' attitudes toward following brands, 3-items with a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) were used (Lee and Aaker 2004). The statements included "To me, the brands that I am following on Instagram are positive", "To me, the brands that I am following on Instagram are good.", and "To me, the brand that I am following on Instagram are favorable." Responses were averaged for subsequent analyses ($M = 5.63$, $SD = 1.04$, Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$).

Brand Trust

Consumers' brand trust was measured using 4 items: "I trust this brand.", "I rely on this brand." "This is an honest brand." and "This brand is safe." using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree (Hu, Li and Harris 2012) ($M = 5.17$, $SD = 1.07$, $\alpha =.88$).

Brand Satisfaction

Brand satisfaction was assessed using 3 items with a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) adopted from Aaker, Fournier and Brasel (2004). The statements included "I am completely satisfied with the brands that I am following on Instagram," "I am completely pleased with the brands that I am following on Instagram.", and "Following brands on Instagram is turning out better than I expected." ($M = 5.17$, $SD = 1.06$, $\alpha =.83$).

Intention to pass along a Brand's posting

Consumers' intention to pass along a brand's messages was measured by participants' indication of what to what extent they agree with the three statements ranging from "1 = strongly disagree" to "7 = strongly agree." For example, "I plan to pass along the brand's posting.", "I will make an effort to pass along the brand's postings." and "I intend to pass along the brand's postings." (Ajzen 2002; 2006; Ajzen and Fishbein 1980) ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.57$, $\alpha = .950$).

Willingness to Buy

The willingness to buy in the future was assessed by three items on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "1 = strongly disagree" to "7 = strongly agree." adopted from Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991). The statements included: "Compared to the brands that I am NOT following on Instagram, the likelihood of purchasing products from the brands that I am following on Instagram is higher.", "If I were in the market, I would consider buying products from the brands that I am following on Instagram.", and "Based on the information that is given on the Instagram accounts of the brands that I am following, I would consider buying the products from the brands that I follow on Instagram." ($M = 5.38$, $SD = 1.11$, $\alpha =.85$).

Results

Background Information

Over a one-month period, a total of 325 people participated in Study 2. Of that total, seven respondents were deleted from the analysis because they did not complete the survey. Thus, 318 respondents were included in the analysis. The final sample was composed of 102 male (32.1%) and 216 female (67.9%) respondents.

The average age of the respondents was approximately 24 years with the youngest respondent being 18 and the oldest respondent being 54 ($SD = 6.16$). More than 50% of the respondents had attended college but did not graduate (51.6%; 164 people). About 30% of respondents (29.2%; 93 people) had either an associate degree or Bachelor's degree. The next largest group of participants, 44, graduated from high school (13.8%) with 9 people who had a master's degree (2.8%), followed by 3 respondents who had a professional degree (JD or MD) (0.9%) and 2 with doctoral degree (0.6%). The majority respondents described themselves as Caucasian/White (57.2%; 182 people). Among the other study participants, Hispanic/Latino and Asian were each 16.7% (53 people) of the sample. Respondents who were African American were 5.7% (18 people) and 0.9% of Native American (3 people).

Respondents' General Instagram Usage

To understand respondents' general patterns of usage, they were asked to answer questions about the duration of their usage as well as how frequently they checked Instagram and uploaded pictures. Additionally, they were asked about the number of pictures they posted, the number accounts they follow, and the number of followers on their private accounts to determine whether they were active users. Participants also indicated the number of brands they followed on Instagram and how many of those brands they actually use or own.

Usage Duration

The average length of time respondents had used Instagram prior to the survey was 42.98 months (Median 48 months) with the longest user use of Instagram being 132 months; the shortest duration of Instagram use was one month before the survey began (SD = 20.70). To see how actively respondents engaged with Instagram, frequency of checking and uploading pictures were investigated.

Frequency of Checking Instagram

Study participants were asked to indicate how often they check Instagram. Among 318 participants, about two-thirds of respondents (65.5%; 208 people) answered that, on average, they check Instagram several times a day, and 15.4% (49 people) checked Instagram at least once a day. About 10.4% (33 people) and 4.1% (13 people) checked Instagram a few times a week and once a week, respectively. Ten among the 318 participants (3.1%) checked Instagram a few times a month, while 0.6% (2 people) checked the application less than once a month. Only 3 people (0.9%) answered they checked Instagram rarely.

