



European Journal  
of Marketing

**Consumers' self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand: cognitive network influence and brand outcomes.**

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	EJM-07-2015-0442.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Homophily, Brand Loyalty, Brand Love, Word of Mouth, Social Tie Strength, Self-congruence

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Consumers' self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand: cognitive network influence and brand outcomes

### **Abstract:**

**Purpose:** Brand 'Likes' on Facebook facilitate self-expression, forming part of consumers' virtual selves. Yet consumers' brand 'Likes' may bear little resemblance to their material realities. This paper tests similarities of brand image with self-image for Facebook 'Likes' to determine whether self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand leads to positive offline brand outcomes. It also investigates whether consumers' perceptions about their Facebook social relations influence self-congruent brand 'Likes'.

**Design/methodology/approach:** A large-scale survey was conducted of regular Facebook users who 'Liked' brands. Data from 438 respondents was analysed and hypotheses tested using structural equation modeling.

**Findings:** Empirical results show that the perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand increases with social tie strength. Perceived social tie strength is informed by perceived attitude homophily. When the perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand is higher, brand love and word of mouth are enhanced. Consumers also have greater brand loyalty and offer more word of mouth when brands are loved.

**Research limitations/implications:** Findings demonstrate the influence of consumers' cognitive network on 'Likes' and brand outcomes. Further replication would enhance generalisability. Future research should use a wider sample and investigate other variables.

**Practical implications:** Findings support managers seeking to grow and analyse Facebook 'Likes', by providing insights into brand loyalty, brand love and word of mouth for 'Liked' brands.

**Originality/value:** The paper addresses the dearth of research exploring how consumers' perceptions of their Facebook network influence their online brand behaviour and how perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand relates to brand outcomes.

**Keywords:** *Self-congruence, homophily, social tie strength, brand loyalty, brand love, word of mouth.*

**Article classification:** Research paper.

## 1. Introduction

Critical to understanding the relationship between consumers, brands, and brand outcomes is self-congruence, also referred to in the literature as self-image congruence, self-congruity and image congruence (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006). Self-concept theory states that people seek to maintain their self-concept, in part through the products and brands they own, seek to own, or do not wish to own (Graeff, 1996). Self-congruence is evident where the brand-user image (or personality) of a given product, brand, or store matches consumer's self-concept (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006; Sirgy *et al.*, 1997). When a consumer believes their (ideal or actual) self-concept fits a brand's personality, they experience greater (ideal or actual) self-congruence, which results in positive outcomes, such as stronger brand loyalty (Sirgy, 1982), positive self-perceptions and intention to re-use (Roy and Rabbane, 2015) and favourable brand attitudes and greater purchase intention (Aguirre-Rodriguez *et al.*, 2012; Kressmann *et al.*, 2006).

Until recently, research on self-congruence with brands was offline centred, where brand consumption involved physical interactions. Recently research has broadened the exploration of the self-concept to consider the role of brands in the construction of the online self (Back *et al.*, 2010; Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012), where 'consumption' is virtual (Schau and Gilly, 2003). With the growth and ubiquity of online social networks sites (SNS), such as Facebook, users continue to use possessions to project aspects of themselves, with particular brands creating, in part, an aggregated self, cognisant of the affirmation that friendship social networks can provide (Belk, 2013). In online social networks, consumers use brands as a 'shorthand', to create a self-identity by 'describing to others who they are, as well as who they are not' (Schau and Gilly, 2003, p. 400). A critical distinction between online and offline brand 'consumption' is that brands used for self-presentation on SNS may never be owned, but are 'consumed' through interaction social networks (Schau and Gilly, 2003; Sekhon *et al.*, 2015). However, on SNS, consumers' choices of brands are highly public (Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012). Therefore brands may, arguably, be more critical to the self-concept in this virtual world, than offline. Recent literature has therefore argued for further investigation of self-congruence in consumers' self-presentation on SNS (Belk, 2013).

Extant research on Facebook has examined whether SNS facilitate presentation of the actual or ideal self (Back *et al.*, 2010; Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012). Back *et al.* (2010) find that on SNS, such as Facebook, consumers express their self through profiles, which tend to reflect the actual self. However, Back *et al.*'s (2010) research focuses on the relationship

1  
2  
3 between ones' personality as presented on Facebook, and ones' offline personality. As such  
4 posts directly describe the individual, the authors acknowledge that Facebook users may be  
5 cognisant of their friends' ability to provide 'accountability and subtle feedback' on ones'  
6 Facebook identity and therefore may be less likely to present an idealised self (Back *et al.*,  
7 2010, p. 372).  
8  
9

10  
11 Less is known about the extent to which other Facebook activities are used to project a  
12 self, which friendship networks may not be in a position to evaluate or authenticate. Schau  
13 and Gilly (2003) suggested, for example, that consumers may include products in their  
14 Facebook profiles that are outside their material reality, for the purpose of impression  
15 management. As Schau and Gilly (2010, p. 394) note 'consumers construct and post personal  
16 Web sites as a form of conspicuous self-presentation where every element is chosen for its  
17 semiotic potential'. Following their research on consumer Facebook profiles, Back *et al.*  
18 (2010) call for the role of specific profile components such as photos or preferences, in  
19 investigating the online self, versus the offline self. Extant literature suggests that consumers  
20 who 'Like' can potentially lack any true sense of identification with a brand, and may merely  
21 be superficially interested in it (Zaglia, 2013).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Hollenbeck and Kaikati's (2012) pioneering work has broadened the investigation of self-  
32 concept on Facebook, and explored consumers' uses of brands as a means to provide cues to  
33 the self. They extend Back *et al.*'s (2010) research exploring Facebook users' use of brands  
34 'as more subtle cues about themselves' (Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012, p. 396). Hollenbeck  
35 and Kaikati (2012) identified that consumers use brands to mould others' impressions of  
36 themselves and may represent either the ideal and/or the actual self, through interactions with  
37 brands. Drawing on insights from a substantial study of Facebook users, they revealed that  
38 consumers' use of brands provided more subtle ideal-self expressions that had previously  
39 'slipped under the radar' (Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012, p. 403). Their study also found that  
40 the ideal and actual self sometimes conflict on Facebook and may blend (congruous) or  
41 conflict (incongruous) but when the identities are congruous, participants indicate either ideal  
42 or actual selves through brands.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 This study explores consumers' self-congruence with Facebook 'Likes' for brands.  
52 While consumers may 'Like' many things, including causes, or events, this study focuses on  
53 consumers' 'Likes' for brands. The 'Like' function for brands allows consumers to share  
54 pages from that brand's website on their own Facebook profile, and by clicking 'Like' the  
55 consumer opts into receiving updates from the brand that will appear in their news feeds  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Richard and Guppy, 2014). When consumers link themselves to brands via Facebook  
4 'Likes', this also creates an impression on others, as consumers are linking themselves  
5 'publicly and deliberately' to brands (Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012, p. 397). Research on  
6 social network stimuli indicated that 'advertising on Facebook significantly can affect sales,  
7 primarily in the long run, and particularly by creating 'Likes'' (Brettel *et al.*, 2015, p. 170).  
8 However, on Facebook, consumers often 'Like' brands that are outside their material realities  
9 (Schau and Gilly, 2003; Sekhon *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, although the consumer can 'Like' a  
10 brand on their Facebook profile, 'Liking' may not signify a 'true' brand relationship, as one  
11 can 'Like' brands without purchasing them (Belk, 2013). In addition, although 'Liked'  
12 brands are value-expressive, as they are associated with a group or person (Bearden and Etzel,  
13 1982), they may not always be self-congruent. Financial incentives (Wong, 2010),  
14 information seeking (Parker, 2012) and a desire for identity construction (Douma, 2008) may  
15 motivate 'Likes' that are incongruent with the self. Clearly, the self-congruence with  
16 Facebook 'Likes' requires further investigation.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Facebook friends also influence a consumer's own 'Liking' behaviour. Socialisation  
28 agents such as peers can influence the acceptance of certain products (Hogg *et al.*, 2009). As  
29 such, the number of Facebook friends' 'Likes' have been found to significantly influence  
30 purchase intentions (Richard and Guppy, 2014). Facebook facilitates the development,  
31 transfer, negotiation and alteration of brand meaning, as the interplay between social  
32 interaction on Facebook, the self, and one's socially visible character influences the meaning  
33 of an object (Ligas and Cotte, 1999). Therefore, when a consumer interacts with a brand on  
34 Facebook (for example by 'Liking' it), the interplay between that consumer, the brand  
35 'Liked', and their Facebook friends' interpretation of this 'Like' informs the meaning of the  
36 brand and how the consumer's socially visible character is perceived. Thus, consumers'  
37 Facebook friends encourage them to consider their network displays more carefully (Schau  
38 and Gilly, 2003) and consequently the Facebook friendship structure may influence the  
39 brands consumers 'Like'. An investigation of self-congruent 'Liking' should therefore  
40 consider the effect of consumers' friendship structures on the self-congruence with their  
41 'Likes'.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Within this context, this study seeks to address the managerial and academic  
53 understanding of Facebook brand 'Likes', their influences and outcomes. Specifically, we  
54 first examine whether consumers' cognitive networks, that is, their perceptions of their  
55 Facebook social network structure, influence the extent to which their brand 'Likes' are self-  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 congruent. Second, we explore whether self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand leads to positive  
4 offline brand outcomes.  
5

6  
7 This research contributes to the literature in various ways. First, we respond to  
8 Hollenbeck and Kaikati's (2012) call for quantitative research to compliment and validate  
9 their findings about consumers' expressions of self via Facebook. Specifically, in our  
10 quantitative study, we adopt Hollenbeck and Kaikati's (2012) contention that the self  
11 presented on Facebook may be either an actual or an ideal self.  
12  
13  
14

