Chapter 19
Netflix: Comparison of the Impact of Social Media Content on Social Media Engagement Behaviour Between Followers of the Series and the Platform

Camila Rumaldo-Calderón, Yerko Tupayachi-Torres, and Manuel Luis Lodeiros-Zubiria

Abstract Brands have identified an opportunity to develop Social Media Engagement Behaviour (SMEB) in their users through Social Media Content (SMC) tools within social networks, such as Facebook. However, they fail to understand whether users are really engaged with them or with their products, especially if both scenarios have their own identities in social networks and different followers. The present research compares the SMEB generated in both scenarios, contrasting the followers of Netflix on Facebook and the official pages of its series. Data were collected by applying two online surveys to 284 users. Subsequently, they were analysed through the PLS-SEM multivariate analysis method based on a second-order construct. The study concludes that the SMEB found in users who follow Netflix's fan page as a brand is higher than that of its series on Facebook, thus revealing a predominance of preference, in terms of content on social networks, for the brand over the product.

Keywords Social Media Content · Social Media Engagement Behaviour · Netflix · Series · Content marketing

19.1 Introduction

Investment in streaming or over-the-top (OTT) services has grown exponentially in recent years [1] with the USA being the industry leader with more than 200 companies offering these services [2], although the industry is actually led by companies such as Netflix, Amazon Prime Video, Hulu and Disney+ [3].

An important part of the success of these platforms has been the way they communicate and relate to their users by achieving the integration of online and offline experiences with brands [4] and creating relevant content [5], being the most demanded,

C. Rumaldo-Calderón · Y. Tupayachi-Torres · M. L. Lodeiros-Zubiria (✉)
Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas (UPC), Lima 15023, Peru
e-mail: pccmmlod@upc.edu.pe

series, films and TV programs [6]. In this sense, one of the keys has been the implementation of promotion and positioning strategies [7], which allow digital platforms to change the forms of relationship and interaction of consumers towards brands [8] enabling their target audience to go from being mere observers to active participants [9] which allows engagement [10].

Social networks have become the main platform for brands to interact [11] and generate engagement with their consumers [12–14] by providing relevant content [15] on social networks [8] that get customers to interact with them and contribute in their dissemination and advocacy [16].

Regarding engagement, this can be understood as those behaviours that the customer has with the brand, which go beyond the purchase of the product [17], where brands should also predefine what type of Customer Engagement Behaviour they want to obtain from their customers through the generated content [18], since as it is known, this can vary [19].

Its research aims to contribute to an academic research priority in marketing and the social sciences in general [20]. In the particular case of the present research, the study of engagement is focused on its generation through social networks called Social Media Engagement Behaviour (SMEB) [21] under the view that brands create content that motivates users to be engaged [22] since as is known, there is a relationship between the types and variables of content generated on social networks with the type of response or engagement behaviour of users [21]. Specifically, this research goes beyond previous studies, as it aims to compare whether the Social Media Content (SMC) created by Netflix on its corporate page and the SMC created, also by Netflix, on the Facebook pages of its own series, generate different SMEB in their followers [23]. This article is structured as follows. First of all, it contains an introduction. Then a literature review and hypothesises are based. The third section includes the methodology. Then the results and the discussion are developed.

19.2 Materials

19.2.1 Social Media Content (SMC)

Companies create different contents to attract or retain users [24], SMC being the main element to achieve a successful digital marketing [25]. These contents, which are expressed in different forms such as photos, videos, and texts [26] can be classified into informative content, entertaining content and relational content [27] being rational or emotional in nature [22].

Posts with informative content are characterised by being rational in nature [28], as they aim to communicate functional characters about a brand, product, or service relevant to users [29], such as general product information, product mentions, events, or information about product availability [22], motivating users to interact with the

brand and facilitating engagement [30], which generates one of the highest possible benefits for a brand's online communities [31].

Regarding entertaining posts, these seek to be fun for users [21] and to be perceived as expressive in their communication [32], appealing to their emotional side [22] to generate greater interaction, attention and a better digital experience [33] to achieve greater engagement [34]. It should be noted that these contents often influence brands' online communities [35] through memes, colloquial jargon, images with celebrities or post descriptions with emoticons and/or interesting images linked to the brand that generate fun facts [22].

While relational posts may be similar to entertaining posts [29], since both appeal to emotions by using posts that encourage activities among users [22], it is worth highlighting that relational content focuses on attracting users to brands [36] by fostering users' social and psychological integration satisfaction through content generated by brands in social, by filling the need to gain a place of belonging in communities related to them [34].

19.2.2 Social Media Engagement Behaviour (SMEB)

The SMEB is behavioural manifestations that users externalise in social networks, generated by motivations commonly represented through participations and interactions [8] that can be seen not only by brands, but by other users within the same online space [19] and generate a link between brands and consumers [34] and finally increase the purchase behaviour [37].