Frequency of Uploading Pictures

In response to the question about how often participants uploaded pictures on Instagram, 36.5% of the respondents (116 people) uploaded pictures a few times a month followed, while 20.1% (64 people) uploaded pictures less than once a month; 14.5% (46 people) rarely upload pictures, while 13.5% (43 people) uploaded photos once a week; 9.4% (30 people) uploaded a few times a week; 4.4% (14 people) uploaded once a day, and 1.6% (5 people) uploaded several times a day.

Number of Picture, Followers, Followings, Following Brands

The average number of pictures on respondents' Instagram accounts were 188.52 (SD = 322.90) with a minimum of 0 and maximum of 3,494. On average, respondents reported 662.25 followers (SD = 947.89). One participant had no followers on Instagram, while one participant had 13,700 followers. With a minimum of 1 and a maximum 7,461, the average number of accounts that respondents were following was 527.75 (SD = 554.35). Among 318 participants, 21 respondents followed only one brand on Instagram, while one participant followed 1,275 brands. The average number of brands followed was 30.14 (SD = 99.65).

Number of Brands Actually Used Among Brands Followed

The study participants were asked to answer how many brands they were actually using among the brands they were following on Instagram. Twenty-two respondents did not use any of the brands they were following on Instagram, while one participant reported using 500 brands among those followed on Instagram. On average, respondents used 10.40 brands of those brands they were following on Instagram (SD = 32.45). See Table 3.12 for a summary of usage statistics.

Factor Analysis of Brand Account Followers' Motives

Highly intercorrelated factors represent dimensions that help to create new composite measures within data (Hair, et al. 2010). Therefore, for Study 2, a principal component analysis (PCA) was used to summarize a large number of variables by examining the relationships among sets of variables (Pallant 2007). PCA with varimax rotation was performed to identify the underlying structure of motivations for following brand accounts on Instagram. The PCA was evaluated using the following criteria: eigenvalue (greater than 1.0), variance explained by each component, loading score for each factor ($\geq |0.50|$), and meaningfulness of each dimension. After deleting 6 items, which had either high loadings on more than one component or loading scores of less than $|0.50|$, the PCA was rerun. Further, a parallel analysis (PA) was conducted to determine the number of factors to be extracted (O'Connor 2000). The results revealed that the eigenvalues of the first seven components extracted from the PCA exceeded those obtained from the random data (Datasets = 1000, percent = 95). Based on these results, a meaningful and interpretable seven-component solution was obtained, and the seven components explained 66.68% of the total variance (see Table 1 for detailed results).

Table 1. Brand Account Following on Instagram Motivation Scales and Individual Items (n=318)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	*Mean*	*SD*
Social Interaction (α=.94)									
To help other brand community members	**.845**	-.070	.159	-.047	.154	.096	.138	2.978	1.647
To feel accepted and approved of in the brand community (e.g., affiliation)	**.841**	-.041	.081	.200	.091	.007	.095	3.022	1.685
To gain social status or social position among others	**.835**	.010	.066	.176	.0570	.0170	-.013	2.915	1.729
To build a close relationship with a brand's community members	**.812**	-.109	.172	-.035	.151	.083	.203	3.116	1.647
To get help from other brand community members	**.801**	-.038	.158	-.058	.133	.141	.194	3.006	1.635
To have something to do with others	**.781**	.066	.128	.200	.0330	-.019	-.139	3.173	1.725
To impress other people	**.758**	.007	.0860	.246	.006	-.025	-.064	2.915	1.693
To show others what I like	**.734**	.250	.129	-.057	-.064	.215	.012	3.468	1.789
To give my opinion about the brand	**.711**	.268	.058	.113	-.032	.048	-.060	3.745	1.815
To get to know others in a brand community	**.675**	-.049	.279	-.001	.087	.201	.185	3.481	1.739
To be identified with a brand	**.664**	.263	.259	.256	-.044	.003	-.118	3.764	1.793
To express my support for the values represented by the brand	**.584**	.380	.140	.046	.094	.204	-.081	4.254	1.785
Brand Love (α=.86)									
Because I love the brand	.076	**.774**	.055	.182	.112	-.016	.184	5.657	1.260
Because I like the brand	-.090	**.773**	-.070	.179	.156	.023	.227	6.003	1.043
Because I am interested in this brand	-.008	**.765**	-.033	.168	.210	.124	.113	5.830	1.057
To learn more about the brand	.162	**.681**	.163	.021	.109	.337	.114	5.364	1.263
Because this brand means a lot to me	.314	**.622**	.214	.179	.031	-.010	.063	4.965	1.473
Because I just like the brand's photos (i.e., high quality, cool, funny)	-.106	**.572**	.186	.214	.335	.022	.017	5.729	1.187
Affinity for Instagram (α=.78)									
Because Instagram is more accurate than other SNSs because it has photos	.331	.078	**.793**	.138	.037	.084	.048	3.619	1.685