15  
16 Second, our research also addresses the call by Belk (2013) to explore network features  
17 as a means of better understanding consumers' relationships with brands. It is recognised that  
18 individuals engaging in self-presentation may be sensitive to impression management,  
19 seeking to project images of themselves that they consider to be appropriate to a particular  
20 target audience (Leary and Allen, 2011). On social networks, extant research suggests that  
21 self-presentation behaviour is informed by social tie strength. Therefore, by exploring the  
22 relationship between perceived social tie strength and self-congruent 'Likes', we advance  
23 knowledge in relation to consumers' relationships with others on their online social networks.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


29  
30 Third, although attracting Facebook 'Likes' remains a potentially valuable marketing  
31 strategy for marketers (Hollis, 2011), less is known about the relationship between brand  
32 'Likes' and offline brand behaviours, such as brand loyalty or word of mouth (WOM). Thus,  
33 this issue merits investigation. In the current study, we expand recent insights (Richard and  
34 Guppy, 2010) by examining the influence of the self-congruence with ones' 'Likes' on brand  
35 outcomes (i.e. brand loyalty, brand love and WOM). To the best of our knowledge, no  
36 previous studies have quantitatively investigated this relationship.  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 In the following sections we elaborate on the theoretical underpinnings of our research.  
43 We then provide information about data collection and analysis, and report the findings.  
44 Finally, we discuss the implications of those findings for practitioners and identify  
45 opportunities for further research.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 2. Conceptual framework and hypotheses

The model presented in Figure 1 depicts the relationships in our study. We investigate the perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand on Facebook by considering the influence of consumers' perceptions about their friendship network on their self-congruent 'Likes' and by examining the relationship between self-congruent 'Likes' and offline brand outcomes.

**Figure 1:** Conceptual framework



Recent literature on consumers' interactions with brands identifies the importance of social interactions in the negotiation and adoption of brands (Hogg *et al.*, 2009). Interactions between friends have been found to positively influence brand self-congruence (Reingen *et al.*, 1984), which leads to positive brand outcomes. For example, young consumers will develop a strong self-connection with a brand when there is a strong relationship between the brand and their reference group and where their self-concept is strongly connected to that reference group (Escalas and Bettman, 2003). Consumers are motivated by public self-motives and may choose brands that are consistent with a social self-concept, for the purpose of social acceptance or self-enhancement (Aguirre-Rodriguez *et al.*, 2012). To better understand the relationship between social interactions and self-congruent brands, brand 'Likes' on Facebook are an interesting context of study. Facebook permits an 'idealised view' of ones' self-narrative (Belk, 2013, p. 484). Extant research suggests that consumers who use brands as

1  
2  
3 part of that self-narrative may present both ideal and actual versions of themselves through  
4 those brands (Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012).

5  
6 As noted earlier, extant research has called for an exploration of network features when  
7 seeking to understand consumers' relationships with brands (Belk, 2013). Therefore, we ask:  
8 to what extent do ones' Facebook friendships inform the extent to which 'Likes' are self-  
9 congruent? We explore the influence of consumers' perceptions about their Facebook  
10 network on consumers' online brand behaviours. Specifically, we investigate whether the  
11 characteristic of homophily influences perceived social tie strength (Granovetter, 1973) and  
12 we examine whether social tie strength influences the extent to which brand 'Likes' are self-  
13 congruent.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 In an offline context, identification with brands requires ownership (Muniz and O'Guinn,  
21 2001). On social networks such as Facebook, brands 'consumed' often remain outside the  
22 consumer's material reality, and brand 'Likes' do not require the financial commitment of a  
23 purchase (Schau and Gilly, 2003). Hollenbeck and Kaikati (2012) observe that brand 'Likes'  
24 may reflect an idealised self, with over 70% of their respondents reporting that more brands  
25 represented aspects of the idealised self, rather than the actual self. In their pioneering  
26 research on Facebook users, they found that information directly created by the user (such as  
27 a 'Like' for a brand), was used to mould others' impressions of them. In our study, we build  
28 upon this important work, by quantitatively measuring each consumer's self-congruence with  
29 a 'Liked' brand, on Facebook.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 In addition, our research considers how each consumer's self-congruence with a 'Liked'  
38 brand influences brand outcomes. Although managers are becoming more comfortable with  
39 the use of social networks for their brands, the issue of ROI remains a challenge (Hoffman  
40 and Fodor, 2010). While managers seek to enhance the number of 'Likes' for their brands,  
41 consumers may use those 'Likes' to co-construct virtual identities, without any 'true' brand  
42 relationship (Schau and Gilly, 2003). It is therefore important to distinguish between the 'real  
43 aficionados' of brands and the 'poseurs' who use brands on social networks merely to  
44 enhance the self (Belk, 2013, p. 493).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Offline, common outcomes of consumers' self-congruence with brands are brand loyalty  
52 (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006), brand love (Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014) and positive WOM  
53 (Saenger *et al.*, 2013). Our study seeks to offer new insights into the relationship between  
54 self-congruence and these offline brand outcomes, when the brand is 'Liked' in the virtual  
55 world of Facebook. Thus, we ask: do self-congruent 'Likes' also lead to those positive brand  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 outcomes? Specifically, we investigate the relationship between the extent to which 'Likes'  
4 are self-congruent, and the brand outcomes of brand loyalty, brand love and WOM. We next  
5 describe our hypotheses in more detail.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 2.1 *The social network and self-congruent 'Liking'*

11  
12 Social networks can be defined as a set of actors with relationships, or ties, between them  
13 (Goldenberg *et al.*, 2009). On Facebook, when one 'friends' another, the friendship  
14 relationship is reciprocal. Therefore, when a consumer 'Likes' a brand on Facebook, it  
15 appears on their profile page, and on their friends' pages, increasing the social  
16 conspicuousness of the brands they 'Like'. Belk (2013, p. 484) notes that 'Facebook is now a  
17 key part of self presentation for one sixth of humanity', and that 'friends co-construct and  
18 reaffirm each others' sense of self' through content and through response to others' content.  
19 Brand 'Likes' are an example of such content. Facebook allows consumers to 'Like' brands  
20 to construct selves that are not necessarily consistent with true selves, or their material  
21 realities (Schau and Gilly, 2003), for example by 'Liking' aspirational brands, or those  
22 approved by a social group. Brand 'Likes' can therefore serve to create a group-self (Hogg *et*  
23 *al.*, 2009), informed by the brand meanings imbued by Facebook friends.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Brand choices, and the extent to which those choices are self-congruent, depend heavily  
34 on the consumer's social structural unit and the nature of the social relations within that unit  
35 (Reingen *et al.*, 1984). In particular, as Belk (2013) explains, differences in digital  
36 relationships are informed by Granovetter's (1973) ideas about relational structure and social  
37 ties. Therefore, we first examine how perceived social relations within the Facebook social  
38 network influence the extent to which 'Liked' brands are self-congruent. This study measures  
39 consumer perceptions of their social relations, rather than actual existing social relations.  
40 Objective studies of existing social relations suggest that a social network is an external  
41 constraint over which the consumer has little control. While measurement of such structures  
42 may be important to investigations of product diffusion for example, Marsden (1990) explains  
43 that measures of 'cognitive networks', that is, social relations as perceived by the actors  
44 within them, are more appropriate when studying social influences on attitudes and opinions.  
45 Specifically, we consider the influence of perceived homophily (Lazarsfeld and Merton,  
46 1954) on perceived social tie strength (Granovetter, 1973), and we explore the extent to which  
47 perceived social tie strength is an antecedent of self-congruent brand 'Likes'.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Homophily is the principle that ‘contact between similar people occurs at a higher rate  
4 than among dissimilar people’ (McPherson *et al.*, 2001, p. 416). It is long recognised as an  
5 organizing standard that informs social structures (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1954; Marsden,  
6 1988). In homophilous relationships, ‘birds of a feather will flock together’. For example, age  
7 homophily is evident in social affiliations, interactions, and interpersonal networked  
8 connections (Louch, 2000). If an individual’s Facebook friend network is comprised of  
9 people in their twenties, there is a high probability that person is also in their twenties. In this  
10 study, we distinguish between perceived attitude homophily and perceived status homophily.  
11 Perceived attitude homophily considers the extent to which consumers believe their network  
12 friends are attitudinally alike, whereas perceived status homophily considers the extent to  
13 which consumers believe their network friends are from similar socioeconomic backgrounds  
14 (McCroskey *et al.*, 1975). In sum, homophily asserts that people will have a natural tendency  
15 to socialise more frequently with those who are more like themselves.  
16  
17

18 The frequency of interactions can be represented as social tie strength. On social  
19 networks, each individual is a ‘node’ connected to other nodes. Connections between nodes  
20 are known as social ties (Newman, 2010). The strength of a tie is defined as ‘a (probably)  
21 linear combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual  
22 confiding) and the reciprocal services which characterise the tie’ (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1361).  
23 The principle of homophily in a dyadic tie network such as Facebook will be influenced by  
24 the similarity of those individuals. When people perceive their friends are more like them,  
25 they are likely to interact with them more frequently. Therefore, we postulate that consumers  
26 who believe their Facebook friends are more like them will also perceive those ties to be  
27 stronger. We posit:  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 *H1a: Greater perceived attitude homophily is positively associated with greater*  
44 *perceived social tie strength.*  
45

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*H1b: Greater perceived status homophily is positively associated with greater*  
*perceived social tie strength.*

When one ‘Likes’ a brand on Facebook, the brand is assimilated into one’s profile,  
forming cues for others to form an impression about them. Thus, the Facebook self is co-  
constructed through interactions with other networked friends (Belk, 2013) and attachment to  
other group members informs the negotiation of brand meaning within that social  
environment (Hogg *et al.*, 2009). On a Facebook friendship network, differences between

1  
2  
3 distant versus immediate friends inform what brands consumers will share with others and  
4 how those items will be interpreted and assimilated into an extended self (Belk, 2013).  
5