Within the SMEB typology, co-creation is the highest and most beneficial level for a brand [22] as users increasingly seek to exert their influence on every aspect of the brands they follow [38] through the creation of content related to the brand and other members to the brand [21] such as creating stories, comments or content that reflect interactive behaviours that facilitate people's learning about brands [39] with the aim of manifesting their creativity and expressing their opinion or ideas about a brand [49].

On the other hand, contribution, another SMEB typology, is defined as sets of moderate, positive and active behaviours, characterised by contributing to the diffusion of a brand in social networks [22], which can be generated between user and brand as user-user about the brand [31], due to users leaving their role as "observers" and becoming "collaborators" [41].

Meanwhile, the consumption typology corresponds to the minimum positive and passive level, since users consume the content generated by brands [21], limiting themselves to using social networks with the sole intention of obtaining some benefit from the information provided, without any form of participation and interaction with it [42]. This type of behaviour is evidenced by actions such as reading posts and viewing images or videos about a brand [43].

Also, recent literature demonstrates the existence of a significant influence on outcome analysis when contrasting different contexts in social networks [44],

including other countries [45] and cultures [46]. Moreover, some research confirmed how the SMC is directly related to engagement behaviour [47], impacting brand health [35, 48], using different social media platforms such as LinkedIn [49], Facebook [50] or Instagram [51]. Moreover, previous findings conclude that the source of the Social Media Content influences users' behaviour to a variety of engagements [52], willingness to share recommendations [53], purchase intention, and eWOM [23]. Furthermore, the relationship between social media engagement and firm content was supported in the media industry [54]. Based on the above, two hypotheses are formulated.

Hypothesis 1—H1. The Social Media Content generated by Netflix's official Facebook page has a positive influence on the Social Media Engagement Behaviour.

Hypothesis 2—H2. The Social Media Content generated by the official pages of the Netflix series on Facebook has a positive influence on the Social Media Engagement Behaviour.

19.3 Methodology

To validate the research hypotheses, data collection was carried out through two online surveys, using two self-administered online questionnaires for one month in the second half of 2021. The study population was composed of Netflix subscribers in Peru who follow Netflix's official Facebook or any of the different official Facebook of the Netflix series. Facebook was chosen because it is the social network where people usually search, share, and recommend content about series and streaming platforms [55]. Data was collected through rigorous ethical protocols to guarantee the respondents' anonymity and the answers' reliability. Furthermore, a filter question in each questionnaire was used to ensure that only followers of the official Netflix Facebook page or the official Facebook pages of the Netflix series answered the surveys. The convenience sample (non-probabilistic sampling procedure) for the present study was 284 people in total. 122 users in the sample indicated that they followed the official Netflix Facebook—Sample 1, while 162 people said they followed the official Facebook of Netflix series—Sample 2. The results of an independent t-test confirmed that the sample characteristics of both samples were similar. The questionnaires were divided into two sections. In the first section, demographic data from the followers as gender and age was collected. In sample 1, 45% of the respondents were male, 55% were female, and 92% were under 35 years old. In sample 2, 99.4% of the respondents were under 35 years old, 56% were female, and 44% were males.

Surveys were conducted online because many people can be accessed at a low investment, response time is shorter, survey length is more accurately addressed, and there is great flexibility and efficiency in management [56].

In the second part, two scales were constructed based on previous research. The first was used to assess the constructs in Netflix's official Facebook followers (Sample 1). In contrast, the second instrument was used to collect responses from official

Facebook followers of the Netflix series (Sample 2). The scales used to measure the variables came from previous literature, adapting scales other authors had already tested in previous studies. These scales were written in English, so they were translated into Spanish so that they could be applied to the study population. All the items in the questionnaire were questions based on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 being totally disagree and 5 totally agree). The scales were pretexted to confirm that the items were correct and only minor corrections were made. The pre-test sample was 15 respondents.

The multidimensional scale of Vale and Fernandes [34] and Schivinski et al. [43] was adapted to measure Social Media Engagement Behaviour (SMEB), based on the dimensions of consumption (four items), contribution (four items), co-creation (four items) validated by Schivinski et al. [41]. Also, the dimensions of entertaining (one item) and informative (one item) content types, originally designed by McQuail [34], were adapted from Vale and Fernandes [57]. One item was taken from Azar et al. [36] on entertaining content, which was adapted from Shu and Chuang [58]. The Fernandes and Castro [42] scale was used to measure the dimensions of informative content (two items) and entertaining content (one item); these were previously adopted by Baldus et al. [59] and Gummerus et al. [51]. Similarly, the approach in De Vries et al. [61] was used with the dimensions of informative content (one item) and entertaining content (one item) based on Muntinga et al. [31]. Relational content was measured employing the three-item multidimensional scale proposed by Helme-Guizon and Magnoni [62], which was adapted from Allen and Meyer [63].