Because Instagram is the only way to get information about the brand (i.e., local brands)	.34	-.03	**.682**	.055	.054	-.024	.179	3.163	1.779
Because Instagram is quicker and shorter than other SNSs	.169	.171	**.636**	.332	.123	.175	.04	4.547	1.706
To see how the brand interacts with consumers	.391	.314	**.535**	-.138	.021	.27	-.072	3.952	1.679
Brand Admiration (α=.74)									
Because the brand is so popular	.274	.173	.204	**.729**	.096	.073	.021	4.685	1.722
Because the brand is what I use regularly	.154	.263	.142	**.650**	-.035	.174	.157	5.037	1.459
Because I plan to buy the brand in the future	.137	.286	-.088	**.549**	.108	.137	.106	5.355	1.432
To use the brand as reference for fashion	.015	.175	.317	**.522**	.297	.353	.076	4.952	1.758
Entertainment (α=.72)									
To pass time when I am bored	.041	.196	-.023	.213	**.742**	-.084	.085	5.371	1.460
To be entertained	.076	.369	.003	-.023	**.726**	.144	-.007	5.415	1.354
To relax	.316	.129	.226	.015	**.697**	.034	-.059	4.355	1.649
Decision Making (α=.71)									
To decide what to buy	.069	.271	.103	.264	.04	**.75**	.166	5.088	1.514
To make sure that I've made the correct decision	.303	.012	.123	.201	.001	**.747**	.06	4.132	1.666
Information (α=.72)									
To get incentives (e.g., coupons, cyber money, promotional deals, free samples, member exclusive events, etc.)	.081	.279	.04	.148	-.078	.094	**.783**	5.374	1.600
To get information that I can't get elsewhere (e.g., clip showing a process of making the brand's product, story behind the brand, etc.)	.055	.307	.155	.103	.111	.114	**.781**	5.220	1.571
Actual eigenvalue from PCA	**10.620**	**4.655**	**1.735**	**1.488**	**1.306**	**1.152**	**1.050**		
Criterion value from PA									
% of variance	**32.181**	**14.107**	**4.510**	**3.957**	**3.490**	**3.490**	**3.181**		
Cumulative %	**32.181**	**46.288**	**51.545**	**56.055**	**60.012**	**63.502**	**66.683**		

As shown in Table 1, the first component, *social interaction*, accounted for 32.18% of the variance and consisted of twelve items such as "To help other brand community members," "To feel accepted and approved of in the brand community," "To gain social status or social position among others," "To build a close relationship with a brand's community members," "To have something to do you with others," "To impress other people," "To show others what I like," and so on. The second component, *Brand Love*, with six items, explained 14.11% of the variance (α = .86). The second component included the following items: "Because I love the brand," "Because I like the brand," "Because I am interested in this brand," "To learn more about the brand," "Because this brand means a lot to me," and "Because I just like the brand's photos." The third component, *Affinity for Instagram*, accounted for 5.26% of the variance (α = .78) and included four items: "Because Instagram is more accurate than other SNSs because it has photos," "Because Instagram is the only way to get information about the brand," "Because Instagram is quicker and shorter than other SNSs," and "To see how the brand interacts with consumers." The fourth component, *Brand Admiration* with four items, explained 4.510% of the variance (α = .74): "Because the brand is so popular", "Because the brand is what I use regularly", "Because I plan to buy the brand in the future", and "To use the brand as reference for fashion." The fifth component, *Entertainment,* accounted for 3.96% of the variance (α = .72) and included three items: "To pass time when I am bored," "To be entertained," and "To relax." The sixth component, *Decision Making*, explained 3.49% of the variance (α = .71) with two items: "To decide what to buy" and "To make sure that I've made the correct decision." Finally, the seventh component, *Information,* accounted for 3.18% of the variance (α = .72) and included two items*:* "To get incentives" and "To get information that I can't get elsewhere."

The Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

A series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to investigate how the seven motives distinctively influenced a variety of outcome variables (e.g., eWOM frequency, attitude toward following brands, brand trust, brand satisfaction, intention to pass along a brand's postings, and willingness to buy (see Table 2 for detailed results).

Table 2. The Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis (n=318)

	eWOM		Attitude		Brand trust		Satisfaction		Intention		Willing to buy	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Control												
Gender	0.12*	0.08	-0.32***	-0.16***	-0.21***	-0.08	-0.22***	-0.10	0.02	-0.06	-0.16**	-0.01
Age	0.15**	0.19***	-0.12*	-0.03	-0.06	0.02	-0.01	0.10*	0.10	0.11*	-0.09	-0.03
Motivation												
Social interaction		0.34***		-0.06		0.16**		0.05		0.56***		0.02
Brand love		0.02		0.49***		0.44***		0.31***		-0.10		0.39***
Affinity for Instagram		0.10		-0.04		-0.10		-0.04		0.14*		-0.06
Brand Admiration		0.04		0.20**		0.20**		0.30***		0.01		0.08
Entertainment		0.11		0.06		0.03		0.04		0.01		-0.04

	eWOM		Attitude		Brand trust		Satisfaction		Intention		Willing to buy	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Decision Making		0.07		-0.08		-0.05		-0.04		-0.00		0.12*
Information		-0.07		0.06		0.11*		0.07		0.07		0.18**
R^2	0.04	0.29	0.13	0.48	0.05	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.01	0.43	0.04	0.33
Adjusted R^2	0.04	0.27	0.12	0.46	0.04	0.42	0.04	0.32	0.01	0.41	0.03	0.32
F	6.88	13.77***	23.35	31.35***	8.36	26.68***	7.74	17.54***	1.89	25.75***	6.05	17.20***
ΔF		15.12**		29.43***		30.35***		19.43***		32.19***		19.67***
ΔR^2		0.25		0.35		0.39		0.29		0.42		0.30

Note. All values indicate standardized β value.

* Statistically significant at .05 level

** Statistically significant at .01 level

*** Statistically significant at .001 level

eWOM Frequency

The regression model with eWOM frequency and the dependent variable was statistically significant (R^2 = .287, R_{adj} = .266, $F(9, 308)$ = 13.77, $p < .001$). Controlling for gender ($p > .1$) and age ($p < .001$), the results showed that only *Social Interaction* (B = .021, β = .336, $t(308)$ = 5.30, $p < .001$) significantly predicted eWOM Frequency, suggesting that as participants had higher social interaction motivation, they were more likely to frequently spread word-of-mouth including leave a comment, repost and send the post. In addition, a motivation for *Entertainment* (B = .031, β = .108, $t(308)$ = 1.93, p = .054) turned out to be a marginally significant predictor for eWOM Frequency, indicating that participants who have higher entertainment motives tend to spread word-of mouth more frequently.

Attitude toward Following Brands

The regression model with attitude toward following brands as the dependent variable was also statistically significant (R^2 = .478, R_{adj} = .463, F(9, 308) = 31.35, $p < .001$). Controlling for gender ($p < .001$) and age ($p > .1$), both brand love (B = .092, β = .494, $t(308)$ = 8.77, $p < .001$) and *Brand Admiration*(B = .043, β = .197, $t(308)$ = 3.33, $p < .01$) effects were found to be significant. These findings suggest that participants who express love of the brand and admiration for the brand evaluated the brands they followed more favorably.