6  
7 In investigating the relationship between individuals, their friends, and consumers' use of  
8 brands on social networks, Belk (2013) cautions that a distinction must be made between  
9 those who are closer on ones' network who forge and reinforce bonds with products and those  
10 who are more remote. Hollenbeck and Kaikati (2012) also helpfully note 'friend' on  
11 Facebook may not carry the usual connotation and they suggest weaker ties between  
12 individuals may allow a consumer to create a more idealised version of themselves, without  
13 as much risk of social sanction. Clearly, in an investigation of self-congruence through  
14 brands 'Liked' on Facebook, it is important to distinguish between strong and weak ties.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Granovetter's (1973) strong ties versus weak ties are a means to understand these  
22 relationships (Belk, 2013). Granovetter (1973) defined social ties in terms of friends'  
23 perceptions about their emotional intensity, their mutual intimacy and their degree of  
24 reciprocity. On Facebook, stronger ties exist between individuals who communicate more  
25 frequently, consider each other to be 'true' friends and are involved in each other's lives.  
26 Extant literature suggests that strong ties are positively associated with shared tastes (Lewis *et*  
27 *al.*, 2008). Likewise, Reingen *et al.*'s (1984) work on social ties suggested self-congruence  
28 with a brand in an offline context depended in part on the type of social relation between  
29 individuals and their structural unit. However, Reingen *et al.*'s (1984) research was limited to  
30 the offline social setting of the college sorority. Less is known about the extent to which  
31 consumers' perceived social relations influence the self-congruence with brands in an online  
32 context. Cognizant that common bonds provide coordinates for the self in consumption  
33 settings (Hogg *et al.*, 2009) such as Facebook, where online consumption of brands may  
34 never require a brand purchase (Schau and Gilly, 2003), allowing consumers to associate with  
35 any brand, regardless of its existence in their material reality and cognizant that Facebook  
36 brand consumption may be influenced by the strength of the social relation with networked  
37 others (Belk, 2013), we propose that social tie strength will influence the extent to which  
38 consumers 'Like' brands on Facebook that are self-congruent. As such, we hypothesise:  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 *H2: Greater perceived social tie strength is positively associated with greater*  
52 *perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand.*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 2.2 Brand self-congruence and brand outcomes

Extant literature suggests that ‘Likes’ by the self, or by friends, is positively associated with consumers’ purchase intentions (Richard and Guppy, 2014). However, as Lapointe (2012, p. 286) notes, ‘to truly understand the predictive value of a Fan, we need to acknowledge that not all fans are created equal’. Although some consumer fans may be brand devotees, other subgroups may lack positive affect towards the brand and may be only superficially interested in it (Zaglia, 2013). Earlier we noted that consumers may ‘Like’ for many reasons, such as to enter competitions or to achieve discounts (Wallace *et al.*, 2014), or to present an augmented self-identity that is far removed from the customer’s material reality (Schau and Gilly, 2003).

In the offline world, extant literature identifies a positive relationship between brand self-congruence and brand outcomes, such as positive brand affect (Mazodier and Merunka, 2012), brand love (Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014), brand loyalty (Kressman *et al.*, 2006), and brand WOM (Saenger *et al.*, 2013). We contend, therefore, that self-congruent ‘Likes’ will also lead to positive brand outcomes, specifically brand loyalty, brand love, and brand WOM, for those brands.

We first explore the relationship between the perceived self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand and brand loyalty. Extant studies in an offline context reveal an important role for self-congruence in the creation of brand loyalty (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006; Malär *et al.*, 2011; Malhotra, 1988; Sirgy, 1982). When consumers perceive a match between their self-concept and the personality of the brand, the use of the brand enhances their self-esteem (Malhotra, 1988). Likewise, the consumption of a self-congruent brand enables consumers to achieve self-consistency (Ericksen and Sirgy, 1989). Therefore, the satisfaction of both consumers’ need for self-esteem and self-consistency prompts the consumer to evaluate the brand positively leading to loyalty (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006).

Sirgy *et al.* (2008) found that self-congruence with a sponsored event has a positive effect on brand loyalty. As such, when a firm is sponsoring an event that consumers can identify with, it is more likely they develop feelings of brand loyalty. Kressmann *et al.* (2006) also revealed a direct and indirect effect, through functional congruity, product involvement and brand relationship quality, of self-congruence on brand loyalty. Building on this literature, we investigate whether self-congruent ‘Likes’ in the virtual world of Facebook will result in brand loyalty. We posit:

1  
2  
3 *H3: Greater perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand is positively associated*  
4 *with greater brand loyalty.*  
5  
6

7 We next examine whether there exists a relationship between the perceived self-  
8 congruence with a 'Liked' brand and brand love. Brand love is 'the degree of passionate  
9 emotional attachment a satisfied customer has for a trade name' (Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006, p.  
10 81). In the same way that one is attracted to another person because they are like themselves,  
11 consumers are attracted to more self-congruent brands (Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014).  
12 Although little is known about 'Liked' brands and brand love, the literature suggests  
13 consumers' love is greater when a brand enhances one's social self and/or reflects one's inner  
14 self (Batra *et al.*, 2012; Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). By 'Liking' a brand that is self-congruent,  
15 consumers communicate their true selves to others. The balance arising from their inner view  
16 and the public perception of themselves creates positive emotion, which leads to brand  
17 attachment (Malär *et al.*, 2011). Therefore, we postulate:  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 *H4: Greater perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand is positively associated*  
27 *with greater brand love.*  
28  
29  
30

31 Offline, congruence between the brand and the self has been positively associated with  
32 WOM (Jamal *et al.*, 2009; Saenger *et al.*, 2013). Recent research (Tuškej *et al.*, 2013) has  
33 shown the stronger a consumer identifies with brands, the more likely they are to engage in  
34 WOM. On social networks such as Facebook, the relationship between brands and WOM is  
35 less clear. Consumers' 'Liking' of brands on Facebook may be driven by a desire to sustain a  
36 certain narrative of the self, generated through interactions with networked others (Belk,  
37 2013), where consumers are less motivated to offer recommendations for their 'Liked' brands  
38 and use the brand solely as a means to enhance their online profiles. Furthermore, the  
39 network coproduction model (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010), suggests WOM on social networks may  
40 be subject to group norms. Brand community research suggests identification with the  
41 community informs consumers' WOM (Hickman and Ward, 2013; Millán and Díaz, 2014).  
42 Further research suggests social networks facilitate WOM that is less motivated by altruism  
43 (Dichter, 1966) and more influenced by communal interests arising from the online network  
44 (Kozinets *et al.*, 2010). Just as 'Likes' offer opportunities for consumers to exaggerate their  
45 extended self through brands (Belk, 2013), consumers may offer WOM for 'Liked' brands  
46 because they are seeking to impress others, or to adhere to established norms. Therefore,  
47 while the power of the social network in facilitating WOM for brands is long established  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Reingen, 1987), the relationship between self-congruence with Facebook brand 'Likes' and  
4 WOM is less clear. Given the value of WOM to the brand manager, and the emphasis of  
5 marketing strategy in attaining 'Likes' (Hollis, 2011), this relationship requires investigation.  
6  
7 Therefore, to test this relationship we hypothesise:  
8  
9

10  
11 *H5: Greater perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand is positively associated*  
12 *with greater WOM.*  
13

14  
15 Extant literature asserts that the feeling of love towards a brand is positively associated  
16 with brand loyalty (Albert and Merunka, 2013; Batra *et al.*, 2012; Bergkvist and Bech-Larsen,  
17 2010; Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006; Thomson *et al.*, 2005) and positive WOM (Albert and  
18 Merunka, 2013; Batra *et al.*, 2012; Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). However, while these results  
19 offer insights into the relationship between brand love and brand loyalty and WOM for brands  
20 in the material world, they offer few insights about brand love in the virtual world, as on the  
21 Facebook social network, the brand 'Liked' may be outside the consumer's material reality  
22 (Schau and Gilly, 20013). In fact, brand 'Likes' may not be an expression of brand affection  
23 or love. For example, as noted earlier, consumers may 'Like' brands for several reasons;  
24 utilitarian reasons such as to receive a discount or to enter a competition, or because they wish  
25 to express genuine love for the brand (Wallace *et al.*, 2014).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Batra *et al.*'s (2012) conceptualisation of brand love encompasses self-brand integration.  
35 As such, brands used to express identity (Belk, 1988) and brands that facilitate interpersonal  
36 relationships (McAlexander *et al.*, 2002) will achieve positive brand outcomes. Just as  
37 consumers utilise brands offline to express identity (Belk, 1998), some consumers use brand  
38 'Likes' on Facebook for the purpose of identity construction (Schau and Gilly, 2003).  
39 Similarly, just as brands offline facilitate interpersonal relationships (McAlexander *et al.*,  
40 2002), so too brand 'Likes' on Facebook help co-create identity through interaction with  
41 others on the social network (Belk, 2013). Therefore, one could expect 'Liked' brands that are  
42 loved will achieve positive brand outcomes, even though these brands may be outside the  
43 consumer's material reality. To contribute to the nascent understanding of brand love  
44 outcomes, we explore whether brand love for 'Liked' brands on Facebook will result in the  
45 positive brand outcomes brand loyalty and brand WOM. We hypothesise:  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 *H6: Greater brand love for 'Liked' brands is positively associated with greater brand*  
55 *loyalty for those brands.*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *H7: Greater brand love for 'Liked' brands is positively associated with greater WOM*  
4 *for those brands.*  
5  
6  
7

### 8 **3. Method**

#### 9 *3.1 Data*

10  
11 We obtained data from 438 Facebook users who actively 'Liked' brands on Facebook.  
12 Respondents were asked to think about a brand they 'Liked' on Facebook, and to answer  
13 questions about that brand. The sample consisted of students at an Irish University. A student  
14 sample was employed as students are heavy Internet users (Gallagher *et al.*, 2001) and recent  
15 research on Facebook fans has shown that fan age skews significantly younger than a typical  
16 customer (Lipsman *et al.*, 2012), as the 'typical Facebooker is approaching adulthood and is  
17 between the ages of 18 and 24' (Richard and Guppy, 2014). Furthermore, the student sample  
18 has relevance for a study of self-congruence: studies exploring self-congruence in an offline  
19 context (Liu *et al.*, 2012; Roy and Rabbane, 2015), and research exploring the self-  
20 congruence of Facebook profiles (Back *et al.*, 2010), have used student samples.  
21  
22