For the present investigation, a PLS-SEM analysis was performed using the Smart-PLS 3 tool [64]. Due to the ability to analyse highly complex, multivariate models with many indicators, in addition to its great statistical scope, PLS-SEM is positioned as the appropriate method for the analysis of social networks [65].

Considering that the two study constructs are multidimensional, since the independent variable (SMC) is formed by the dimensions of informational content (IC), entertaining content (EC) and relational content (RC) and the dependent variable (SMEB) by the dimensions of co-creation (CC), consumption (CS) and contribution (CTR), a second-order analysis was carried out, where the indicators of the first-order latent variables were used to construct the variables SMC and SMEB [66], both of second order. SMC and SMBE being multidimensional variables of reflective character, the model validation was done in three steps, the measurement model of lower-order reflective constructs, the measurement model of higher-order reflective constructs and structural model assessment [67].

19.4   Results

The PLS-SEM results were evaluated according to the embedded two-stage approach of hierarchical models with Mode A [67]. Likewise, two different samples were used on the structural model; these differ only in the approach of the independent variable. Sample 1 focused on content generated by Netflix's official Facebook page,

while Sample 2 focused on content generated by the official Facebook pages of the respondents' favourite Netflix series.

The first step followed was to check the measurement model of lower-order reflective constructs [68], for which Cronbach's Alpha (α), Rho_A, composite reliability and the convergent validity (AVE) were calculated. Analysing the results of the composite reliability assessment [69], the IC, EC, RC, CTR, CC, and CS constructs were used for Sample 1—Netflix (Table 19.1) and Sample 2—Series (Table 19.2). The results of the analysis showed that both constructs and samples satisfactorily reached the level of composite reliability, given that they are within an acceptable range between 0.70 and 0.95 [70]. Continuing with the reliability test, Cronbach's Alpha, of both samples (1 and 2), yielded values between 0.80 and 0.89, being considered acceptable, because an Alpha value between 0.7 and 0.9 is a good internal consistency [65, 67]. Regarding convergent validity, for both samples, the IC, EC, RC, CTR, CC, and CS constructs were used. The AVE values are above 0.5, which indicates a convergent validity, by exceeding 50% of the variation of its elements [67].

Finally, the discriminant validity results were analysed using the HTMT criterion, which shows that the values are below the established threshold [71, 72].

The second step was the measurement model of high-order reflective constructs. The analysis results indicate that the reflective measurement model meets the relevant criteria required for both samples. The model was built, initially, based on the analysis of the factor loadings of the indicators related to each of the dimensions in order to assess the reliability of the internal consistency of the latent variables, and subsequently, the causality between the exogenous and endogenous constructs to test the hypotheses raised [73]. Regarding the external loads, Sample 1 (Fig. 19.1) obtained external loads between 0.810 and 0.925, while Sample 2 (Fig. 19.2) obtained external loads between 0.785 and 0.897.

Both samples obtained results above the threshold of 0.7, which reveals that the indicators show a satisfactory level of reliability [67, 68]. The next step is the internal consistency reliability; first of all, following the results of the composite reliability assessment [69], the SMC and SMEB constructs were used for both samples. Sample 1 showed the values of 0.915 and 0.899, respectively, while Sample 2, the values of 0.884 and 0.875. These results represent the degree of satisfaction in the level of reliability with respect to the composite reliability, since they are in the satisfactory range of between 0.70 and 0.95 [66, 73]. Likewise, continuing with the internal consistency reliability test, both samples (1 and 2) were subjected to the Cronbach's Alpha test, whose results were found to be within the range of 0.785 and 0.861, which is considered acceptable, since an Alpha value between 0.7 and 0.9 indicates good internal consistency [74]. For the elaboration of the convergent validity, both samples used the SMC and SMEB constructs, as a result, the corresponding AVE values of Sample 1 were 0.717 and 0.700, respectively, while for Sample 2, they were 0.783 and 0.749. These results are above 0.5, which indicates that there is a convergent validity, since both constructs show more than 50% of the variation of their elements [65, 70, 73] (see Table 19.1).

Table 19.1 Reliability and validity statistics—high-order reflective constructs

	Cronbach's α	Rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average variance extracted (AVE)
SMC$_{Netflix}$	0.861	0.873	0.915	0.783
SMEB$_{Netflix}$	0.833	0.860	0.899	0.749
SMC$_{Series}$	0.802	0.804	0.884	0.717
SMEB$_{Series}$	0.833	0.799	0.875	0.700

Accordingly, the discriminant validity was worked through the HTMT criterion; for this, the different indicators of the research model were grouped, thus applying a second order for both samples. In this way, Sample 1 obtained a value of 0.890, while Sample 2 obtained one of 0.836. With these results, the discriminant validity reaches a suitable level of satisfaction, since it has not exceeded the threshold of 0.90 [71] (see Table 19.2).