Factor Analysis of Brand Account Followers' Motives

Brand Trust

The regression model with brand trust as the dependent variable was also statistically significant (R^2 = .438, R_{adj} = .422, F(9, 308) = 26.68, $p < .001$). Controlling for gender ($p > .1$) and age ($p > .1$), the results showed that *Brand Love* (B = .084, β = .436, $t(308)$ = 7.47, $p < .001$) and *Brand Admiration* (B = .045, β = .199, $t(308)$ = 3.24, $p < .01$) significantly influenced brand trust. The results suggest that participants who love or admire brands tend to trust those brands more than other brands. In addition, *Social Interaction* (B = .010, β = .158, $t(308)$ = 2.79, $p <$

.01) and *Information* (B = .043, β = .113, $t(308)$ = 2.27, $p < .01$) were also significant, showing that participants who were more motivated to have social interaction or to obtain information from following brands had higher levels of brand trust.

Brand Satisfaction

Similar to other models, the brand satisfaction regression was statistically significant (R^2 = .339, R_{adj} = .320, F(9, 308) = 17.54, $p <.001$). Controlling for gender ($p < .1$) and age ($p < .05$), *Brand Love* (B = .059, β = .308, $t(308)$ = 4.87, $p < .001$) and *Brand Admiration* (B = .066, β = .297, $t(308)$ = 4.46, $p < .001$) were significant predictors of brand satisfaction. This result suggests that participants were more satisfied the more they loved or admired the brands they followed on Instagram.

Intention to pass along a Brand's posting

Similar to other regression models, the regression for intention to pass along a brand's postings was statistically significant (R^2 = .429, R_{adj} = .413, F(9, 308) = 25.75, $p <.001$). Controlling for gender ($p > .1$) and age ($p < .5$), the results showed that the effect of *Social Interaction* (B = .054, β = .558, $t(308)$ = 9.83, $p < .001$) and *Affinity for Instagram* (B = .043, β = .144, $t(308)$ = 2.51, $p < .01$) were significant. The data showed that as participants had higher levels of social interaction and affinity for Instagram motives, they were more likely to pass along a brand' postings to other users.

Willingness to Buy

Finally, the regression for willingness to buy was statistically significant as well (R^2 = .334, R_{adj} = .315, F(9, 308) = 17.20, $p <.001$). Controlling for gender ($p > .1$) and age ($p > .1$), the influence of brand love (B = .078, β = .390, $t(308)$ = 6.14, $p < .001$), information (B = .070, β = .176, $t(308)$ = 3.26, $p < .01$), and decision making (B = .046, β = .116, $t(308)$ = 2.07, $p < .05$) on willingness to buy were significant. This suggests that as participants expressed more love for brands, they were more willing to obtain information, and the greater their need to decide or confirm their decisions, the greater their willingness to purchase products of brands they followed as advertised on Instagram.

Discussion

This study addresses consumers' motivations in terms of why they follow a brand's account on Instagram, helping us to understand what specific motives and needs consumers have regarding their use of the Instagram platform. To further investigate the relationship between identified motives and consumer involvement in SNS brand accounts, Study 2 measured involvement outcome variables such as eWOM frequency, attitude toward brand, brand trust, brand satisfaction, pass along intention, and willingness to buy.

Results of the study found that individuals who follow Instagram brand accounts have seven primary social and

psychological motives: *Social Interaction, Brand Love, Affinity for Instagram, Brand Admiration, Entertainment, Decision-Making, and Information*. The results further revealed that *Social Interaction* is the strongest factor in motivating brand followers to engage in social relationships with the brand and other brand community members. *Social Interaction* motivation predicted eWOM behaviors and intention to pass along brand messages. The findings of *Brand Love* as second primary motivation indicate that individuals are motivated to follow a specific brand because they have quite favorable feelings when they follow brands. This motivation was found to significantly predict attitude toward following a brand, brand trust, brand satisfaction, and willingness to buy. The *Affinity for Instagram* was found to serve as a strong motive for following brand accounts. That is, brand account followers utilize Instagram to gain advanced benefits, such as quicker, shorter, accurate and exclusive information, as a result of communicating with brands. *Affinity for Instagram* motivation predicted intention to pass along a brand's postings.