23  
24 In our study, all respondents used Facebook. 100% had 'Liked' brands on their profile  
25 pages and all had used Facebook in the last month. 63.2% of respondents were female. The  
26 mean age was 21.2 years, and 93.1% were Irish. Respondents were predominantly  
27 undergraduates (88%) and spent 2.4 hours on Facebook daily, with an average of 472  
28 Facebook friends. A profile of respondents is presented in Table 1.  
29

30  
31 < Place Table 1 about here >  
32  
33

#### 34 *3.2 Measures*

35  
36 A full listing of survey measures is provided in Table 2. Measures used in this research were  
37 validated in previous studies.  
38

39  
40 < Place Table 2 about here >  
41  
42

43  
44 Cognitive network measures of consumers' perceptions about attitude homophily and  
45 status homophily were based on McCroskey *et al.*'s (1975) measures, with items including  
46 'Most of my Facebook friends think like me' (perceived attitude homophily) and 'Most of my  
47 Facebook friends have an economic situation like mine' (perceived status homophily). We  
48 made one revision to McCroskey *et al.*'s scale items: the scale item 'Have the same status as  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 me' was revised to 'Have the same social status as me', to clarify we were measuring social  
4 status, rather than Facebook status. Items were rated on 7-point Likert scales ranging from 1  
5 = 'strongly disagree' to 7 = 'strongly agree'.

6  
7  
8 Perceptions of social tie strength were based on Granovetter's (1973) conceptualisation  
9 of social tie strength, and Brown and Reingen's (1987) study on social ties and WOM,  
10 prefaced by 'Most of my Facebook friends' with items including 'are people I interact with  
11 every day', 'are people I like to spend time with away from Facebook' and 'are true friends  
12 rather than acquaintances'. Each construct was measured with four items respectively, rated  
13 on 7-point Likert scales (1 = 'strongly disagree'; 7 = 'strongly agree').

14  
15 Brand loyalty was measured using Yoo *et al.*'s (2000) measure of brand loyalty, with  
16 items including 'I consider myself loyal to this brand' and 'This brand would be my first  
17 choice when considering this type of product'. Participants responded to the statements on 7-  
18 point Likert scales with anchors 1 = 'strongly disagree' and 7 = 'strongly agree'.

19  
20 The measures of brand love and WOM contain scales by Carroll and Ahuvia (2006). The  
21 brand love scale consists of 10 items including 'This is a wonderful brand' and 'I'm very  
22 passionate about this brand'. To allow for cultural variations in expression, one item 'This  
23 brand is awesome!' from the original Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) measure was revised as 'This  
24 brand is fantastic'. The WOM scale consists of 8 items, based on Carroll and Ahuvia's  
25 (2006) measure of WOM, but adapted to encompass WOM on Facebook. Items include 'I  
26 have recommended this brand to a lot of people' and 'I give this brand a lot of positive word  
27 of mouth online'. In this case, 5-point Likert scales were used, with anchors 'strongly  
28 disagree' and 'strongly agree'.

29  
30 Finally, to measure the perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand, we used the  
31 difference scores between brand personality and self-concept. The study adopted Geuens *et*  
32 *al.*'s (2009) measure of brand personality, a valid and reliable scale tested in USA and non-  
33 USA research contexts. The 12 items used to measure personality included facets such as  
34 'down to earth', 'stable', 'responsible', 'active', 'aggressive' and 'sentimental' and reflect  
35 five major dimensions (see the measure in Appendix I). Following the traditional two-step  
36 procedure (Helgeson and Supphellen, 2006), respondents first rated the brand with respect to  
37 the twelve brand personality facets proposed by Geuens *et al.* (2009). For each item,  
38 respondents were asked to think about the brand 'Liked' and indicate to what extent the  
39 personality items applied to the brand (1 = 'not characteristic of this brand'; 5 = 'very  
40 characteristic of this brand'). Next, respondents rated their actual and ideal self-concepts  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

using the same characteristics. First, participants were asked to think about themselves and evaluate their actual self-concept by indicating to what extent these characteristics describe them (1= 'not at all like me'; 5 = 'very like me'). Similarly, ideal self-concept was evaluated asking respondents to indicate to what extent the same characteristics describe how they would like to be. Specifically, they were asked to think about how they would see themselves in an ideal world – their ideal self- and indicate how they would describe their 'ideal self' (1 = 'not at all like my ideal self'; 5 = 'very like my ideal self').

Actual and ideal self-congruence scores were operationalised as the absolute difference score between respondents' brand personality rating and their actual and ideal self-concept scores, respectively (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006). We multiplied each index by -1 so that larger values would indicate high self-congruence. This is mathematically indicated as

$$ASC_k = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |BP_{ik} - AS_{ik}|}{n}$$

where,  $ASC_k$  = actual self-congruence score for respondent  $k$ ,  $n$  = number of personality facets ( $n = 12$ ),  $i$  = personality facet  $i$  ( $i = 1...n$ ),  $BP_{ik}$  = brand rating on personality facet  $i$  for respondent  $k$ , and  $AS_{ik}$  = actual-self concept on personality facet  $i$  for respondent  $k$ . And,

$$ISC_k = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |BP_{ik} - IS_{ik}|}{n}$$

where,  $ISC_k$  = ideal self-congruence score for respondent  $k$ ,  $n$  = number of personality facets ( $n = 12$ ),  $i$  = personality facet  $i$  ( $i = 1...n$ ),  $BP_{ik}$  = brand rating on personality facet  $i$  for respondent  $k$ , and  $IS_{ik}$  = ideal-self concept on personality facet  $i$  for respondent  $k$ .

Actual and ideal self-congruence indices were correlated (.586), as expected. Therefore, consistent with extant approaches (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006), the two self-congruence indices were used as two indicators of self-congruence in the statistical model.

### 3.3 Questionnaire

The questionnaire presented to respondents was constructed as follows. After a brief introduction, respondents were asked questions about their general Facebook use (hours spent online, number of friends) and about their perceptions in relation to their Facebook friends (social tie strength and homophily). Then respondents were asked whether they 'Liked' a brand on Facebook and, if yes, what brand they 'Liked' on Facebook. Respondents who 'Liked' more than one brand were asked to think about only one of those brands throughout

1  
2  
3 the remainder of the survey. Brand outcomes measures (brand love, brand loyalty and WOM)  
4 came next. The brand personality, actual self and ideal self were then measured, by  
5 presenting personality facets and measuring level of agreement. Demographic questions were  
6 asked at the end of the questionnaire.  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 3.4 Test for Common Method Bias 13

14 As this study relies on self-reported measures, several steps were taken to prevent and control  
15 for common method bias (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). First, information confidentiality and  
16 anonymity reduce the possibility that the individuals responded artificially, or in a dishonest  
17 manner. In addition, dependent and independent variables were on different pages of the  
18 electronic questionnaire, trying to avoid respondents being able to infer cause-effect  
19 relationships among the constructs. To check for potential common method bias, exploratory  
20 factor analysis was carried out to establish the data factorial structure. This revealed the  
21 existence of seven different factors. The highest proportion of variance accumulated by one  
22 single factor was 20.27%. Consequently, the results of the factor analysis revealed that more  
23 than a single factor emerged with no single factor accounting for the majority of variance. A  
24 Harman's one-factor test by means of confirmatory factor analysis with EQS 6.1 also  
25 confirmed this finding. This test showed the goodness of fit for a measurement model where  
26 all the variables loaded on a single factor ( $\chi^2 = 4315.03$ ;  $df = 377$ ) was substantially worse  
27 than the goodness of fit for a model where every item loaded on its corresponding latent  
28 variable ( $\chi^2 = 882.29$ ;  $df = 356$ ;  $\Delta\chi^2 = 3432.74$ ;  $\Delta df = 21$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Thus, there is no  
29 evidence to suggest the presence of common method bias.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

## 43 44 4. Results 45

### 46 4.1 The measurement model 47

48 Scales were evaluated using confirmatory techniques to assess reliability, dimensionality and  
49 validity. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using EQS 6.1 and the robust maximum-  
50 likelihood estimation method suggested the deletion of one item in the attitude homophily  
51 construct and two items in the brand love scale due to weak factor loadings. After these  
52 deletions, CFA produced an acceptable fit to the data: S-B  $\chi^2 = 770.51$  (356)  $p < 0.001$ , NNFI  
53 = 0.926, CFI = 0.935, IFI = 0.935, RMSEA = 0.052 (Hair *et al.*, 2006). All factor loadings  
54 were above 0.5 and statistically significant which suggested the convergent validity of the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

factors (Steenkamp and Van Trijp, 1991). The average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) values were greater than 0.5 and 0.7, respectively (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988). Discriminant validity was also supported. In all cases the AVE for any two constructs was always greater than the squared correlations (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). See Tables 2 and 3 for full details of the measurement model results.

< Place Table 3 about here >

#### 4.2 The structural model

Prior to testing the hypotheses, multicollinearity was assessed. Variance inflation factor (VIF) was computed for each variable. Specifically, in this test each variable becomes a dependent variable and is regressed on the remaining independent variables. A VIF value that exceeds five is an indication of severe multicollinearity (Belsley, 1991). Results show that all VIF values remained below 1.9, so there is no indication of multicollinearity.

The results of the structural model indicate the model fits the data well (see Table 4). The results indicate perceived attitude homophily predicted social tie strength positively and significantly ( $\beta = .538$ ,  $t = 8.58$ ), providing support for H1a. However, H1b was not supported, as the relationship between perceived status homophily and social tie strength was not significant ( $\beta = .084$ ,  $t = 1.58$ ). Perceived social tie strength predicted the self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand ( $\beta = .127$ ,  $t = 2.09$ ), providing support for H2.

