

# **Social Capital on Instagram: Application for Small Apparel Retailers**

**Brittany R. McKneely**  
**University of North Texas**

**Jiyoung Kim**  
**University of North Texas**

**Xi Leung**  
**University of North Texas**

**Sanjukta Pookulangara**  
**University of North Texas**

*The purpose of this study is to investigate consumer's perceived benefit and development of social capital in small apparel retailer's Instagram pages that ultimately lead to purchase intentions for the retailer, applying Social Capital theory. Using a field survey method, 200 complete and accurate responses were collected and used to run multiple regression analysis. The result revealed several insignificant relationships, contrary to our initial expectation. The ad hoc multiple regression analysis found several other significant relationships between the social capital dimensions and perceived benefit dimensions on brand identification, trust, and purchase intentions.*

*Keywords: social capital, instagram, small business, apparel*

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 2018, the Small Business Administration reported 30.2 million small businesses in the United States, which is 99.9% of businesses in the US. Additionally, they reported 58.9 million small business employees, which consists of 47.5% of United States employees (Small Business Administration, 2018). Small businesses are also highly valuable to the global economy as they employ at least half of the workforce and contribute more than half the value added to the GDP (OECD, 2010).

While small businesses have such an impact on both the United States and global economies, it faces a major challenge to stay competitive with larger firms. In comparison to small businesses, large businesses have the upper hand in attracting customers because of their solid marketing campaigns, convenient store locations, well-trained staff, established customer base, and high brand awareness ("How your business can compete", n.d.). This leads small business owners to find creative solutions for marketing with their current budget, which is where social media can play an important role (Schaupp, & Bélanger, 2014). For small businesses, social media provides benefits such as; (1) online marketing that

increases brand exposure (Noel, 2014), (2) engaged customers (Jordan, 2018) and increased clientele (He et al., 2017), (3) a communication channel that influences purchasing decisions and sharing information (Chang, Yu, & Lu, 2015), and (4) brand loyalty, trust and satisfaction (Zheng et al., 2015).

Among the different social media platforms, Instagram is experiencing rapid growth in popularity with an estimated 1 billion active users worldwide and 107 million active users in the U.S. This number is forecasted to grow to 126 million by 2023 (Clement, 2019). Instagram is a mobile photo and video sharing application launched in 2010 and ranks second after Facebook for the most used site daily at 51% (Chaffey, 2019). However, Instagram is ahead of Facebook in regard to engagement levels, with a rate of 1.60% per posts for brands (Zote, 2019). According to Jordan's (2018) survey, Instagram is one of the top three social media platforms used by small businesses to engage customers and remain competitive with larger businesses.

While there are several studies on Facebook and how it leads to a positive financial outcome for the small businesses (e.g. Ainin, et al., 2015), there are few studies that examine Instagram's financial benefits and its ability to aid in relationship building between the users and small retailers. Instagram and small business studies found in the literature mainly focus on influencer advertising effects (e.g., Konstantopoulou et al., 2019) and marketing for a competitive advantage (e.g. Pavlova, 2018). Therefore, the proposed research attempts to examine how small apparel retailers can develop a strong social network and accumulate social capital in the Instagram platform that eventually lead to purchase intention.

The purpose of this study is to investigate customer's perceived benefit and development of social capital in a small apparel retailer's Instagram page that lead to purchase intentions for the retailer. This study will use the social capital theory (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman 1988; Putnam 1993) that postulates the idea of social value on communication networks (Carmichael et al., 2015). Several considerations were given in defining small apparel retailers in this current study. Small Business Administration (SBA) defines a small business as a business that has an annual maximum revenue of \$7.5 million (Small Business Administration, n.d.). The European Commission (2012) classifies small retailers as having fewer than 250 employees.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Social Capital Theory**

The social capital theory (e.g. Bourdieu, 1986) draws attention to the effects and consequences of human sociability, connectedness, and their relations to the individual and social structure (Tzanakis, 2013). According to Coleman (1988), social capital broadly refers to the resources accumulated through relationships among people. According to a framework developed by Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1988), social capital consists of three dimensions; structural, cognitive, and relational. The structural dimension refers to the connection between people (Bolino et al., 2002) characterized by the number and strength of the existing network ties between individuals and their network (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1988). Cognitive social capital is defined as "those resources providing shared representations, interpretations, and systems of meaning among parties" (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1988, p. 244). Lastly, the relational dimension refers to "the kind of personal relationships people have developed with each other through a history of interactions" (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1988 p. 244). Tsai and Ghoshal (1998) found that both structural and cognitive social capital were indicators of relational social capital. As a result, more studies have used and supported this theoretical relationship (e.g. Wang et al., 2016). This study will examine the three social capital dimensions; structural, cognitive, and relational, and how it can ultimately influence purchase intentions.

### **Perceived Social Capital Within the Instagram Community**

In this study, the perceived structural social capital within the retailers' Instagram community is defined as the amount of connection and interactivity the consumer perceives the retailer has based on their indication of affiliation and responsiveness on Instagram. In the context of social media, affiliation

refers to the total number of consumers connected to a brand (Yang et al., 2016), depicting ties with others on Instagram. Affiliation on Instagram will be evaluated by the number of posts, number of followers, and likes on the retailer's Instagram profile. In this study, responsiveness refers to the retailer's ability to respond promptly to comments, concerns, and customer service information of customers on Instagram.

Perceived cognitive social capital within the retailers' Instagram community is manifested through shared value and norm of reciprocity in this study. Morgan and Hunt (1994) define shared values as the extent to which partners have beliefs in common about what behaviors, goals, and policies are important or unimportant, appropriate, or inappropriate and right or wrong. Customers can share beliefs with a brand through different attributes such as ethical views, product quality, promotion tactics, or customer service. Norm of reciprocity is expecting benefits from the community from one's present contribution and participation, such as information flow and knowledge sharing (Kankanhalli et al., 2005). In the context of social media, the norm of reciprocity is shared through repeated interactions and social exchange, including the exchange of personal experiences and advice (Blau, 1964).