The fourth strongest motivation, the *Brand Admiration* motive, suggests that followers utilize Instagram brand accounts to learn about current trends and fashion. This result suggests this motive plays a significant role in forming positive attitudes toward following brands and brand trust, thereby leading to brand satisfaction. The emergence of *Entertainment* motive indicates that brand followers use brand Instagram accounts to relax and be entertained. Finally, *Decision-Making* and *Information* help brand followers on Instagram to make a buying decision and gain useful information. Both *Decision-Making* and *Information* motivations significantly predicted the likelihood of purchase among brand followers.

This study provided theoretical support for the Uses and Gratifications Theory (U&G) refining and extending it to computer-mediated consumer-brand relationships in Instagram. Most applications of the U&G are used to explain why and how people use certain media, such as Facebook and Twitter. The current research advanced our understanding of SNS users by examining their motivations to follow brand accounts on Instagram.

The overall findings of this research point to the importance of applying social presence theory to understanding consumer behavior in the Instagram context. Social presence theory defines "the degree to which a person is perceived as a real person in mediated communication" (Gunawardena 1995). In addition to that definition, (Lowenthal 2010) posited that social presence can be experienced by the extent to which individuals have emotional connections through interpersonal communication and the extent to which individuals perceive another communicator as being "present," "there," or "real." Previous literature has suggested two constructs of social presence: intimacy and immediacy (Argyle & Dean 1965; Cobb 2009). First, intimacy is influenced by such factors as physical distance, facial expression, emotional expression, and subjects of communication (Argyle & Dean 1965). Although Instagram brand accounts are not physically present, intimacy between brand followers and the brands they follow may be enhanced through what brands present on Instagram, such as frequent usage of emoticons for emotional expression and tagging of location and person for reducing distance. Immediacy can be defined as the extent to which an individual perceives psychological distance between him/herself and the object of communication (Cobb 2009). In that regard, brand account followers' intrinsic motivations may reduce the psychological distance that they perceive between themselves and the brand they are following. Moreover, high quality visual postings on Instagram may influence followers to assume "this brand is there." Since social

presence is a crucial factor of satisfaction in computer-mediated communication, the findings of this research combined with social presence theory may provide a broader perspective on consumer-brand relationships on Instagram.

Conclusion

Please use 10-point font size. Please margin the text to the justified. Manuscripts should be 1.5 times spaced. A paragraph should have at least 3 sentences. Footnotes and endnotes are not accepted. All relevant information should be included in main text. Do not indent paragraphs; leave a space of one line between consecutive paragraphs. Do not underline words for emphasis. Use italics instead. Both numbered lists and bulleted lists can be used if necessary. Before submitting your manuscript, please ensure that every in-text citation has a corresponding reference in the reference list. Conversely, ensure that every entry in the reference list has a corresponding in-text citation.

Subdivide text into unnumbered sections, using short, meaningful sub-headings. Please do not use numbered headings. Please limit heading use to three levels. Please use 12-point bold for first-level headings, 10-point bold for second-level headings, and 10-point italics for third -level headings with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns. Leave one blank line (1.5 times spaced) before and after each heading. (Exception: no blank line between consecutive headings.) Please margin all headings to the left.

Recommendations

Please use 10-point font size. Please margin the text to the justified. Manuscripts should be 1.5 times spaced. Footnotes and endnotes are not accepted. All relevant information should be included in main text. Do not indent paragraphs; leave a space of one line between consecutive paragraphs. Do not underline words for emphasis. Use italics instead. Both numbered lists and bulleted lists can be used if necessary. Before submitting your manuscript, please ensure that every in-text citation has a corresponding reference in the reference list. Conversely, ensure that every entry in the reference list has a corresponding in-text citation.

Subdivide text into unnumbered sections, using short, meaningful sub-headings. Please do not use numbered headings. Please limit heading use to three levels. Please use 12-point bold for first-level headings, 10-point bold for second-level headings, and 10-point italics for third -level headings with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns. Leave one blank line (1.5 times spaced) before and after each heading. (Exception: no blank line between consecutive headings.) Please margin all headings to the left.