Subsequently, the development of criteria for the structural model was preceded with. Regarding the collinearity of the model, the PLS-SEM analysis had the results by means of the quotient of the variance of this or VIF. Sample 1 obtained values within a range of 1865 and 2798, while Sample 2 obtained values between 1401 and 2369. As a result, it is concluded that the levels of collinearity of the indicators of the research model are not critical, since they are below 5 [65, 71, 73]. Continuing with the evaluation of R^2, the SMEB dependent variable of the research model was submitted in both samples (1 and 2). Sample 1 obtained an R^2 of 0.595 in its dependent variable, while Sample 2 obtained an R^2 of 0.450. According to these results, the proportion of the variation of the dependent variable SMEB, explained by its independent variable SMC, can be considered moderate [70, 71, 75] (see Figs. 19.1 and 19.2).

Afterwards, the data was subjected to a Bootstrapping of 5000 samples, without the option to change the sign, Bootstrapping confidence interval (BCa), with a significance level of 0.001. The results of each sample validate hypotheses H1 and H2,

Table 19.2 HTMT criterion—high-order reflective constructs

	SMC$_{Netflix}$	SMEB$_{Netflix}$	SMC$_{Series}$	SMEB$_{Series}$
SMC$_{Netflix}$	0.890		0.836	
SMEB$_{Netflix}$				
SMC$_{Series}$				
SMEB$_{Series}$				

Fig. 19.1 Results of the PLS-SEM of sample 1. Followers of the official Netflix page

Fig. 19.2 Results of the PLS-SEM of sample 2. Followers of the official pages of Netflix series

Table 19.3 Standardised path coefficients, R^2 and hypothesis testing

Hypothesis	Path coefficient (β)	R^2	T-value	ρ-value	Hypothesis check
H1. $SMC_{NETFLIX} \rightarrow$ $SMEB_{NETFLIX}$ H2. $SMC_{SERIES} \rightarrow SMEB_{SERIES}$	0.772 0.671	0.595 0.450	20.035 15.583	0.000* 0.000*	Yes Yes

*$p < 0.001$

proving that both samples comply with a value less than 0.001 because they have a p-value (ρ-value) of 0.000 (see Table 19.3). The H1—$SMC_{NETFLIX} \rightarrow SMEB_{NETFLIX}$ had a β of 0.772. Meanwhile, the H2, that analysed the relationship of $SMC_{SERIES} \rightarrow SME_{BSERIES}$ showed a β of 0.671 (see Table 19.3).

The next step was to establish the effects of f^2 for both samples; Sample 1 obtained an f^2 of 1.472, while Sample 2 obtained an f^2 of 0.818. These values indicate that there is a higher effect of the latent exogenous variable, since the value is well above 0.35 [76]. Regarding the evaluation of Q^2, the dependent variable SMEB was subjected to this test in both samples (1 and 2). Sample 1 obtained a Q^2 of 0.427 in its dependent variable, while Sample 2 obtained a Q^2 of 0.304; these results indicate that the prediction accuracy of the model is acceptable, since the values are greater than zero [65, 67, 71].

19.5 Discussion

This research shows several contributions to the research framework on consumer behaviour in the context of social networks, as suggested by previous research from Cao et al., Creevey et al., Dolan et al., Schivinski et al., Vale and Fernandes [22, 77], but on this occasion, a reliable entertainment technology company such as Netflix has been taken as the main context within a growing industry which is highly valued by users such as video streaming. The first contribution of the study has been the comparison that the impact of the SMC on the SMEB, analysing two types of followers of the same company, is different; unlike previous research that evaluated the possible causes and consequences of the impact of the SMC on the SMEB in other industries [8, 34], this research has addressed the importance of the context in social networks

in a new way, since the comparison of the SMEB achieved through the SMC of the products, in this case, the series, was made against that obtained by the company, Netflix. The first group of followers evaluated is made up of followers of Netflix series fan pages, while the second group is made up of followers of the official Netflix page; the study was carried out on Face-book. The second contribution refers to the verification that, indeed, the SMEB is different depending on the entity that generates the content. According to the results of this research, there is a greater impact of the SMC on the SMEB in users who interact with the official Netflix page on Facebook, than in those users who follow the content of their favourite Netflix series. Taking into account that both the SMC of the series pages and the official page itself are created by Netflix, it could be deduced that users prioritise the general and diverse content created by Netflix as a brand, over the content created for one of its series in particular, probably because users value Netflix's SMC as a whole and not in a specific way when creating SMEBs.