In this study, the perceived relational social capital refers to social bonding. Social bonding applies to strong relationships that provide emotional kinship, trust, and social support (Putnam, 2000). On Instagram, customers can feel a social bond with a small apparel retailer by having someone to turn to, to help make shopping decisions, a source of engagement, and ultimately considering them to be a friend.

## **Hypothesis Development**

### *Affiliation, Responsiveness and Social Bonding on Instagram*

Depending on the social media platform, consumers can be connected through different ways such as following, liking, and online brand communities. Hofer and Aubert (2013) found that the greater number of followers their participants possessed; online bonding increased. According to Ellison et al. (2014), if a Facebook status is without likes or comments this can signal a lack of interest from one's network. In contrast, more likes and comments can suggest retailers are invested in cultivating relationships which can allow small apparel retailers to build their reputation and network. Therefore, the hypothesis is as follows:

**H1:** *Customer's evaluation of small apparel retailer's Instagram affiliation will positively affect social bonding.*

Ahearne et al. (2007), linked responsiveness to the reliability of a salesperson by identifying who is "promptly returning phone calls, following up on commitments, fulfilling customer requests, and remaining available when needed" (p. 605). This definition can be translated into the social media context – small apparel retailers responding to complaints, comments, and other requests made on Instagram (Agnihotri et al., 2016). Social media creates two-way communication between customers and brands, allowing for customers to strengthen their relationship with the brand (Rishika et al., 2013). Therefore, the hypothesis is as follows:

**H2:** *Customer's evaluation of small apparel retailers' Instagram responsiveness will positively affect social bonding.*

### *Shared Value, Norm of Reciprocity and Social Bonding on Instagram*

Jin (2018) finds that customers' perception of authenticity for shared values and corporate competence influences self-brand connection. Social tie formation is driven by similar interest and shared activities (Zeng & Wei, 2013) therefore the hypothesis is as follows:

**H3:** *Perceived shared value within a small apparel retailer's Instagram page will positively affect social bonding.*

Norm of reciprocity catalyzes relationship and community building (e.g. Molm, 2010). Positive reciprocity is the exchange performed with good intentions or goals in mind, the foundation of trust, social capital, connectivity, and relationship maintenance, which strengthens off and online communities (e.g. Molm, 2010). Therefore, the hypothesis is as follows:

**H4:** *Perceived norm of reciprocity within a small apparel retailer's Instagram page will positively affect social bonding.*

#### *Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Enjoyment and Social Bonding on Instagram*

According to Hui et al., (2006), social adjustment is a type of perceived benefits that refers to the need of people to establish social identities by integrating into a desired social group. This concept can be applied to the small apparel retailers providing useful benefits to their customer, that makes them feel they are apart and included in their social group – ultimately developing a relationship. Therefore, this study hypothesizes:

**H5:** *Customer's perceived usefulness of a small apparel retailer's Instagram page will positively affect social bonding.*

Previous literature supports that enjoyment has a positive effect on continued intention to use a social networking service (Lin & Lu, 2011). If customers continue to follow the brand, their intention to building a relationship can increase, thus the hypothesis is as follows:

**H6:** *Customer's perceived enjoyment towards small apparel retailer's Instagram page will positively affect social bonding.*

#### *Social Bonding on Instagram and Brand Trust*

Trust can best be defined as a customer's willingness to rely on their exchange partner with the belief that they will be honest, be reliable, and engage in activities that only yield the best possible outcomes (Chellappa & Sim, 2005). Frequent social interactions grow into trusting relationships (Granovetter, 1985). Crotts, et al. (2001), finds social bonding to be a strong predictor of trust. The social bond that's created on social media influences the user's trust toward brands (Bertrand, 2013). Based on the above, the hypothesis is as follows:

**H7:** *Customer's social bonding within a small apparel retailer's Instagram page will positively affect trust towards the retailer.*

#### *Social Bonding on Instagram and Brand Identification*

According to Tuškej et al. (2013), consumer-brand identification refers to the individual's sense of sameness with a particular brand. Tate et al. (2016) found that the depth of a customer's engagement with online brands formed symbolic self-expression with the brand. Using this same logic, the social bond between the Instagram followers of small apparel retailers can develop brand identification, therefore the hypothesis is as follows:

**H8:** *Customer's social bonding within a small apparel retailer's Instagram page will positively affect their brand identification.*

#### *Brand Trust, Brand Identification and Purchase Intention*

Trust creates greater confidence and enhances the customer's pride in identifying with the brand (e.g. Kuenzel & Halliday, 2008). Becerra and Badrinarayanan (2013) finds that brand trust significantly reflects brand identification. When trust is formed, the relationship becomes highly valued in the eyes of

the consumer that lead them to demonstrate their belongingness by identifying with the brand (Becerra & Badrinarayanan, 2013). Therefore, the hypothesis is as follows:

**H9:** *Trust positively affect customer's brand identification with a small apparel retailer.*

Purchase intention is a customer's volitional commitment to purchase from a retailer (Kim et al., 2009). Becerra and Badrinarayanan (2013) states that trust and brand identification have the power to influence brand evangelism, which includes purchase intentions. Cornwell and Coote's (2005) study supports that the level a participant identifies with an organization is positively related to purchase intentions. Therefore, the hypothesis is as follows:

**H10:** *Brand identification will positively affect purchase intentions towards a small apparel retailer.*

Higher levels of trust will increase the likelihood that a consumer is willing to accept a level of vulnerability by forming an intention to purchase (Kim et al., 2009). Additionally, Konstantopoulou et al. (2019) found that once an Instagram influencer gained the participants' trust, the decision-making process was facilitated. Therefore, the hypothesis is:

**H11:** *Trust will positively affect customer's purchase intentions towards a small apparel retailer.*

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Instrument**

A three-item scale for affiliation was developed to measure participants' evaluation of small apparel retailer's affiliation on Instagram. Responsiveness items were adopted from Cenfetelli et al., (2008) with a .82 Cronbach alpha. For shared values adopted one item from Ko et al. (2005) and two from Tsai and Ghoshal (1998) were adopted. Norm of reciprocity items was adopted from Moghavvemi et al. (2017b) with a Cronbach alpha over .70. Perceived usefulness items were adopted from Davis et al. (1989). Perceived enjoyment items were adopted from Agarwal and Karahanna (2000) and Kim et al. (2007). Two items from Williams (2016) and three from Beatty et al. (1996) to measure social bonding. Four items were adopted from Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) to measure trust, with a .74 Cronbach alpha. Three items were adopted from Kuenzel and Halliday (2008) to measure consumer-brand identification, with a .81 Cronbach alpha. Three items are adopted from Kim et al. (2012) and Algesheimer et al. (2005) to measure purchase intentions. All items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

### **Data Collection**

To ensure wider participation of Millennial shoppers, two different strategies were used for data collection. First, the survey link was distributed to students at a large Southern university in the United States. As an incentive, participants received extra credit for the class. Also, snowball sampling was administered through the researcher's social media account. For both data collection methods, the researchers offered an incentive for participants to enter a drawing for a \$25 Amazon gift card.

Since this study was specifically about small apparel retailers on Instagram, two screening questions were asked at the beginning of the survey, (1) "Are you an Instagram user?" and (2) "Do you follow a small apparel retailer on Instagram?". Within the second screening question, the definition of a small apparel retailer was given. Following the second question, the respondent had to name the small apparel retailer they followed on Instagram, which they would use to base their answers for the remainder of the questionnaire.

## RESULTS

### Sample Characteristics

Out of 413 responses, 200 responses were usable, complete, and accurate. The researcher checked all given Instagram names of small apparel retailers to ensure they had less than 250 employees and had maximum revenue of \$27.5 million (clothing and shoe industry) or \$15 million (accessories and jewelry industry) (Small Business Administration, 2018). Based on the definitions above, the researcher Googled the given business names' annual revenue. If this information was not available, the researcher looked at other business information such as; the number of followers, likes, and verification on Instagram and the number of locations the retailer had. See Table 1 for detailed sample characteristics.

**TABLE 1**  
**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND FREQUENCIES**

Characteristic	N	%
Gender		
Female	164	82.4%
Male	35	17.6%
Age		
18-25	165	84.6%
26-30	22	11.3%
31-40	5	2.6%
40+	3	1.5%
Education		
Associate degree in college (2-year)	51	25.6%
Bachelor's degree in college (4-year)	57	28.6%
High school graduate	6	3.0%
Less than high school degree	1	0.5%
Professional degree (JD, MD)	1	0.5%
Some college but no degree	83	41.7%
Income		
Less than \$10,000	85	42.7%
\$10,001 - \$20,000	39	19.6%
\$20,001 - \$30,000	26	13.1%
\$30,001 - \$40,000	19	9.5%
\$40,001 - \$50,000	11	5.5%
\$50,001 - \$60,000	11	5.5%
\$60,001 - \$70,000	4	2.0%
Over \$100,000	4	2.0%

### Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify the underlying constructs among the measured variables. After the initial EFA, items with low loadings were carefully investigated. One item for perceived usefulness (.523) and one item for trust (.516) was deleted due to low loading and the conceptual vagueness of the terms used. Further, based on the EFA result, perceived usefulness was split into two constructs. After close inspection of each item, it was found that the first three items all relate to perceived usefulness while the last two speak more about perceived convenience. In addition to the EFA result, the literature supports that perceived convenience is a perceived benefit that influences user's behavior on social media and mobile devices (e.g. Cheung et al., 2015). As a result, perceived convenience was included in this study as another perceived benefit on Instagram. Once the low loading items were deleted, the final EFA was ran using 11 factors. The items loaded properly for the respective factors (Table 2).

**TABLE 2**  
**CONSTRUCT ITEMS**

Items	Factor Loading	Cronbach alpha	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perceived Affiliation		.738	3.49	0.963
Q1_1	0.575			
Q1_2	0.857			
Q1_3	0.859			
Perceived Responsiveness		.838	3.96	0.917
Q2_1	0.802			
Q2_2	0.828			
Q2_3	0.757			
Perceived Usefulness		.885	4.01	0.814
Q3a_1	0.658			
Q3a_2	0.684			
Q3a_3	0.590			
Perceived Convenience		.802	3.94	0.976
Q3b_1	0.652			
Q3b_2	0.790			
Perceived Enjoyment		.905	3.88	0.821
Q4_1	0.685			
Q4_2	0.814			
Q4_3	0.806			
Q4_4	0.801			
Shared Vales		.813	3.74	0.787
Q5_1	0.711			
Q5_2	0.762			
Q5_3	0.727			
Norm of Reciprocity		.857	3.51	0.894
Q6_1	0.664			
Q6_2	0.635			
Q6_3	0.698			
Q6_4	0.736			
Q6_5	0.711			
Social Bonding		.865	3.14	1.125
Q7_1	0.531			
Q7_2	0.786			
Q7_3	0.804			
Q7_4	0.732			
Q7_5	0.720			
Trust		.922	4.11	0.664
Q8_1	0.791			
Q8_2	0.855			
Q8_3	0.846			
Purchase Intentions		.795	4.00	0.781
Q9_1	0.722			
Q9_2	0.734			
Q9_3	0.545			
Brand Identification		.858	3.49	1.087
Q10_1	0.800			
Q10_2	0.837			
Q10_3	0.709			

## Hypothesis Testing Results

### *Structural Social Capital, Cognitive Social Capital and Perceived Benefit (H1-6)*

Multiple regression was conducted to test H1-H6 (Table 3). The analysis result shows that the norm of reciprocity had a significant positive effect on social bonding ( $p=.000$   $\beta= .343$ ), supporting H4. In addition, perceived convenience had a significant relationship to social bonding ( $p=.04$   $\beta= .109$ ). However, perceived affiliation, perceived responsiveness, shared values, perceived usefulness, and perceived enjoyment did not exhibit significant influence on social bonding (H1, H2, H3, H5, H6). Statistically significant relationships are in boldface.