With respect to the hypotheses pertaining to the relationship between online 'Likes' and brand outcomes, higher perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand successfully predicted brand love ( $\beta = .162$ ,  $t = 2.57$ ) and WOM ( $\beta = .155$ ,  $t = 3.22$ ), providing support for H4 and H5 respectively. The relationship between perceived self-congruence and brand loyalty was not significant ( $\beta = .070$ ,  $t = 1.54$ ). Therefore, H3 was rejected.

Finally, the results provide support for H6 and H7. Brand love is positively and significantly associated with greater brand loyalty ( $\beta = .699$ ,  $t = 13.80$ ) and WOM ( $\beta = .503$ ,  $t = 8.48$ ).

< Place Table 4 about here >

Following Preacher and Hayes (2008), a post hoc analysis of indirect effects was conducted. Specifically, we analysed whether the impact of perceived self-congruence with a

1  
2  
3 ‘Liked’ brand on brand loyalty and WOM is mediated by brand love (see Table 5). Preacher  
4 and Hayes’ (2008) macro, using 5,000 bootstrapped samples and bias-corrected and  
5 accelerated 95% confidence intervals, was employed. This analysis includes an examination  
6 of the total and direct effects of the independent variable (IV) (i.e. self-congruence with a  
7 ‘Liked’ brand) on the dependent variable (DV) (i.e. brand loyalty and WOM), as well as an  
8 estimation of the indirect effect of the IV on the DV through the mediator (i.e. brand love). In  
9 addition, the bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrap generates a 95 percent confidence  
10 interval (CI) for the mediator. If the CI excludes zero, the indirect effect is significant.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Results show a positive and significant indirect effect of self-congruence on brand loyalty  
18 (coefficient = .208; CI: 0.002; 0.435). As the direct effect of self-congruence on brand loyalty  
19 is non-significant, brand love fully mediates this relationship. In addition to the direct effect,  
20 self-congruence also indirectly influences WOM through brand love (coefficient = .098; CI:  
21 0.002; 0.209). Therefore, the influence of self-congruence on WOM is partially mediated by  
22 brand love.  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 < Place Table 5 about here >  
28  
29  
30

## 31 **5. Discussion**

32  
33 Considering the ubiquity of the Facebook social network it is somewhat surprising that so  
34 little is known about the influence of perceived social tie strength on brand ‘Liking’, or  
35 outcomes of brand ‘Likes’ - in terms of brand love, brand loyalty and WOM – for brands.  
36 Our study addresses these gaps by analysing the attitudes of 438 Facebook fans who ‘Like’  
37 brands. Our study finds a) when consumers believe their network is characterised by greater  
38 social tie strength, the perceived self-congruence with a brand they ‘Like’ is higher, b) the  
39 perceived self-congruence with a brand they ‘Like’ positively affects WOM both directly and  
40 indirectly through brand love, and c) the perceived self-congruence with a brand they ‘Like’  
41 positively influences brand loyalty through its effect on brand love.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *5.1 Theoretical contributions*

52  
53 First, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to quantitatively measure the self-  
54 congruence (actual and ideal self) with ‘Liked’ brands and to explore antecedents and  
55 outcomes of self-congruent brand ‘Likes’ on Facebook. The current study builds on a  
56 growing body of literature that investigates the congruence of self-presentation on social  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 networks such as Facebook (e.g. Back *et al.*, 2010). More specifically, recent research has  
4 investigated how brands are used to present the self on social networks and explored the  
5 relationship between those brands and the self-concept. However, to date, most of this  
6 research has been qualitative in nature. For example, Sekhon *et al.* (2015) use content  
7 analysis to explore how consumers use brand mentions for self-presentation, drawing on  
8 twitter data to investigate braggart behaviour. In their seminal study, Hollenbeck and Kaikati  
9 (2012) also drew on a large-scale mixed-method qualitative study of Facebook users to  
10 explore consumers' representations of themselves on Facebook, focusing on consumers' use  
11 of brands as subtle cues to the self. Our research, therefore, extends these findings and  
12 responds to Hollenbeck and Kaikati's (2012) call for quantitative research to complement  
13 their findings.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Second, we address the call by Belk (2013) to consider social ties in investigating the  
23 relationship between brands and the online self, by exploring consumers' cognitive networks.  
24 Greater social tie strength exists where interactions between Facebook friends are more  
25 intimate, more frequent and where there is greater reciprocity between the tied parties  
26 (Granovetter, 1973). To date, some literature on consumers' use of brands on social networks  
27 has suggested their brand relationships may serve mainly to create an idealised self for friends  
28 to see (e.g., Schau and Gilly, 2003), while other research suggests that Facebook profiles may  
29 actually represent the true self, partly because 'faking it' could be challenged by Facebook  
30 friends (Back *et al.*, 2010). Furthermore, Hollenbeck and Kaikati (2012) suggest many  
31 Facebook friendships were characterised by weak ties, which allow individuals to provide an  
32 idealised version of themselves because of the reduced risk of social sanction from people  
33 who do not know them very well. Our study shows when the social network is characterised  
34 by strong social ties, there is greater self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand. We contend this  
35 finding supports Hollenbeck and Kaikati's (2012) assertions about weak ties, as we believe  
36 that, when consumers have stronger social ties, they 'Like' a brand with a higher level of self-  
37 congruence, possibly because they know their stronger friendship network would reveal them  
38 as fakes otherwise. We also suggest another reason for this finding: perhaps when their social  
39 ties are perceived to be strong, consumers feel more confident about revealing their self-  
40 congruent brand preferences?  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 This study has also examined the extent to which consumers perceived attitudinal  
55 homophily (whether they believed their friends thought in the same way they did) and status  
56 homophily (whether they believed their friends shared the same status as they had) among  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 their Facebook friends. Respondents were asked to answer thinking about ‘most of my  
4 Facebook friends’, so they would indicate the extent to which they perceived the majority of  
5 their Facebook friends were like them, or not like them. Results show when consumers  
6 perceive most of their Facebook friends are quite similar to themselves, those consumers are  
7 more likely to perceive their network is characterised by greater social tie strength. In other  
8 words, ‘birds of a feather flock together’, as when, for example, Mary perceives her Facebook  
9 friends to be more like herself, she is more likely to perceive there is a stronger social tie  
10 between Mary and those Facebook friends.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 Third, our research offers new insights into the relationship between brand ‘Likes’ and  
18 brand outcomes. While the extant literature on brand outcomes identifies a positive  
19 relationship between self-congruence and brand loyalty (Kressmann *et al.*, 2006), brand love  
20 (Rauschnabel and Ahuvia, 2014), and positive WOM (Saenger *et al.*, 2013), brand outcomes  
21 have not been tested for brands in the virtual world, where brands may not be part of a  
22 consumer’s material reality (Schau and Gilly, 2003; Sekhon *et al.*, 2015).  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Recent research has indicated a positive relationship between both Facebook ‘Likes’ and  
28 friends’ ‘Likes’ and customer purchase intention (Richard and Guppy, 2014). Drawing on  
29 offline research that indicates a relationship between self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand  
30 and brand consumption (Aguirre-Rodriguez *et al.*, 2012), we extend Richard and Guppy’s  
31 (2014) findings. Our study shows the perceived self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand leads to  
32 positive brand outcomes. Particularly, we show higher self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand  
33 successfully predicts brand love and WOM. By contrast, the relationship between self-  
34 congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand and brand loyalty is not significant. However, post hoc  
35 analysis reveals self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand indirectly influences brand loyalty via  
36 brand love. Similarly, the influence of self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand on WOM for that  
37 brand is partially mediated by brand love.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 We were cognisant that consumers often ‘Like’ brands that offer discounts, rather than  
47 because of any real affect for the brand (Wallace *et al.*, 2014). However in this study we  
48 show when consumers have greater self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand, consumers also  
49 have greater love for that brand. This finding extends the perspective that offline, brands  
50 offering self-brand integration are more loved (Batra *et al.*, 2012), into the online context.  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 We also find a positive relationship between self-congruence with a ‘Liked’ brand and  
56 WOM. Tuškej *et al.* (2013) asserted that congruence between the brand and customer values  
57 enhances WOM. Although Tuškej *et al.*’s (2013) study involved consumers’ favourite  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 brands, this study finds the same outcome for brands 'Liked' on Facebook. When the  
4 perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand is higher, consumer are also more inclined to  
5 offer WOM; or, alternatively, consumers are more likely to offer WOM for brands that are  
6 consistent with, and help to reinforce, their self-concept. Findings from Roy and Rabbanee  
7 (2015) may also explain the positive relationship between self-congruent brands and greater  
8 WOM. Their offline research found greater self-congruence for luxury brands positively  
9 influenced intention to reuse the brand's shopping bag. We suggest that, just as the luxury  
10 brand's shopping bag is prestigious to tote around (Roy and Rabbanee, 2015), offering WOM  
11 for a 'Liked' brand also creates an impression on others and allows consumers to 'show off'  
12 about a brand they believe is congruent with their self-concept.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 In addition, our research informs our understanding of brand love. We sought to  
21 understand whether brand love for 'Liked' brands resulted in the same outcomes as studies of  
22 brand love for offline brands have revealed (see for example Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006). Our  
23 findings confirm a positive relationship between brand love and WOM. As anticipated, and  
24 supporting Carroll and Ahuvia's (2006) offline finding, more loved 'Liked' brands engender  
25 greater positive WOM. As online brands are used, in part, as a form of self-expression (Schau  
26 and Gilly, 2003), it is understandable that consumers would also offer WOM for such brands,  
27 especially when those brands are loved. Likewise, results show that brand love for 'Liked'  
28 brands is positively associated with loyalty for those brands.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Finally, post hoc assessment of mediating effects reveals perceived self-congruence with  
37 a 'Liked' brand affects WOM indirectly via brand love. In addition, although perceived self-  
38 congruence does not directly influence brand loyalty, post hoc analysis of mediating effects  
39 illustrate brand love fully mediates the impact of self-congruence on brand loyalty. This  
40 finding implies consumers may only exhibit such loyalty when the brand holds emotional or  
41 passionate attachment for them.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

## 48 *5.2 Managerial implications*

49

50 A key question is how marketing managers can best use social networks for successful  
51 marketing activities and analyse the success of those activities. With 1.04 billion daily active  
52 users of Facebook alone (Facebook newsroom, 2016), the social network is a valuable  
53 medium to reach consumers, as well as an invaluable source of behavioural data.  
54 Increasingly, marketing metrics incorporate analytics enabling marketers to better evaluate  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the success of their marketing initiatives on social platforms and to plan effective strategies.  
4 As examples, *Salesforce's* (2016) Predictive intelligence method explores consumers'  
5 behavioural history to reveal preferences, purchase habits, and to inform personalised  
6 marketing across marketing channels; and Facebook offers 'insights' (Facebook, 2016) to  
7 managers seeking to explore their page metrics. Using such data, managers seeking to  
8 enhance customer engagement can identify which of their previous posts was most effective.  
9 Managers can also identify audience behaviour, lifestyle, and purchase information, to  
10 develop further marketing campaigns.