References

Aaker, J. L., Fournier, S., Brasel, S. A.(2004). When Good Brands Do Bad. *Journal of Consumer research*, *31*(1), 1-16.

Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived Behavioral Control, Self-efficacy, Locus of Control, and The Theory of   Planned

Behavior. *Journal of applied social psychology*, *32*(4), *665-683.*

Ajzen, I. (2006). Constructing a Theory of Planned Behavior Questionnaire: Conceptual and Methodological Consideration. http://www.people.umass.edu/aizen/pdf/tpb.measurement.pdf

Ajzen, I., Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour.

Argyle, M., Dean, J. (1965). Eye-Contact, Distance and Affiliation. *Sociometry, 28(3), 289-304.*

Ashley, C., Tuten, T. (2014). Creative Strategies in Social Media Marketing: An Exploratory Study of Branded Social Content and Consumer Engagement. *Psychology & Marketing*, *32(1), 15-27.*

Blumler, J. G. (1979). The Role of Theory in Uses and Gratifications Studies. *Communication research, 6(1), 9-36.*

Cobb, S. C. (2009). Social Presence and Online Learning: A Current View From a Research Perspective. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, *8(3), 241-254.*

Dholakia, U. M., Bagozzi, R.P. (2004). A Social Influence Model of Consumer Participation in Network- and Small-Group- Based Virtual Communities. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 21(3), 241-263.*

Duggan, M., Ellison,N. B., Lampe, C., Lenhart, A., Madden, M. (2015). Social Media Update2014.*Pew Research Center*, *9*. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/.

eMarketer. (2013). Social Advertisers Rely on Branded Pages More than Paid Ads. Retrieved from http://www.emarketer.com/Article/Social-Advertisers-Rely-on-Branded Pages More-Than Paid Ads/1009917.

Number of companies using Instagram to nearly double next year - eMarketer: Social Marketing, social media marketing, network marketing. Pinterest. (2015). Retrieved March 9, 2023, from https://www.pinterest.com/pin/number-of-companies-using-instagram-to-nearly-double-next-year emarketer--474707616951552037/

Global Digital Report (2018). Global Social Media Research Summary 2018. Retrieved from https://www.smartinsights.com/social-media-marketing/social-media strategy/new-global-social media-research/.

Gunawardena, C. N. (1995). Social Presence Theory and Implications for Interaction Collaborative Learning in Computer Conferences. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 1(2/3), *147-166.*

Gwinner, K. P., Gremler, D. D., Bitner, M, J. (1998). Relational Benefits in Services Industries: The Customer's Perspective. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, *26(2), 101-114.*

Hair, J. F. Black, W. C., Babin, B, J., Anderson, R. E., (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective* (Vol. 7). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Hou, J. (2011). Uses and Gratifications of Social Games: Blending Social Networking and Game Play. *First Monday*, *16(7), 1-21.*

Hu, Y., Manikonda, L., Kambhampati, S. (2014). What We Instagram: A First Analysis of Instagram Photo Content and User Types. *In ICWSM*.

Instagram (2016). FAQ. Retrieved from https://www.instagram.com/about/faq/.

Instagram (2016). Instagram Today: 500 Million Windows to The World. Retrieved from http://blog.instagram.com/post/146255204757/160621-news.

Internet Usage Statistics (2015). Internet Usage Statics: World Internet Users and 2015 Population Stats. Retrieved from http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

Katz, Elihu., Jay G. Blumler., and Michael Gurevitch(1974). Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual. In Blumler, J. & Katz, E. (Ed.), *The uses of mass communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research*, Beverly Hills: Sage.

KPR Social Communication Research Lab (2016). 2016 Social Media Trend. Retrieved from http://view.asiae.co.kr/news/view.htm?idxno=2016061516161650992.