**TABLE 3**  
**HYPOTHESIS 1-6 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS**

Hypotheses			<i>p</i>	Standardized Beta	Unstandardized Beta	t value
(H1)	PA	→ SB	.662	.020	.024	.437
(H2)	PR	→ SB	.346	-.050	-.061	-.944
(H3)	SV	→ SB	.079	.090	.129	1.759
<b>(H4)</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>→ SB</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.343</b>	<b>.432</b>	<b>6.885</b>
(H5a)	PU	→ SB	.634	.026	.026	.477
<b>(H5b)</b>	<b>PC</b>	<b>→ SB</b>	<b>.04</b>	<b>.109</b>	<b>.125</b>	<b>2.062</b>
(H6)	PE	→ SB	.097	.088	.120	1.665
R <sup>2</sup> = .228						

Note. PA = Perceived Affiliation; PR = Perceived Responsiveness; SV = Shared Values; NR = Norm of Reciprocity; PU = Perceived Usefulness; PC = Perceived Convenience; PE = Perceived Enjoyment, SB = Social Bonding.

### *Social Bonding, Trust, Brand Identification and Purchase Intention (H7-11)*

Linear regression analysis tested the relationship between social bonding and trust, H7 (Table 4). Social bonding was found to have significant influence on trust ( $p=.000$   $\beta= .269$ ). Multiple regression analysis tested H8 and H9 (Table 5) and found that trust and social bonding had significant influence on brand identification (trust,  $p=.000$   $\beta= .253$ , social bonding  $p=.000$   $\beta= .297$ ). Multiple regression analysis tested H10 and H11 (Table 6) and found that brand identification and trust had a significant relationship to purchase intentions (brand identification  $p=.000$   $\beta= .180$ , trust  $p=.000$   $\beta= .372$ ). Tables 4, 5, and 6 present statistically significant relationships in boldface.

**TABLE 4**  
**H7 LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULT**

Hypothesis 7		<i>p</i>	Standardized Beta	Unstandardized Beta	t value
<b>(H7)</b>	<b>SB → Trust</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.269</b>	<b>.159</b>	<b>6.839</b>
R <sup>2</sup> = .073					

Note. SB = Social Bonding.



**TABLE 5**  
**H8 AND 9 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS**

Hypotheses		<i>p</i>	Standardized Beta	Unstandardized Beta	t value
(H8) SB	→ BI	.000	.297	.287	7.773
(H9) Trust	→ BI	.000	.254	.414	6.617
R <sup>2</sup> = .192					

Note. SB = Social Bonding, BI = Brand Identification.

**TABLE 6**  
**H10 AND 11 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS**

Hypotheses		<i>p</i>	Standardized Beta	Unstandardized Beta	t value
(H10) BI	→ PI	.000	.180	.129	4.689
(H11) Trust	→ PI	.000	.372	.437	9.669
R <sup>2</sup> = .215					

Note. BI = Brand Identification, PI = Purchase Intentions.

#### Ad Hoc Analysis

Contrary to our expectation, the first multiple regression analysis (H1-6) found all but one of the independent variables had significant influence on social bonding. The initial reasoning was that the users will build relational social capital (i.e. social bonding) on the retailer's Instagram page before it is transferred to the retailer for stronger trust, brand identification, and purchase intention. While previous literature supported the initially hypothesized relationship, it is possible that younger consumers have different ways to build relationships on social media and in particular, towards a small apparel retailer. They might directly transfer the structural social capital, cognitive social capital, and perceived benefit from the Instagram page to the retailer, rather than formulating a strong social bonding for the Instagram page first. Therefore, an ad hoc multiple regression analysis tested the effect of structural and cognitive social capital and perceived benefit towards trust, brand identification, and purchase intentions. See the results below in Table 7, 8 and 9. Significant relationships are in bold.

**TABLE 7**  
**AD HOC MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS**

Hypotheses		<i>p</i>	Standardized Beta	Unstandardized Beta	t value
PA	→ Trust	.625	-.023	-.016	-.490
PR	→ Trust	.055	.101	.073	1.924
PU	<b>→ Trust</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.198</b>	<b>.162</b>	<b>3.618</b>
PC	→ Trust	.268	.058	.039	1.108
PE	<b>→ Trust</b>	<b>.006</b>	<b>.143</b>	<b>.116</b>	<b>2.741</b>
SV	<b>→ Trust</b>	<b>.025</b>	<b>.114</b>	<b>.097</b>	<b>2.250</b>
NR	<b>→ Trust</b>	<b>.024</b>	<b>.112</b>	<b>.083</b>	<b>2.259</b>
R <sup>2</sup> = .239					

**TABLE 8**  
**AD HOC MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS**

			Standardized	Unstandardized		
		<i>p</i>	Beta	Beta	t value	
PA	→	BI	.449	-.036	-.041	-.759
<b>PR</b>	→	<b>BI</b>	<b>.018</b>	<b>-.127</b>	<b>-.151</b>	<b>-2.367</b>
<b>PU</b>	→	<b>BI</b>	<b>.001</b>	<b>.191</b>	<b>.255</b>	<b>3.415</b>
PC	→	BI	.925	-.005	-.006	-.094
<b>PE</b>	→	<b>BI</b>	<b>.036</b>	<b>.112</b>	<b>.148</b>	<b>2.104</b>
<b>SV</b>	→	<b>BI</b>	<b>.002</b>	<b>.166</b>	<b>.229</b>	<b>3.188</b>
<b>NR</b>	→	<b>BI</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.223</b>	<b>.272</b>	<b>4.425</b>
R <sup>2</sup> = .208						

**TABLE 9**  
**AD HOC MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS**

			Standardized	Unstandardized		
		<i>p</i>	Beta	Beta	t value	
PA	→	PI	.984	.001	.001	.020
PR	→	PI	.124	.083	.070	1.540
<b>PU</b>	→	<b>PI</b>	<b>.021</b>	<b>.129</b>	<b>.124</b>	<b>2.310</b>
<b>PC</b>	→	<b>PI</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.227</b>	<b>.181</b>	<b>4.257</b>
PE	→	PI	.178	.072	.068	1.349
SV	→	PI	.441	.040	.040	.772
<b>NR</b>	→	<b>PI</b>	<b>.020</b>	<b>.117</b>	<b>.103</b>	<b>2.332</b>
R <sup>2</sup> = .208						

## DISCUSSION

### Conclusions

This study examined the impact of structural (i.e. perceived affiliation, perceived responsiveness) and cognitive (i.e. shared value, norm of reciprocity) social capital and perceived benefits (i.e. perceived usefulness, perceived convenience, perceived enjoyment) on relational social capital (i.e. social bonding) on Instagram. In addition, the relationships among social bonding on Instagram, trust, brand identification, and purchase intentions were examined. Lastly, the ad hoc multiple regression analysis found several other significant with influence of the social capital dimensions and perceived benefit dimensions on brand identification, trust, and purchase intentions. The relationships are discussed in detail in the following sections.