11  
12  
13 How does our study support these insights? We elicited the attitudes of consumers who  
14 'Like' a brand on Facebook. These consumers are therefore known as fans of that brand's  
15 page. As 'Likes' are an important metric for brands (Facebook, 2016), our study provides new  
16 insights by investigating the extent to which 'Likes' are self-congruent. Our findings have  
17 several managerial implications.

18  
19  
20 We identify a relationship between consumers' perceptions about their social network  
21 structure and the extent to which their 'Liked' brands are self-congruent. We reveal that  
22 attitudinally homophilous relationships are positively related with social tie strength, which in  
23 turn positively influence perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand. Brand managers  
24 seeking to use fans' Facebook data to understand consumer brand relationships should  
25 consider how the network structure influences those individuals' use of the brand on  
26 Facebook. We advocate using marketing analytics to consider segmenting fans of a brand's  
27 page according to their tie strength, as consumers with stronger social ties are more likely to  
28 perceive greater self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand. By contrast, consumers that have  
29 weaker social ties may perceive less self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand.

30  
31  
32 Our study reveals significant relationships between self-congruent 'Likes' and brand  
33 outcomes. Findings show that those consumers who perceive greater self-congruence with a  
34 'Liked' brand have greater brand love for that brand. *Batra et al.* (2012) advocate that  
35 marketing communications could emphasise intrinsic benefits over extrinsic benefits to foster  
36 brand love. This insight may also inform the way brands are marketed on Facebook. To  
37 enhance brand love, managers should appeal to consumers using the intrinsic components of  
38 brands, to encourage a perception of greater self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand.

39  
40  
41 Managers seeking to attract new customers may also value network data to identify  
42 sources of positive WOM from their Facebook fans. Although the literature suggests weaker  
43 ties have greater influence on WOM (Brown and Reingen, 1987), we find that social tie

1  
2  
3 strength is associated with greater self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand, which in turn is  
4 positively associated with WOM. Therefore, there are opportunities presented by Facebook  
5 for managers seeking to encourage WOM from brand fans. Marketing analytics could  
6 explore the relationship between tie strength, brand 'Likes' and WOM for 'Liked' brands.  
7  
8 Networks with stronger social ties may spread greater WOM for brands, because those fans  
9 are more likely to perceive greater self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand.  
10  
11

12  
13 Furthermore, while extant analytics can estimate consumers' future purchase intention  
14 from consumer data (for example Salesforce, 2016), our study provides new insights which  
15 inform managers' understanding of loyalty. We found consumers expressed brand loyalty for  
16 'Liked' brands only when they also had brand love for those brands. We suggest analysis of  
17 consumers' purchase intention from Facebook data could also measure the brand love the  
18 consumer has with the brand. We suggest managers might consider proxy measures of 'love',  
19 drawing on Batra et al.'s (2012) conceptualisation, to explore the existence of brand love  
20 among their fans. For example an analysis of the valence of consumer comments may  
21 suggest positive affect such as the length of consumer comments may imply their willingness  
22 to invest in the brand, consumers' use of emoticons and punctuation may suggest excitement,  
23 or their use of words may suggest passion for the brand. An aggregation of these measures  
24 may provide insights about the level of brand love experienced by fans. By incorporating such  
25 measures to estimate consumers' brand love, brand loyalty for 'Liked' brands may be more  
26 accurately predicted.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 *5.3 Limitations and future research*

40  
41 Our framework and analysis have several limitations. First, we base our propositions on  
42 consumers' assessments of their own network homophily and social tie strength. Although it  
43 would have been interesting to have objective measures of students' actual Facebook network  
44 structures, ethical considerations concerning the use of Facebook networks did not permit  
45 access such data. However, extant literature provides reassurance for our approach. As  
46 Marsden (1990) noted, measures of social relations should vary according to the dependent  
47 variables to be interpreted in light of the network data. Eliciting perceptions of network  
48 structure is appropriate for studies of social influence on behaviour or opinions (Marsden,  
49 1990). Therefore, the 'cognitive structure' approach adopted in this study, by capturing  
50 perceptions of homophily and social tie strength, is suitable. Furthermore, our study adopts  
51 long-established and well-tested measures of homophily and social tie strength (Granovetter,  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1973). The measures performed well, with good reliability and dimensionality, providing  
4 further reassurance.  
5

6  
7 Second, emergent research on network structure reveals the existence of a ‘majority  
8 illusion’ (Lerman *et al.*, 2015), where individuals lacking global knowledge of behaviours of  
9 others estimate them from their friends’ behaviours and over-estimate the prevalence of the  
10 behaviours of those who have a greater number of connections on the network than they have.  
11 This ‘majority illusion’ suggests consumers with fewer connections on Facebook may infer  
12 global preferences from friends who are more connected on the same network, but who may,  
13 in fact, be in the minority. Therefore, the ‘majority illusion’ has relevance to studies of  
14 perceptions of attitude homophily. As we acknowledge above, we did not have information  
15 about the topology of the Facebook social network, and we were therefore unable to consider  
16 the influence of a majority illusion. Given its relevance to the acceptance or diffusion of  
17 ideas in social networks (Lerman *et al.*, 2015), we suggest future research into attitude  
18 homophily consider the ‘majority illusion’, by also exploring the degree distribution of the  
19 network and its influence on the observations of others.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 Third, our study is based among a student population in Ireland. We note the brands  
30 ‘Liked’ may have been influenced by proximity to other students and influenced by the  
31 student reference group. We also note Hollenbeck and Kaikati’s (2012) assertion that  
32 situational context influences self-expression motives on Facebook. We accept the college  
33 student is in a unique situational context, which will inform their self-expression motives.  
34 Although we explain that a student population has greater relevance for a study of Facebook  
35 ‘Likes’ than perhaps other brand activities, there may be further insights to be gained by  
36 replicating this study with other consumer groups, or in other countries. Such findings could  
37 enhance the generalizability of our study. We also note consideration of a respondent’s  
38 primary and secondary groups was outside the scope of this research and we advocate that  
39 consideration of these groups may inform our findings in further study. Further research  
40 could also explore the applicability of our model to different groups, such as student/non-  
41 student groups, or groups with characteristics that lead them to have higher self-congruence or  
42 lower self-congruence, to further explore the application of our model among different  
43 Facebook users.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Fourth, other variables that have informed studies on self-congruence and product/brand  
55 evaluation have included self-monitoring (e.g., Hogg *et al.*, 2000), self-esteem (e.g., Malär *et*  
56 *al.*, 2011) and self-enhancement motives (e.g., Aguirre-Rodriguez *et al.*, 2012). Further  
57  
58  
59  
60

research could investigate whether these additional variables inform the relationship between the Facebook social network and self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand, and the relationship between 'Likes' and brand outcomes.

Fifth, our measures of brand outcomes are based on extant measures that are more commonly used for relationships with brands in the offline environment (e.g. Carroll and Ahuvia, 2006; Yoo *et al.*, 2000). Nevertheless, even in an online environment where consumers are occasionally maligned for 'Liking' brands for self-expressive reasons without any real emotional connection, we find positive outcomes for brand love, brand loyalty and WOM, when the perceived self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand is higher. Perhaps the virtual self is not so divergent from the actual self, after all.

## References

- Aguirre-Rodriguez, A., Bosnjak, M. and Sirgy, M.J. (2012), "Moderators of the self-congruity effect on consumer decision-making: A meta-analysis", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 65 No. 8, pp. 1179-1188.
- Albert, N. and Merunka, D. (2013), "The role of brand love in consumer-brand relationships", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 258-266.
- Back, M.D., Stopfer, J.M., Vazire, S., Gaddis, S., Schmulke, S.C., Egloff, B., and Gosling, S.D. (2010), "Facebook profiles reflect actual personality, not self-idealization", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 372-374.
- Bagozzi R.P. and Yi, Y. (1988), "On the evaluation of structural equation models", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 74-94.
- Batra, R., Ahuvia, A. and Bagozzi, P. (2012), "Brand love", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 76 No. 2, pp.1-16.
- Bearden, W.O. and Etzel, M.J. (1982), "Reference group influence on product and brand purchase decisions", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9, pp. 183-194.
- Belk, R.W. (1988), "Possessions and the extended self", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 139-168.
- Belk, R.W. (2013), "Extended self in a digital world", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 477-500.
- Belsley, D.A. (1991), *Conditioning Diagnostics: Collinearity and Weak Data in Regression*, Wiley & Sons, New York.