This is an important finding because although some Netflix series are top-rated, the research results show that the content created by Netflix on its official fan page is more effective in getting followers to generate SMEB. This may be due to the fact that although some of the series become very popular, their popularity is limited to brief periods of time [78], commonly coinciding with the time that elapses from the launch of the new chapters until the followers watch the entire season, which makes it challenging to generate SMEB with the series in the long run. On the contrary, the results allow us to affirm that the constant generation of digital content on Facebook by Netflix makes its followers more predisposed to generate SMEB, sharing, cocre-ating, or consuming the content offered by Netflix on its official Facebook fan page. This may be because content consumption on streaming platforms, such as Netflix, is not limited to a single series; on the contrary, the subscribers of these platforms seek extensive and varied content, which is constantly renewed. This statement is especially true of users who generate SMEB since they are heavy users of Netflix in most cases.

Furthermore, the research also supposes a methodological contribution to the study of said variables [67] since the research proposal was analysed as a second order since both constructs were multidimensional, contrary to the previous researches where the dimensions of SMEB and SMC were considered constructs and studied as a first PLS-SEM.

Also, the results have straightforward practical implications for companies that offer streaming services, such as Netflix. As verified in the results, there is a clear relationship between SMC and SMEB. This implies that the strategies carried out by Netflix through social networks, specifically Facebook, are effective in getting users to be willing to create content, share information or consume it. As is known, nowadays, getting users to generate SMEBs is crucial for companies in general since achieving engagement increases the profitability of companies [79] and the purchase intention, mainly because users share their resources selflessly with the company, in the specific case of this investigation, with Netflix. At the same time, the results allow us to corroborate the importance for Netflix to frequently generate informative content while entertaining the followers and fostering relationships. This

implies that the SMEB is not generated spontaneously; on the contrary, Netflix users react to digital marketing actions on social networks through the SMC. It should be noted that these findings allow companies that offer streaming services to understand how to optimise their digital content strategies by demonstrating the close relationship between SMC and SMEB [80], which can undoubtedly be of great help in an increasingly competitive environment and with smaller marketing budgets.

It is also worth noting that this research clarifies the debate on whether it is more important to have one or two high-impact series or, on the contrary, Netflix users prefer vast and diverse content to view. The results allow us to understand that although SMEB can be achieved through SMC strategies in the official fan pages of the most popular Netflix series, it is undoubtedly more effective to implement SMC strategies on the official Netflix fan page promoting the full content of the streaming platform. In this sense, it can be affirmed that the users of a streaming platform are willing to generate SMEB and share their resources. Still, for this, platforms such as Netflix must have an immense catalogue of series and programs that allow them to create informative, entertaining content with the ability to go viral and reinforce brand equity.

The present investigation has a series of limitations, which can be corrected in future investigations. In the first place, the information gathering of the study was carried out clearly in Peru, which, although correct, limits the extrapolation of the findings to other realities; in this sense, the research could be replicated in other South American countries in order to universalise the results. Second, the research focused on the most important streaming brand, Netflix, but it is suggested that other researchers expand the number of streaming platforms, as it would serve to obtain a broader view of the impact of SMC and SMEB on the context of companies capable of producing high-value audio-visual content for users in general. In third place, it would be significant to expand the range of social networks of the study because, currently, digital platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, or the future web 3.0 [81], are becoming more popular than Facebook, and SMC and SMEB are likely to be produced differently. Furthermore, the expansion of the complexity of the model with variables related to the content generation strategy is suggested, such as the time or day the content was published, since it could generate interesting results on engagement behaviour [22]. Likewise, the expansion of the research with more current measurement instruments in the context of social networks and the digital field, in general, is suggested [41], such as Big Data or the blockchain. Finally, studying the role of influencers in the generation of Social Media Content can be considered a future research priority.

References

1. Lee, S., Lee, S., Joo, H., & Nam, Y. (2021). Examining factors influencing early paid over-the-top video streaming market growth: A cross-country empirical study. *Sustainability,13*(10). https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13105702

2. McMahon, L., Chpman, M., Tuma, S., & Flynn, M. (2018). Over the top video is coming of age.

3. Rose, J., Zuckerman, N., Sheerin, A., Mank, T., Schmitz, L., Cadicamo, A. (2020). Can Subscription video providers hold on to their new customers? BCG, 2020. https://www.bcg.com/publications/2020/can-subscription-video-providers-hold-on-to-their-new-customers. Accessed November 04, 2020.