The influence of perceived affiliation and perceived responsiveness on social bonding were found to be insignificant. For a small apparel retailer, customers may have low expectations towards timely responses for their comments and the number of likes and followers by the retailer. Guta (2019) states that customer's high expectations for small businesses lie in the area of customer service; they expect a more honest and friendly service in comparison to large businesses. As a result, respondents didn't consider responsiveness and affiliation as a relationship-building factor with small apparel retailers.

The influence of shared values were found insignificant while norms of reciprocity were found to be a significant predictor of social bonding. Both shared values and norms of reciprocity represent cognitive social capital. When examining the items for shared values, it evaluates the respondents shared values with the retailer; in contrast, the norm of reciprocity items is about the respondent's exchange with others on the retailer's Instagram page. The difference between the two constructs is "who" their interaction is

with; shared values are directly with the retailer and the norm of reciprocity is with “others” on the retailer’s Instagram page. As a result, younger consumers may feel the interaction with others on a small apparel retailer’s Instagram is what helps develop a social bond with the retailer instead of the commonalities with the retailer. Sokolova & Kefi, (2019) found that in contrast to older consumers, younger consumers shared values is important when it comes to following a blogger online. This suggests that younger consumers value a mediator, such as an influencer to develop a relationship with a brand, specifically a small apparel retailer.

Perceived usefulness was found to be an insignificant predictor of social bonding. The items for perceived usefulness referred to how “useful” the small apparel retailer’s Instagram page is. That term could’ve been too vague and for the respondent to answer accurately. Kim et al., (2016) found source credibility to be a predictor of perceived usefulness. Source credibility is the “extent to which information is perceived to be believable, competent, and trustworthy by information recipients” (Bhattacharjee & Sanford, 2006 p.811). One way to develop source credibility is by reading online reviews; which isn’t common for small apparel retailers. Small retail shoppers may be aware of this, which suggests perceived usefulness is not a factor in building a social bond with a small apparel retailer’s Instagram page. Future studies are suggested to further investigate the mediating role of source credibility.

Perceived enjoyment did not present a significant influence on social bonding. The theory of para-social interaction defines the relationship between a spectator and a performer, with an illusion of intimacy as for the ‘real’ interpersonal relationships; this type of relationships is self-established by one party, but the other party is unaware of the relationship and influence (e.g. Kelman, 1958). Since perceived enjoyment is an intrinsic benefit, it could lead to para-social interaction instead of social bonding, which are action-based interactions. In addition, the para-social interaction concept can be also understood as an addiction and content consumption (e.g. Moghavvemi, et al., 2017a). This could suggest that customers may perceive enjoyment by using the social media site itself rather than a retailer’s Instagram content. As a result, the perceived enjoyment may not lead to a stronger bond or relationship with the small apparel retailer's Instagram page.

The ad-hoc multiple regression analysis found other significant relationships between the independent variables (i.e. perceived affiliation, perceived responsiveness, perceived usefulness, perceived convenience, perceived enjoyment, shared values, norm of reciprocity), and dependent variables (i.e. trust, brand identification, purchase intentions). The literature supports that younger consumers have various factors that encourage relationship building on social media. This is explained in the discussion below.

The ad hoc multiple analysis found perceived responsiveness, perceived usefulness, perceived enjoyment, and shared values have significant influence on brand identification. Brand identification can be expressed in various ways. Individuals can interwind themselves psychologically to the brand (So et al., 2017), which supports why shared values significantly relate to brand identification. Additionally, individuals develop a sense a sameness if the brand helps satisfy their self-definitional needs (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003), which can support why perceived responsiveness, perceived usefulness, and perceived enjoyment effects brand identification. Sahay & Sharma (2010) found that younger consumers connect with a brand as they associate their personality with the brand. This sense of oneness and reciprocity explains why shared values and norms of reciprocity were found to affect brand identification. Regarding perceived enjoyment and perceived responsiveness, Shaoolian (2018) states that responding to comments and customer service requests and imagery helps create a community that represents the brand. The benefits and reciprocity attribute built within Instagram carry over into consumer-brand identification with the small apparel retailer.

The results also indicate that perceived usefulness and perceived enjoyment influence trust. Previous literature supports that perceived usefulness positively affects trust in internet settings (e.g. Ye et al., 2019). However, the literature doesn’t support that perceived enjoyment leads to trust (Rouibah, et al., 2016). Rouibah et al. (2016) suggest it’s because their study was general and didn’t specify a mobile commerce site or application for brands or sites to be used as a reference to place a focus on trust. This

current study did use a specific application (Instagram) and brand (the choice of the respondent), which could explain the reason for a significant relationship between perceived enjoyment and trust.

In this study, both shared values and norms of reciprocity (i.e. cognitive social capital) were found to positively affect trust. Trust is commonly referred to as a component of the relational dimension of social capital (e.g. Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998:). The significant relationship between cognitive social capital and relational social capital is supported in the literature by several authors (e.g. Wang et al, 2016). Based on the literature, small apparel retailer customers look for attributes of usefulness, enjoyment, commonalities, and reciprocity on the retailer's Instagram page, to help develop trust towards the retailer.