- 1  
2  
3 Bergkvist, L. and Bech-Larsen, T. (2010), "Two studies of consequences and actionable  
4 antecedents of brand love", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 17 No. 7, pp. 504-518.
- 5  
6 Brettel, M., Reich, J.-C., Gavilanes, J.M. and Flatten, T.C. (2015), "What drives advertising  
7 success on Facebook? An advertising-effectiveness Model", *Journal of Advertising  
8 Research*, Vol. 55 No. 2, pp. 162-175.
- 9  
10  
11 Brown, J.J. and Reingen, P.H. (1987), "Social ties and word-of-mouth referral behaviour",  
12 *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 350-362.
- 13  
14 Carroll, B.A. and Ahuvia, A.C. (2006), "Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love",  
15 *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 79-89.
- 16  
17  
18 Dichter, E. (1966), "How word-of-mouth advertising works", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol.  
19 44 No. 6, pp. 147-160.
- 20  
21 Douma, C. (2008), "Best practices for facebook fan pages: user types", *Socialmediatoday*,  
22 available at: <http://socialmediatoday.com/index.php?q=SMC/49304>, (accessed 6 July  
23 2015).
- 24  
25  
26 Ericksen M.K. and Sirgy M.J. (1989), "Achievement motivation and clothing behavior of  
27 working women: a self-image congruence analysis", *Journal of Social Behavior and  
28 Personality*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 307-326.
- 29  
30  
31 Escalas, J.E. and Bettman, J.R. (2003), "You are what they eat: the influence of reference  
32 groups on consumers' connections to brands", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 13  
33 No. 3, pp.339-348.
- 34  
35  
36 Facebook (2016), "Help center", available at:  
37 <https://www.facebook.com/help/search/?query=insights> (accessed 19 April 2016).
- 38  
39  
40 Facebook newsroom (2016), "Company info", available at:  
41 <http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/> (accessed 19 April 2016).
- 42  
43 Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Evaluating structural equation models with  
44 unobservable variables and measurement error", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 18  
45 No. 1, pp. 39-50.
- 46  
47  
48 Gallagher, K., Foster, K.D. and Parsons, J. (2001), "The medium is not the message:  
49 Advertising effectiveness and content evaluation in print and on the web", *Journal of  
50 Advertising Research*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 57-70.
- 51  
52  
53 Geuens, M., Weijters, B. and De Wulf, K. (2009), "A new measure of brand personality",  
54 *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 97-107.
- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Graeff, T.R. (1996), "Image congruence effects on product evaluations: The role of self-  
4 monitoring and public/private consumption", *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 5,  
5 pp. 481-499.  
6  
7  
8 Granovetter, M.S. (1973), "The strength of weak ties", *The American Journal of Sociology*,  
9 Vol. 78 No. 6, pp. 1360-1380.  
10  
11 Goldenberg, J., Han, S., Lehman, D.R. and Weon, J. (2009), "The role of hubs in the adoption  
12 process", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 73 No. 2, pp. 1-13.  
13  
14 Hair, J.F., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R.E. and Tatham, R.L. (2006), *Multivariate Data*  
15 *Analysis*, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed., Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.  
16  
17 Helgeson, J.G. and Supphellen, M. (2006), "A conceptual and measurement comparison of  
18 self-congruity and brand personality", *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 46  
19 No. 2, pp. 205-233.  
20  
21  
22  
23 Hickman, T.M. and Ward, J.C. (2013), "Implications of brand communities for rival brands:  
24 Negative brand ratings, negative stereotyping of their consumers and negative word-of-  
25 mouth", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 501-517.  
26  
27  
28 Hoffman, D.L. and Fodor, M. (2010), "Can you measure the ROI of your social media  
29 marketing?", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 41-49.  
30  
31 Hogg, M., Banister, E.N. and Stephenson, C.A. (2009), "Mapping symbolic (anti-)  
32 consumption", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 2, pp. 148-159.  
33  
34 Hogg, M., Cox, A.J. and Keeling, K. (2000), "The impact of self-monitoring on image  
35 congruence and product/brand evaluation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 34 No.  
36 5/6, pp. 641-776.  
37  
38  
39 Hollenbeck, C.R. and Kaikati, A.M. (2012), "Consumers' use of brands to reflect their actual  
40 and ideal selves on Facebook", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 29  
41 No. 4, pp. 395-405.  
42  
43  
44 Hollis, N. (2011), "The value of a social media fan", available at:  
45 [http://www.millwardbrown.com/global-navigation/blogs/post/mb-blog/2011/04/04/The-](http://www.millwardbrown.com/global-navigation/blogs/post/mb-blog/2011/04/04/The-value-of-a-social-media-fan.aspx)  
46 [value-of-a-social-media-fan.aspx](http://www.millwardbrown.com/global-navigation/blogs/post/mb-blog/2011/04/04/The-value-of-a-social-media-fan.aspx) (accessed 3 July 2015).  
47  
48  
49 Jamal, A., Khan, M.S. and Tsesmetzi, M.S. (2009), "Perceived quality, packaging and self-  
50 image congruence: An application in the cosmetics market", working paper, *Advances in*  
51 *Consumer Research*, North American Conference Proceedings, Vol. 36, pp.1019-1021.  
52  
53  
54 Kozinets, R.V., de Valck, K, Woknicki, A.C. and Wilner, S.J.S. (2010), "Networked  
55 narratives: Understanding word of mouth marketing in online communities", *Journal of*  
56 *Marketing*, Vol. 74 No. 2, pp. 71-89.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Kressmann, F., Sirgy, M.J., Hermann, A., Huber, F., Huber, S. and Lee, D-J. (2006), "Direct  
4 and indirect effects of self-image congruence on brand loyalty", *Journal of Business*  
5 *Research*, Vol. 59 No. 9, pp. 955-964.  
6  
7 Lapointe, P. (2012), "Measuring Facebook's impact on marketing. The proverbial hits the  
8 fan", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 286-287.  
9  
10 Lazarsfeld P.F. and Merton R.K. (1954), "Friendship as a social process: a substantive and  
11 methodological analysis", in Berger, M. (Ed.), *Freedom and Control in Modern Society*,  
12 Van Nostrand, New York, pp. 18-66.  
13  
14 Leary, M.R. and Allen, A.B. (2011), "Self-presentational persona: Simultaneous management  
15 of multiple impressions". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 101 No. 5,  
16 pp. 1033-1049.  
17  
18 Lerman, K., Yan, X. and Wu, X.Z. (2015), "The majority illusion in social networks",  
19 *Cornell University Library*, available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.03022v1> (accessed 18  
20 April 2016).  
21  
22 Lewis, K., Kaufman, J., Gonzalez, M., Wimmer, A. and Christakis, N. (2008), "Tastes, ties  
23 and time: A new social network dataset using Facebook.com", *Social Networks*, Vol. 30  
24 No. 4, pp. 330-342.  
25  
26 Ligas, M. and Cotte, J. (1999), "The process of negotiating brand meaning: a symbolic  
27 interactionist perspective", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 26, pp. 609-614.  
28  
29 Lipsman, A., Mudd, G., Rich, M. and Bruich, S. (2012), "The power of "Like". How brands  
30 reach (and influence) fans through social-media marketing", *Journal of Advertising*  
31 *Research*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 40-52.  
32  
33 Liu, F., Li, J. Mizerski, D. and Soh, H. (2012), "Self-congruity, brand attitude, and brand  
34 loyalty: a study on luxury brands", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46 No. 7/8, pp.  
35 922-937.  
36  
37 Louch, H. (2000), "Personal network integration: transitivity and homophily in strong-tie  
38 relations", *Social Networks*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 45-64.  
39  
40 Malär, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W.D. and Nyffenegger, B. (2011), "Emotional brand  
41 attachment and brand personality: The relative importance of the actual and ideal self",  
42 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 75 No. 4, pp. 35-52.  
43  
44 Malhotra, N.K. (1988), "Self-concept and product choice: an integrated perspective", *Journal*  
45 *of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 1-28.  
46  
47 Marsden P.V. (1988), "Homogeneity in confiding relations", *Social Network*, Vol. 10 No. 1,  
48 pp. 57-76  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Marsden, P.V. (1990), "Network data and measurement", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol.  
4 16, pp. 435-463.  
5  
6 Mazodier, M. and Merunka, D. (2012), "Achieving brand loyalty through sponsorship: The  
7 role of fit and self-congruity", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 40 No.  
8 6, pp. 807-820.  
9  
10 McAlexander, J.H., Schouten, J.W. and Koenig, H.F. (2002), "Building brand community",  
11 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 38-54.  
12  
13 McCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P. and Daly, J.A. (1975), "The development of a measure of  
14 perceived homophily in interpersonal communication", *Human Communication Research*,  
15 Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 323-332.  
16  
17 McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L. and Cook, J.M. (2001), "Birds of a feather: Homophily in  
18 social networks", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 27, pp. 415-444.  
19  
20 Millán, Á. and Díaz, E. (2014), "Analysis of consumers' response to brand community  
21 integration and brand identification", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp.  
22 254-272.  
23  
24 Muniz, A.M.Jr. and O'Guinn, T.C. (2001), "Brand community", *Journal of Consumer*  
25 *Research*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 412-432.  
26  
27 Newman, M. (2010), *Networks: An introduction*, Oxford University Press, London.  
28  
29 Parker, S. (2012), "The 5 types of Facebook fans and how to keep them", *Socialmedia today*,  
30 available at: <http://www.socialmediatoday.com/content/5-types-facebook-fans-and-how-keep-them> (accessed 6 July 2015).  
31  
32 Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S., Lee, J. and Podsakoff, N. (2003), "Common method biases  
33 in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies",  
34 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 5, pp. 879-903.  
35  
36 Preacher, K.J. and Hayes, A.F. (2008), "Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing  
37 and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models", *Behavior Research Methods*,  
38 Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 879-891.  
39  
40 Rauschnabel, P.A. and Ahuvia, A.C. (2014), "You're so lovable: Anthropomorphism and  
41 brand love", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 372-395.  
42  
43 Reingen, P.H. (1987), "A word of mouth network", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 14  
44 No. 1, pp. 213-217.  
45  
46 Reingen, P.H., Foster, B.L., Johnson Brown, J. and Seidman, S.B. (1984), "Brand congruence  
47 in interpersonal relations: A social network analysis", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.  
48 11 No. 3, pp. 771-783.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Richard, J.E. and Guppy, S. (2014), "Facebook: investigating the influence on customer  
4 purchase intention", *Asian Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 1-15.
- 5  
6 Roy, R. and Rabbane, F.K. (2015), "Antecedents and consequences of self-congruity",  
7  
8 *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 3/4, pp. 444-466.
- 9  
10 Saenger, C., Thomas, V.L. and Johnson, J.W. (2013), "Consumption-focused self-expression  
11 word of mouth: A new scale and its role in consumer research", *Psychology and*  
12  
13 *Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 11, pp. 959-970.
- 14  
15 Salesforce (2016), "Predictive Intelligence", available at:  
16  
17 <http://www.salesforce.com/eu/marketing-cloud/features/predictive-internet-intelligence/>  
18  
19 (accessed 19 April 2016).
- 20  
21 Schau, H.J. and Gilly, M.C. (2003), "We are what we post? Self-presentation in a personal  
22 web space", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 385-404.
- 23  
24 Sekhon, T., Bickart, B., Trudel, R. and Fournier, S. (2015), "Being a likeable braggart: How  
25 customers use brands for self-mention on social media", in Dimofte, C., Haugtvedt, C. and  
26  
27 Yalch, R. (Eds.), *Consumer Psychology in a Social Media World*, M. E. Sharpe, Armonk,  
28  
29 NY.
- 30  
31 Sirgy, M.J. (1982), "Self-concept in consumer behavior: a critical review", *Journal of*  
32  
33 *Consumer Research*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 287-300.
- 34  
35 Sirgy, M.J., Grewal, D., Mangleburg, T.F., Park, J.O., Chon, K.S., Claiborne, C. B., Johar, J.  
36  
37 S. and Berkman, H. (1997), "Assessing the predictive validity of two methods of  
38  
39 measuring self-image congruence", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 25  
40  
41 No. 3, pp. 229-241.
- 42  
43 Sirgy, M.J., Lee, D-J., Johar, J.S. and Tidwell, J. (2008), "Effect of self-congruity with  
44  
45 sponsorship on brand loyalty", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 61 No. 10, pp. 1091-  
46  
47 1097.
- 48  
49 Steenkamp, J-B. E. M. and Van Trijp, H. C. (1991), "The use of LISREL in the validating  
50  
51 marketing constructs", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp.  
52  
53 283-299.
- 54  
55 Thomson, M., MacInnis, D.J. and Park, C.W. (2005), "The ties that bind: Measuring the  
56  
57 strength of consumers' emotional attachments to brands", *Journal of Consumer*  
58  
59 *Psychology*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 77-91.
- 60  
61 Tuškej, U., Golob, U. and Podnar, K. (2013), "The role of consumer-brand identification in  
62  
63 building brand relationships", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 66 No. 1, pp. 53-59.