4. Perreault, M. -C., & Mosconi, E. (2018). Social media engagement: Content strategy and metrics research opportunities. In *Proceedings of the 51st Hawaii international conference on system sciences* (vol. 9, pp. 3568–3577). https://doi.org/10.24251/hicss.2018.451

5. de Sá, S. L., de Rocha, A. A., & Paes, A. (2021). Predicting popularity of video streaming services with representation learning: A survey and a real-world case study. *Sensors, 21.* https://doi.org/10.3390/S21217328

6. Sharma, K., & Lulandala, E. E. (2022). OTT platforms resilience to COVID-19—A study of business strategies and consumer media consumption in India. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis.* https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-06-2021-2816/FULL/XML

7. Smith, K. T. (2011). Digital marketing strategies that Millennials find appealing, motivating, or just annoying. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 19*(6), 489–499. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2011.581383

8. Creevey, D., Kidney, E., & Mehta, G. (2019). From dreaming to believing: A review of consumer engagement behaviours with brands' social media content across the holiday travel process. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 36*(6), 679–691. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2019.1624242

9. (Josie) Liu, Z. (2021). Illusion versus disillusion: Chinese viewers' articulation of 'house of cards'. *Journalism and Media, 2*(2), 115–128. https://doi.org/10.3390/JOURNALMEDIA2020008

10. Appel, G., Grewal, L., Hadi, R., & Stephen, A. T. (2019). The future of social media in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48*(1), 79–95. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00695-1

11. Rosário, A., & Raimundo, R. (2021). Consumer marketing strategy and e-commerce in the last decade: A literature review. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 16*(7), 3003–3024. https://doi.org/10.3390/JTAER16070164

12. Du Plessis, C. (2017). The role of content marketing in social media content communities. *SA Journal of Information Management, 19*(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajim.v19i1.866

13. Gonçalves, H. M., Rey-Martí, A., Roig-Tierno, N., & Miles, M. P. (2016). The role of qualitative research in current digital social media: Issues and aspects—An introduction. *Psychology and Marketing, 33*(12), 1023–1028. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20935

14. Harrigan, P., Evers, U., Miles, M. P., & Daly, T. (2018). Customer engagement and the relationship between involvement, engagement, self-brand connection and brand usage intent. *Journal of Business Research, 88*(November), 388–396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.11.046

15. Guo, L., Gruen, T. W., & Tang, C. (2017). Seeing relationships through the lens of psychological contracts: The structure of consumer service relationships. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 45*(3), 357–376. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0462-5

16. Sabate, F., Berbegal-Mirabent, J., Cañabate, A., & Lebherz, P. R. (2014). Factors influencing popularity of branded content in Facebook fan pages. *European Management Journal, 32*(6), 1001–1011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2014.05.001

17. Syrdal, H. A., & Briggs, E. (2018). Engagement with social media content: A qualitative exploration. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 26*(1–2), 4–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2017.1389243

18. Carlson, J., Rahman, M., Voola, R., & De Vries, N. (2018). Customer engagement behaviours in social media: Capturing innovation opportunities. *Journal of Services Marketing, 32*(1), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-02-2017-0059
19. Wright, L. T., Gaber, H., Robin, R., & Cai, H. (2018). Back to the future: Using marketing basics to provide customer value. *Academy of Marketing Science, 2018*(May), 255–256. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66023-3
20. Peltier, J., Dahl, A. J., & VanderShee, B. A. (2020). Antecedent consumer factors, consequential branding outcomes and measures of online consumer engagement: Current research and future directions. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing, 14*(2), 239–268. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-01-2020-0010/FULL/HTML
21. Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J., & Goodman, S. (2016). Social media engagement behaviour: A uses and gratifications perspective. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 24*(3–4), 261–277. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2015.1095222
22. Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Frethey-Bentham, C., Fahy, J., & Goodman, S. (2019). Social media engagement behavior. *European Journal of Marketing, 53*(10), 2213–2243. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-03-2017-0182
23. Muda, M., & Hamzah, M. I. (2021). Should I suggest this YouTube clip? The impact of UGC source credibility on eWOM and purchase intention. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing, 15*(3), 441–459. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-04-2020-0072/FULL/HTML
24. Holliman, G., & Rowley, J. (2014). Business to business digital content marketing: Marketers' perceptions of best practice. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing, 8*(4), 269–293. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-02-2014-0013
25. Parent, M., Plangger, K., & Bal, A. (2011). The new WTP: Willingness to participate. *Business Horizons, 54*(3), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.003
26. Juntunen, M., Ismagilova, E., & Oikarinen, E. L. (2019). B2B brands on Twitter: Engaging users with a varying combination of social media content objectives, strategies, and tactics. Industrial Marketing Management, 1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.03.001
27. De Vries, L., Gensler, S., & Leeflang, P. S. H. (2012). Popularity of brand posts on brand fan pages: An investigation of the effects of social media marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 26*(2), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2012.01.003
28. Campbell, C., Pitt, L. F., Parent, M., & Berthon, P. R. (2011). Understanding consumer conversations around ads in a Web 2.0 world. *Journal of Advertising, 40*(1), 87–102. https://doi.org/10.2753/JOA0091-3367400106
29. Menon, R. G. V., & et al. (2018). How to grow brand post engagement on Facebook and Twitter for airlines? An empirical investigation of design and content factors. *Journal of Air Transport Management, 79*, 101678. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jairtraman.2019.05.002
30. Hofacker, C. F., & Belanche, D. (2016). Eight social media challenges for marketing managers. *Spanish Journal of Marketing—ESIC, 20*(2), 73–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SJME.2016.07.003
31. Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M., & Smit, E. G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for brand-related social media use. *International Journal of Advertising, 30*(1), 37–41. https://doi.org/10.2501/IJA-30-1-013-046
32. Stubb, C. (2018). Story versus info: Tracking blog readers' online viewing time of sponsored blog posts based on content-specific elements. *Comput Human Behav, 82*, 54–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.01.001
33. Arli, D. (2017). Does social media matter? Investigating the effect of social media features on consumer attitudes. *Journal of Promotion Management, 23*(4), 521–539. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2017.1297974
34. Vale, L., & Fernandes, T. (2018). Social media and sports: Driving fan engagement with football clubs on Facebook. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 26*(1), 37–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2017.1359655
35. Pletikosa Cvijikj, I., & Michahelles, F. (2013). Online engagement factors on Facebook brand pages. *Social Networking Analysis and Mining, 3*(4), 843–861. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13278-013-0098-8