Lastly, perceived usefulness, perceived convenience, and norm of reciprocity were found to significantly influence purchase intentions. The relationship between perceived usefulness and purchase intention is supported by Cho and Sagynov (2015). According to Johnson and Kaye (2002), perceived convenience has interactive and transactional abilities in the online context. Users have easy access to the small apparel retailer's Instagram page at any time, making it easier to form purchase intention. Personal reciprocity had a significant relationship to future purchase intentions in Wu et al., (2008) study. These variables are helpful decision-making aids, which could support why the above relationships were significant. Salpini (2017) found that social media influences more than 80% of Gen Z shopping purchases and 74% for Millennials; both Millennials and Gen Z are most influenced by Instagram. In addition, Schmall (2019), found that Millennials prefer to do business with small businesses over large businesses. According to that study, these were the reasons: "They're more convenient", "The experience is better" "It feels more personal" "Unique product and services", and "I like to support local residents and local economy". Based on Millennials and Gen Z's Instagram shopping influence and the reasons why they shop small, we can explain why perceived convenience, perceived usefulness, and norm of reciprocity is a significant predictor of purchase intentions.

Norm of reciprocity had an interesting finding; it was significant to all dependent variables – social bonding, trust, brand identification, and purchase intentions. McCorkindale, et al. (2013) found that engaging with Millennials to build relationships on social networking sites requires not only authenticity and transparency but reciprocity. This could support the reason why the norm of reciprocity had significant relationships with all dependent variables.

### **Implication**

By examining Instagram attributes, this study attempts to help small apparel retailers stay ahead with large retailers as well as the customers' demands. Small apparel retailers can use the results of this study to improve in the areas they may be lacking. For example, if they would like to increase purchase intentions, revisiting convenience factors (e.g. links to shop) on their Instagram page can help achieve the goal.

Small businesses usually struggle because they lack creating customer value, and fail to attract and retain customers (Chen, & Popvich, 2003; Rana, Bhat, & Rani, 2015). However, customer's purchase decisions are shifting and they are purchasing more private-label brands (Rosinski, 2018). This is an opportunity for small apparel retailers to create value and attract customers because they are inherently a one-of-a-kind. According to the findings of this study, brand identification had a significant relationship to purchase intention. Younger consumers identify with the brand when influencer marketing is used (Shaoolian, 2018; McEvoy, 2019). Small apparel retailers should partner with an influencer that resembles their brand easily and promote their unique product and provide experience through the influencer. Influencer marketing increases business performance and creates value to customers encouraging them to return, ultimately sustaining the small apparel retailer's business. This is one possible way to combat 50% of small businesses failing.

Norm of reciprocity was reported to have a significant effect on all dependent variables: social bonding, brand identification, trust, and purchase intentions. It was found that younger consumers have a "what can you do for me" attitude (Vorvoreanu, 2009). McCorkindale, et al. (2013) studied how Millennials engage and build relationships with organizations on Facebook. They found that reciprocity was a reoccurring theme in their respondents' answers. Specifically, responders said they were more

willing to “like” a page for an up and coming designer if they were given a discount. Other encouragement to “like” a page included celebrity endorsements and giveaways. Vorvoreanu (2009) also supports that relationships with Millennials on Facebook is encouraged through contests and offering discounts. Although these studies were about Facebook, the significant relationships with the norm of reciprocity in this study support it can apply to Instagram as well. A manager or owner of a small apparel retailer who has a younger customer audience can utilize these promotion tactics to attain and retain their customers. If they want to grow their audience on Instagram and increase profits, encouraging their customers through contests, giveaways and discounts is a way to do so.

The results and relationships of this study are based on younger customers of small apparel retailers in the US. Therefore, it directly helps small apparel retailers whose customers are Millennials or Gen Z. However, each retailer has its own specific customer base within a generational cohort, so moderation may be required.

### **Limitation and Future Studies**

A methodological limitation of this study is the sample amount of 200 and using snowball sampling. The study had a specific population, Instagram users who followed a small apparel retailer on Instagram, which limited the number of people qualified for the study. As a result, only 200 usable data were obtained. This lowers the generalizability of the study. Future studies could have a larger sample which could include other generational cohorts, providing different managerial implications. Another limitation of this study is the geographic location. Most responses came from students at a Southern University; therefore, the results favor the Southern small apparel retailer customers. Future studies could investigate a different geographic location for small apparel retailers in that area. This current study used perceived affiliation and perceived responsiveness to represent structural social capital, however, all but one of the relationships were significant. Future research could use different dimensions for structural social capital and replace social bonding with trust as the relational dimension of social capital. This could provide further insights for the social capital relationships on Instagram for small apparel retailers. Lastly, possible researchers could focus on one small apparel retailer, by administering the survey to that retailer’s customer via Instagram, email to newsletter subscribers, or in-person survey in the physical store.

### **REFERENCES**

- Agarwal, R., & Karahanna, E. (2000). Time flies when you're having fun: Cognitive absorption and beliefs about information technology usage. *MIS Quarterly*, 24(4), 665-694. doi:10.2307/3250951
- Agnihotri, R., Dingus, R., Hu, M., & Krush, M. (2016). Social media: Influencing customer satisfaction in B2B sales. *Industrial Marketing Management*. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2142/science/article/pii/S0019850115002631>
- Ahearne, M., Jelinek, R., & Jones, E. (2007). Examining the effect of salesperson service behavior in a competitive context. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35(4), 603-616.
- Ainin, S., Parveen, F., Moghavvemi, S., Jaafar, N. I., & Mohd Shuib, N.L. (2015). Factors influencing the use of social media by SMEs and its performance outcomes. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 115(3), 570-588.
- Algesheimer, R., Dholakia, U.M., & Herrmann, A. (2005). The social influence of brand communities: evidence from European car clubs. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3), 19-34.
- Beatty, S.E., Coleman, J.E., Reynolds, K.E., & Lee, J. (1996). Customer-sales associate retail relationships. *Journal of Retailing*, 72(3), 223-247.
- Becerra, E., & Badrinarayanan, V. (2013). The influence of brand trust and brand identification on brand evangelism. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 22(5/6), 371-383.
- Bertrand, G. (2013). Viewpoint: Social media research: Developing a trust metric in the social age. *International Journal of Market Research*, 55(3), 333-335. doi:10.2501/IJMR-2013-032