1  
2  
3 Wallace, E., Buil, I., de Chernatony, L. and Hogan, M. (2014). "Who "likes" you... and why?  
4 A typology of Facebook fans", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 92-  
5 109.  
6

7  
8 Wong, E. (2010), "Dangling incentives on Facebook", *Adweek*, available at:  
9 [http://www.adweek.com/news/advertising-branding/dangling-incentives-facebook-](http://www.adweek.com/news/advertising-branding/dangling-incentives-facebook-103612#1)  
10 [103612#1](http://www.adweek.com/news/advertising-branding/dangling-incentives-facebook-103612#1) (accessed 6 July 2015).  
11

12  
13 Yoo, B., Donthu, N. and Lee, S. (2000), "An examination of selected marketing mix elements  
14 and brand equity", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 195-  
15 211.  
16

17  
18 Zaglia, M.E. (2013), "Brand communities embedded in social networks", *Journal of Business*  
19 *Research*, Vol. 66 No. 2, pp. 216-223.  
20

21  
22  
23 < Appendix >  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1.** Profile of survey respondents (demographics and Facebook use)

Category	N = 438*
Gender	63.2% = Female 36.8% = Male
Age	Mean = 21.2 years SD = 4.088
Nationality	93.1% = Irish 6.9% = Other
Level of education	87.7% = Undergraduate Student 7.8% = Masters student 3.7% = Doctoral student
Has a Facebook account, accessed in past month	100% = "Yes"
'Likes' a brand on Facebook	100% = "Yes"
Product categories of 'Liked' brands on Facebook	34% Fashion 20% Haircare and cosmetics 20% Music 19% Food and Tea/Coffee 18% Sport 17% Alcohol 13% Sportswear
Number of Facebook friends	Mean = 472 friends SD = 243
How long do they spend on Facebook on a typical day?	Mean = 2.4 hours SD = 1.6

Note: \* Due to rounding, some figures do not add to 100%. SD = Standard deviation from the mean.

Table 2. Scale items and measurement model results

Constructs and scale items	Range of standardised factor loading	CR	AVE
<b>Attitude homophily</b>		.891	.733
Are mainly like me	.89		
Are quite similar to me	.92		
Think like me	.74		
Behave like me <sup>a</sup>	-		
<b>Status homophily</b>		.826	.544
Have the same social status as me	.70		
Are from the same social class as me	.83		
Are culturally similar to me	.68		
Have an economic situation like mine	.72		
<b>Social tie strength</b>		.864	.615
Are people I interact with every day	.68		
Are true friends, rather than acquaintances	.88		
Are people I like to spend time with away from Facebook	.81		
Are so close to me it is hard to imagine life without them	.76		
<b>Self-congruence with a 'Liked' brand</b>		.779	.649
Actual self-congruence index	.61		
Ideal self-congruence index	.96		
<b>Brand love</b>		.936	.646
This is a wonderful brand	.77		
This brand makes me feel good	.75		
This brand is fantastic	.80		
I have neutral feelings about this brand <sup>ab</sup>	-		
This brand makes me very happy	.82		
I love this brand!	.85		
I have no particular feelings about this brand <sup>ab</sup>	-		
This brand is a pure delight	.83		
I am passionate about this brand	.82		
I am very attached to this brand	.80		
<b>Brand loyalty</b>		.826	.618
I consider myself to be loyal to this brand	.87		
This brand would be my first choice when considering this type of product	.85		
I will not buy other brands of this type of product if this brand is available at the store	.61		
<b>Worth of mouth</b>		.856	.545
I click 'Like' on Facebook for this brand in order to "talk up" this brand to my friends	.83		
I click 'Like' on Facebook for this brand as it enhances my Facebook profile	.66		
I click 'Like' on Facebook for this brand to spread the good word about this brand	.77		
I give this brand a lot of positive word of mouth online	.75		
I recommend this brand to friends and family on Facebook	.68		
<b>Fit indices</b>			
S-B $\chi^2=770.51$ (356) $p<0.001$ NNFI = 0.926 CFI = 0.935 IFI = 0.935 RMSEA = 0.052			

Note: <sup>a</sup> Items deleted in the validation process; <sup>b</sup> Reverse-coded items.

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics and correlations

Constructs	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Attitude homophily <sup>a</sup>	3.74	1.35	.733						
2. Status homophily <sup>a</sup>	4.31	1.29	.165	.544					
3. Social tie strength <sup>a</sup>	3.37	1.39	.326	.092	.615				
4. Self-congruence <sup>c</sup>	-1.17	.48	.018	.001	.011	.649			
5. Brand love <sup>b</sup>	3.61	.84	.004	.000	.013	.027	.646		
6. Brand loyalty <sup>a</sup>	4.59	1.53	.013	.000	.012	.032	.501	.618	
7. Worth of mouth <sup>b</sup>	2.51	.97	.005	.000	.018	.047	.276	.189	.545

Note: <sup>a</sup> 7-point scale; <sup>b</sup> 5-point scale; <sup>c</sup> Scale ranging from -4 to 0. Means and standard deviations (SD) are based on summated scale averages. Items deleted in the validation process are not included. Squared correlations are below the diagonal and AVE estimates are presented on the diagonal.

**Table 4.** Structural model results

Hypotheses	Standardised $\beta$ (t)	Hypothesis verification
H1a Attitude homophily $\rightarrow$ Social tie strength	.538** (8.58)	Yes
H1b Status homophily $\rightarrow$ Social tie strength	.084 (1.58)	No
H2 Social tie strength $\rightarrow$ Self-congruence	.127** (2.09)	Yes
H3 Self-congruence $\rightarrow$ Brand loyalty	.070 (1.54)	No
H4 Self-congruence $\rightarrow$ Brand love	.162** (2.57)	Yes
H5 Self-congruence $\rightarrow$ Word of mouth	.155** (3.22)	Yes
H6 Brand love $\rightarrow$ Brand loyalty	.699** (13.80)	Yes
H7 Brand love $\rightarrow$ Word of mouth	.503** (8.48)	Yes

**Fit Indices:**

S-B  $\chi^2 = 784.72$  (368)  $p < 0.001$ ; NNFI = 0.928; CFI = 0.935; IFI = 0.935; RMSEA = 0.051

Note: \*\* $p < 0.05$

**Table 5.** Total, direct and indirect effects of self-congruence on brand loyalty and WOM

	Total effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	
	Coefficient (t-value)	Coefficient (t-value)	Point Estimate	Bias-Corrected and Accelerated 95% Confidence interval (Lower, Upper)
Model 1: Brand loyalty as dependent variable	.377** (2.50)	.168 (1.41)	.208	0.002; 0.435
Model 2: WOM as dependent variable	.387** (4.09)	.288** (3.41)	.098	0.002; 0.209

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Appendix I:** Geuens *et al.*'s brand personality measure

<b>Brand personality dimensions</b>	<b>Brand personality items</b>
Responsibility	Down to earth Stable Responsible
Activity	Active Dynamic Innovative
Aggressiveness	Aggressive Bold
Simplicity	Ordinary Simple
Emotionality	Romantic Sentimental