36. Azar, S. L., Machado, J. C., Vacas-De-Carvalho, L., & Mendes, A. (2016). Motivations to interact with brands on Facebook—Towards a typology of consumer-brand interactions. *Journal of Brand Management, 23*(2), 153–178. https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2016.3

37. Malthouse, E. C., Calder, B. J., Kim, S. J., & Vandenbosch, M. (2016). Evidence that user-generated content that produces engagement increases purchase behaviours. *Journal of Marketing Management, 32*(5–6), 427–444. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257x.2016.1148066

38. Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18*(3), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.20015

39. Brodie, R. J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. (2013). Consumer engagement in a virtual brand community: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(1), 105–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.029

40. Yadav, M., Kamboj, S., & Rahman, Z. (2016). Customer co-creation through social media: The case of 'Crash the Pepsi IPL 2015.' *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice, 17*(4), 259–271. https://doi.org/10.1057/dddmp.2016.4

41. Schivinski, B., Christodoulides, G., & Dabrowski, D. (2016). Measuring consumers' engagement with brand-related social-media content: Development and validation of a scale that identifies levels of social-media engagement with brands. *Journal of Advertising Research, 56*(1), 64–80. https://doi.org/10.2501/JAR-2016-004

42. Fernandes, T., & Castro, A. (2020). Understanding drivers and outcomes of lurking versus posting engagement behaviours in social media-based brand communities. *Journal of Marketing Management, 00*(00), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2020.1724179

43. Schivinski, B., Muntinga, D. G., Pontes, H. M., & Lukasik, P. (2019). Influencing COBRAs: The effects of brand equity on the consumer's propensity to engage with brand-related content on social media. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 00*(00), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/096 5254X.2019.1572641

44. Lee, C., Choi, Y., & Kim, J. (2018). Testing a cultural orientation model of electronic word-of-mouth communication: A comparative study of U.S. and Korean social media users. *Asian Journal of Communication, 28*(1), 74–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2017.1334075

45. Lee, J., & Park, C. (2022). Social media content, customer engagement and brand equity: US versus Korea. *Management Decision, 60*(8), 2195–2223. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-12-2020-1595/FULL/XML

46. Khan, I., Dongping, H., & Wahab, A. (2016). Does culture matter in effectiveness of social media marketing strategy? An investigation of brand fan pages. *Aslib Journal of Information Management, 68*(6), 694–715. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-03-2016-0035

47. Shahbaznezhad, H., Dolan, R., & Rashidirad, M. (2022). *The role of social media content format and platform in users' engagement behaviour* (vol. 53, pp. 47–65). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2020.05.001

48. Ahmad, N. S., Musa, R., & Harun, M. H. M. (2016). The impact of social media content marketing (SMCM) towards brand health. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 37*, 331–336. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(16)30133-2

49. Sundström, M., Alm, K. H., Larsson, N., & Dahlin, O. (2021). B2B social media content: Engagement on LinkedIn. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing, 36*(3), 454–468. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-02-2020-0078/FULL/XML

50. Hinson, R., Boateng, H., Renner, A., & Kosiba, J. P. B. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of customer engagement on Facebook: An attachment theory perspective. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing, 13*(2), 204–226. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-04-2018-0059/FULL/HTML

51. Balio, S., & Casais, B. (2021). A content marketing framework to analyze customer engagement on social media. *Research Anthology on Strategies for Using Social Media as a Service and Tool in Business*, 320–336. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-9020-1.CH016

52. Schaefers, T., Falk, T., Kumar, A., & Schamari, J. (2021). More of the same? Effects of volume and variety of social media brand engagement behavior. *Journal of Business Research, 135*, 282–294. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JBUSRES.2021.06.033