- Bhattacharya, C.B., & Sen, S. (2003). Consumer–company identification: A framework for understanding consumers’ relationships with companies. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(2), 76-88.
- Bhattacharjee, A., & Sanford, C.C. (2006). Influence processes for information technology acceptance: An elaboration likelihood model. *MIS Quarterly*, 30(4), 805-825.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bolino, M.C., Turnley, W.H., & Bloodgood, J.M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505-522.
- Carmichael, D., Archibald, J., & Lund, G. (2015). *Social Capital Theory in Social Media Research*. Retrieved from SSRN 2612872.
- Cenfetelli, R.T., Benbasat, I., & Sameh, A-N., (2008). Addressing the what and how of online services: Positioning supporting-services functionality and service quality for business-to-consumer success. *Information Systems Research*, 19(2), 161-181. Retrieved from <http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2126/10.1287/isre.1070.0163>
- Chaffey, D. (2019). *Global social media research summary*. Smart Insights. Retrieved from <https://www.smartinsights.com/social-media-marketing/social-media-strategy/new-global-social-media-research/>
- Chang, Y.T., Yu, H., & Lu, H.P. (2015). Persuasive messages, popularity cohesion, and message diffusion in social media marketing. *Journal of Business Research*, 68, 777-782. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.11.027
- Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M.B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93. doi:10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255
- Chellappa, R.K., & Sin, R.G. (2005). Personalization versus privacy: An empirical examination of the online consumer’s dilemma. *Information Technology and Management*, 6(2/3), 181-202.
- Cheung, C., Lee, Z.W.Y., & Chan, T.K.H. (2015). Self-disclosure in social networking sites. *Internet Research*, 25(2), 279-299. doi:<http://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2126/10.1108/IntR-09-2013-0192>
- Cho, J.R., Chung, J.E., & Hwang, J. (2015). Effects of satisfaction and trust on long-term orientation in small apparel retailer–supplier relationships. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 33(2), 83-98.
- Cho, Y.C., & Sagynov, E. (2015). Exploring factors that affect usefulness, ease of use, trust, and purchase intention in the online environment. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems (IJMIS)*, 19(1), 21-36.
- Clement, J. (2019). *Instagram: Number of users in the United States 2017-2023*. Statista. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/293771/number-of-us-instagram-users/>
- Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.
- Cornwell, T.B., & Coote, L.V. (2005). Corporate sponsorship of a cause: the role of identification in purchase intent. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(3), 268-276.
- Crotts, J.C., Coppage, C.M.A., & Andibo, A. (2001). Trust-commitment model of buyer-supplier relationships. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 25(2), 195-208. doi:10.1177/109634800102500206
- Davis, F., Bagozzi, R., & Warshaw, P. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. *Management Science*, 35(8), 982–1003. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.35.8.982>
- Duffin, E. (2019). *U.S. population by generation 2017*. Statista. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/797321/us-population-by-generation/>
- Ellison, N.B., Vitak, J., Gray, R., & Lampe, C. (2014). Cultivating social resources on social network sites: Facebook relationship maintenance behaviors and their role in social capital processes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(4), 855-870. doi:10.1111/jcc4.12078

- European Commission. (2012). *The New SME Definition. User Guide and Model Declaration*. Retrieved April 13, 2019, from [https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition_en)
- Granovetter, M.S. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481–510.
- Guta, M. (2019). *Customers expect small businesses to be friendlier than big ones, study says*. Small Business Trends. Retrieved from <https://smallbiztrends.com/2019/04/small-business-customer-expectations.html>
- He, W., Wang, F.K., Chen, Y., & Zha, S. (2017). An exploratory investigation of social media adoption by small businesses. *Information Technology and Management*, 18, 149-160. doi:10.1007/s10799-015-0243-3
- Hofer, M., & Aubert, V. (2013). Perceived bridging and bonding social capital on twitter: Differentiating between followers and followees. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2134-2142. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2013.04.038
- Hui, K., Tan, B., & Goh, C. (2006). Online information disclosure: Motivators and measurements. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT)*, 6(4), 415-441. doi:10.1145/1183463.1183467
- Jin, C.H. (2018). The effects of creating shared value (CSV) on the consumer self–brand connection: Perspective of sustainable development. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 25(6), 1246-1257.
- Johnson, T.J., & Kaye, B.K. (2002). Webelievability: A path model examining how convenience and reliance predict online credibility. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79(3), 619-642. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.library.unt.edu/login?url=https://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2165/docview/216930996?accountid=7113>
- Jordan, R.S. (2018). *Social media marketing strategies used by small retail businesses*. Doctoral dissertation, Walden University.
- Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B.C., & Wei, K-K. (2005). Contributing knowledge to electronic knowledge repositories: An empirical investigation. *MIS Quarterly*.
- Kelman, H. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(1), 51–60.
- Kim, D.J., Ferrin, D.L., & Rao, H.R. (2009). Trust and satisfaction, two stepping stones for successful e-commerce relationships: A longitudinal exploration. *Information Systems Research*, 20(2), 237-57.
- Kim, H.W., Chan, H.C., & Gupta, S. (2007). Value-based adoption of mobile internet: an empirical investigation. *Decision Support Systems*, 43(1), 111-126.
- Kim, H.W., Xu, Y., & Gupta, S. (2012). Which is more important in Internet shopping, perceived price or trust? *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 11(3), 241-252.
- Kim, M.J., Chung, N.H., Lee, C.K., & Preis, M.W. (2016). Dual-route of persuasive communications in mobile tourism shopping. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33(2), 293e308.
- Ko, D., Kirsch, K.J., & King, W.R. (2005). Antecedents of knowledge transfer from consultants to clients in enterprise system implementations. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 59-85.
- Konstantopoulou, A., Rizomyliotis, I., Konstantoulaki, K., & Badahdah, R. (2019). Improving SMEs' competitiveness with the use of Instagram influencer advertising and eWOM. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 27(2), 308-321.
- Kuenzel, S., & Halliday, S.V. (2008). Investigating antecedents and consequences of brand identification. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 17(5), 293-304.
- Lin, K., & Lu, H. (2011). Why people use social networking sites: An empirical study integrating network externalities and motivation theory. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 27(3), 1152-1161. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2010.12.009
- McCorkindale, T., DiStaso, M.W., & Sisco, H.F. (2013). How millennials are engaging and building relationships with organizations on Facebook. *The Journal of Social Media in Society*, 2(1).