LaRose, R., Mastro, D., Eastin, M. S. (2001). Understanding Internet Usage: A Social-Cognitive Approach to Uses and Gratifications. *Social Science Review*, *19(4), 395–413.*

Lee, A. Y., Aaker, J. L. (2004). Bringing the Frame Into Focus: The Influence of Regulatory Fit on Processing Fluency and Persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*(2), 205–218

Leung, L., Wei, R. (2000). More Than Just Talk on The Move: The Uses and Gratifications of The Cellular Phone. *Journalism of Mass Communication Quarterly*, *77(2), 308-320.*

Lowenthal, P. R. (2010). The Evolution and Influence of Social Presence Theory on Online Learning. *Online Education and Adult Learning: New Frontiers for Teaching Practices*,124-139.

McQuail, D. (1983). *Mass communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mediakix Team (2016). The Most Impressive Instagram Statistics for 2016. *Media Kix.* Retrieved from http://mediakix.com/2016/03/top-instagram-statistics-you-should know/#gs.Us7QF0I.

Mediakix Team (2017). The Top 10 Instagram Video Statistics Marketers Should Know *Media Kix*. Retrieved from http://mediakix.com/2017/08/instagram-video-statistics-marketers-should-know/#gs.swV0H5o.

Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M., Smit, E.G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring Motivations for Brand Related Social Media Use. *International Journal of Advertising*, *30(1), 13–46*.

Nielsen (2014). The Digital Consumer. Retrieved from https://www.nielsen.com/wp content/uploads/sites/2/2019/04/the-digital-consumer-report-feb-2014.pdf

O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS Programs for Determining the Number of Components Using Parallel Analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, 32(3), 396-402.*

Osman, M. (2017). 18 Instagram States Every Marketer Should Know for 2017. Sprout Social. Retrieved from https://sproutsocial.com/insights/instagram-stats/.

Ouwersloot, H., Gaby, O. (2008). Who's Who in Brand Communities and Why?. *European Journal of Marketing*, *42*(5/6), *571-585.*

Palmgreen, P., Rayburn, J. D. (1979). Uses and Gratifications and Exposure to Public Television: A Discrepancy Approach. *Communication Research*, 6(2), *155–180.*

Parker, S. (2016). A Long List of Instagram Statistics That Marketers Need to Know. Retrieved from https://blog.hootsuite.com/instagram-statistics/.

Quan-Haase, A., Young, A. L. (2010). Uses and Gratifications of Social Media: A Comparison of Facebook and Instant Messaging. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 30(5), 349-361.

Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and Gratifications Theory in the 21st century. *Mass Communication & Society*, *3*(1), 3-37.

Sheldon, P. (2008). The Relationship Between Unwillingness to Communicate and Students' Facebook use. *Journal of Media Psychology*, 20, 67-75.

Sheldon, P., Bryant, K. (2016). Instagram: Motives for Its Use and Relationship to Narcissism and Contextual Age. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *58*, 89-97.

Shively, K. (2015). 2015 State of Social Marketing Report. *Simply Measured*. Retrieved fromhttp://simplymeasured.com/blog/7-stats-about-the-top-social-networks-for brands/#sm.0000u3sv3e1nrfn6qiw19b3f9cvrw.

Stafford, L., Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance Strategies and Romantic Relationship Type, Gender, and Relational Characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationship*, 8(2), 217-242.

Stelzner, M. A. (2013). *2013 Social Media Marketing Industry Report: How Marketers are Using Social Media to Grow Their Businesses*. SocialMediaExaminer. com.

Stelzner, M. A. (2016). *2016 Social Media Marketing Industry Report: How Marketers are Using Social Media to Grow their Businesses*. SocialMediaExaminer. com.

Weise, S. (2015). Instagram Usage Doubles in Last Two Years. *We are Social*. Retrieved from http://wearesocial.com/uk/blog/2015/12/instagram-usage-doubles-years.

Author Information

Jung Hwa Choi

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4166-3367

University of South Alabama

307 N University Blvd, Mobile, AL 36688

U.S.A.

Mihyun Kang

https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5696-9801

Eastern Connecticut State University

83 Windham St, Willimantic, CT 06226

U.S.A.

Tae Rang Choi

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7958-1028

Texas Christian University

2800 S University Dr, Fort Worth, TX 76129

U.S.A.

Contact e-mail: *t.r.choi@tcu.edu*