53. Kim, M., & Lee, M. (2017). Brand-related user-generated content on social media: The roles of source and sponsorship. *Internet Research, 27*(5), 1085–1103. https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-07-2016-0206/FULL/XML

54. Viswanathan, V., Malthouse, E. C., Maslowska, E., Hoornaert, S., & van den Poel, D. (2018). Dynamics between social media engagement, firm-generated content, and live and time-shifted TV viewing. *Journal of Service Management, 29*(3), 378–398. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-09-2016-0241/FULL/XML

55. López-De-ayala, M. C., García-Jiménez, A., & Pastor-Ruiz, Y. (2021). Differentiated uses of social networking platforms among young people in the autonomous region of Madrid. *Social Sciences, 10*(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/SOCSCI10040114

56. Le Guin, T. D., Baker, R., Mechling, J., & Ruyle, E. (2012). Myths and realities of respondent engagement in online surveys. *International Journal of Market Research, 54*(5), 613–633. https://doi.org/10.2501/ijmr-54-5-613-633

57. McQuail, D. (1983). *Mass communication theory* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.

58. Shu, W., & Chuang, Y. H. (2011). The perceived benefits of six-degree-separation social networks. *Internet Research, 21*(1), 26–45. https://doi.org/10.1108/10662241111104866

59. Baldus, B. J., Voorhees, C., & Calantone, R. (2015). Online brand community engagement: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research, 68*(5), 978–985. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2014.09.035

60. Gummerus, J., Liljander, V., Weman, E., & Pihlström, M. (2012). *Customer engagement in a Facebook brand community* (vol. 35, no. 9). https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171211256578

61. De Vries, L., Peluso, A. M., Romani, S., Leeflang, P. S. H., & Marcati, A. (2017). Explaining consumer brand-related activities on social media: An investigation of the different roles of self-expression and socializing motivations. *Comput Human Behav, 75*, 272–282. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.05.016

62. Helme-Guizon, A., & Magnoni, F. (2019). Consumer brand engagement and its social side on brand-hosted social media: How do they contribute to brand loyalty? *Journal of Marketing Management, 35*(7–8), 716–741. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2019.1599990

63. Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology., 63*, 1–18.

64. Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, S. (2015). SmartPLS 3. *Boenningstedt: SmartPLS*. https://www.smartpls.com/

65. Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2017). Partial least squares structural equation modeling. In *Handbook of market research* (pp. 1–40). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05542-8_15-1

66. van Riel, A. C. R., Henseler, J., Kemény, I., & Sasovova, Z. (2017). Estimating hierarchical constructs using consistent partial least squares: The case of second-order composites of common factors. *Industrial Management and Data Systems, 117*(3), 459–477. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-07-2016-0286

67. Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J. H., Becker, J. M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). How to specify, estimate, and validate higher-order constructs in PLS-SEM. *Australasian Marketing Journal, 27*(3), 197–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2019.05.003

68. Crocetta, C., et al. (2020). Higher-order PLS-PM approach for different types of constructs. *Social Indicators Research.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02563-w

69. Jöreskog, K. G. (1971). Simultaneous factor analysis in several populations. *Psychometrika, 36*(4), 409–426. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291366

70. Hair, J., Hult, G., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.

71. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

72. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing. *Advances in International Marketing, 20*(2009), 277–319. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-7979(2009)0000020014

73. Hair, J., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C., & Gudergan, S. (2017). Advanced issues in partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). Thousand oaks.
74. González, J., & Pazmiño, M. (2015). Cálculo e interpretación del Alfa de Cronbach para el caso de validación de la consistencia interna de un cuestionario, con dos posibles escalas tipo Likert. *Revista Publicando, 2*(2), 62–67.
75. Hair, J., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 19*(2), 139–152. https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-667919 0202
76. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
77. Cao, D., Meadows, M., Wong, D., & Xia, S. (2020). Understanding consumers' social media engagement behaviour: An examination of the moderation effect of social media context. *Journal Business Research*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.06.025
78. Rahman, K. T., & Arif, Md. Z. U. (2021). Impacts of Binge-watching on Netflix during the COVID-19 pandemic. *South Asian Journal of Marketing, 2*(1), 97–112. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJM-05-2021-0070
79. Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 28*(2), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002
80. Yuan, S. T. D., Chou, S. Y., Yang, W. C., Wu, C. A., & Huang, C. T. (2017). Customer engagement within multiple new media and broader business ecosystem—A holistic perspective. *Kybernetes, 46*(6), 1000–1020. https://doi.org/10.1108/K-01-2017-0042/FULL/XML
81. Zheng, J., & Mason, D. S. (2022). New media, digitalization, and the evolution of the professional sport industry. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living, 4*, 221. https://doi.org/10.3389/FSPOR.2022.921329/XML/NLM