- Moghavvemi, S., Sharabati, M., Paramanathan, T., & Rahin, N. M. (2017a). The impact of perceived enjoyment, perceived reciprocal benefits and knowledge power on students' knowledge sharing through Facebook. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(1), 1-12.
- Moghavvemi, S., Sulaiman, A.B., Jaafar, N.I.B., & Kasem, N. (2017b). Facebook and youtube addiction: The usage pattern of Malaysian students. *2017 International Conference on Research and Innovation in Information Systems (ICRIIS)*, pp. 1–6.
- Molm, L. (2010). The structure of reciprocity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 73(2), 119–131.
- Morgan, R.M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.library.unt.edu/login?url=https://libproxy.library.unt.edu:2165/docview/227767551?accountid=7113>
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242-266.
- Noel, N.M. (2014). A benchmark process for measuring consumer perceptions of total quality. *International Journal of Market Research*, 56, 149-166. doi:10.2501/IJMR-2014-012
- OECD. (2010). *SMEs, entrepreneurship and innovation*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Pavlova, A. (2018). *Instagram marketing for business promotion by SMEs: Evidence from the Republic of Karelia*. Bachelor's thesis, JAMK University of Applied Sciences. Retrieved from [https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/159342/Pavlova\\_Anna.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/159342/Pavlova_Anna.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Rishika, R., Kumar, A., Janakiraman, R., & Bezawada, R. (2013). The effect of customers' social media participation on customer visit frequency and profitability: An empirical investigation. *Information Systems Research*, 24(1), 108–127. doi:10.1287/isre.1120.0460
- Rosinski, M. (2018). *Shopping without brands? How the growing popularity of non-brand-name products reflects larger shifts in consumers' retail expectations*. Geo Marketing. Retrieved from <https://geomarketing.com/shopping-without-brands-how-the-growing-popularity-of-non-brand-name-products-reflects-larger-shifts-in-consumers-retail-expectations>
- Rouibah, K., Lowry, P.B., & Hwang, Y. (2016). The effects of perceived enjoyment and perceived risks on trust formation and intentions to use online payment systems: New perspectives from an Arab country. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 19, 33-43.
- Sahay, A., & Sharma, N. (2010). Brand relationships and switching behaviour for highly used products in young consumers. *Vikalpa*, 35(1), 15-30.
- Salpini, C. (2017). *Study: 80% of Gen Z purchases influenced by social media*. Retail Dive. Retrieved from <https://www.retaildive.com/news/study-80-of-gen-z-purchases-influenced-by-social-media/447249/>
- Schaupp, L.C., & Bélanger, F. (2014). The value of social media for small businesses. *Journal of Information Systems*, 28(1), 187–207. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2308/isys-50674>
- Schmall, T. (2019). *Why millennials plan to shop more at small businesses this year*. New York Post. Retrieved from <https://nypost.com/2019/05/13/why-millennials-plan-to-shop-more-at-small-businesses-this-year/>
- Shaoolian, G. (2018). *How to use social media to get Millennials to buy from you*. Entrepreneur. Retrieved from <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/323275>
- Small Business Administration. (2018). *2018 Small Business Profile*. Retrieved from <https://www.sba.gov/sites/default/files/advocacy/2018-Small-Business-Profiles-US.pdf>
- Small Business Administration. (n.d.). *Basic Requirements*. Retrieved from <https://www.sba.gov/federal-contracting/contracting-guide/basic-requirements>
- So, K. K. F., King, C., Hudson, S., & Meng, F. (2017). The missing link in building customer brand identification: The role of brand attractiveness. *Tourism Management*, 59, 640-651.



- Sokolova, K., & Kefi, H. (2019). Instagram and YouTube bloggers promote it, why should I buy? How credibility and parasocial interaction influence purchase intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*.
- Tate, M., Gao, H., Zhang, H., & Johnstone, D. (2016). *How to be a good frand in China: An exploratory study of effective social media behaviours for foreign brands*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01432.
- Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4), 464-476.
- Tuškej, U., Golob, U., & Podnar, K. (2013). The role of consumer–brand identification in building brand relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(1), 53-59. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.022
- Tzanakis, M. (2013). Social capital in Bourdieu's, Coleman's and Putnam's theory: Empirical evidence and emergent measurement issues. *Educate*, 13(2), 2-23.
- Wang, T., Yeh, R. K. J., Chen, C., & Tsydypov, Z. (2016). What drives electronic word-of-mouth on social networking sites? Perspectives of social capital and self-determination. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33(4), 1034-1047.
- Williams, D. (2006). On and off the 'net: Scales for social capital in an online era. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(2), 593–628. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00029.x>
- Wu, W.P., Chan, T.S., & Lau, H.H. (2008). Does consumers' personal reciprocity affect future purchase intentions? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(3-4), 345-360.
- Xero. (n.d.). *How your business can compete with larger retailers*. Retrieved from <https://www.xero.com/us/resources/small-business-guides/business-management/compete-large-retailers/>
- Yang, S., Lin, S., Carlson, J.R., & Ross, W.T. (2016). Brand engagement on social media: Will firms' social media efforts influence search engine advertising effectiveness? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32(5–6), 526–557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2016.1143863>
- Ye, S., Ying, T., Zhou, L., & Wang, T. (2019). Enhancing customer trust in peer-to-peer accommodation: A “soft” strategy via social presence. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 79, 1-10.
- Zheng, X., Cheung, C. M., Lee, M. K., & Liang, L. (2015). Building brand loyalty through user engagement in online brand communities in social networking sites. *Information Technology and People*, 28, 90-106. doi:10.1108/ITP-08-2013-0144
- Zote, J. (2019). *Sixty-five social media statistics to bookmark in 2019*. Sprout Social. Retrieved from <https://sproutsocial.com/insights/social-media-statistics/>