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Abstract

This dissertation was written as a part of the MSc in e-Business and Digital Marketing at the International Hellenic University. The aim of this study is to analyze the phenomenon of influencer marketing, its rise and its effects on consumer behaviour and brand perception. This research was implemented in collaboration with a Greek footwear retail shop, with both online and offline presence, named Arte Piedi. A thorough research was conducted in the state-of-the-art literature along with a qualitative research in order to identify Greek consumers perception about influencer marketing, how it affects their behaviour and how it helps or damages a brand.

The findings concern both influencers and brands which utilizing influencer marketing technique. The analysis of the collected data revealed the most appealing characteristics of influencers and the main challenges that influencers and brands need to aware in order to avoid unsuccessful campaigns and failure.
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1. Introduction

The nature of media and advertising is continually changing. Ahead of her time, Tracy Tuten (2008) introduces the consequence of the Web 2.0 in advertising, properly using the title “Advertising 2.0”. Tuten shows the changes in the role and meaning of advertising and notes some significant flaws between traditional and online advertising models. A major point is that traditional definition of advertising changes; while it used to be a paid one-way promotional communication, some of the most valuable advertising may now be unpaid, or indirectly paid, consisting aspects of current social network advertising and the viral spread of brand messages. The emergence and growth of user-driven technologies like blogs and social networks has revealed a communication revolution, which Smith (2009) aptly describes as a revolution in user-generated content, global community and the publishing consumer opinion.

In the last five years, social networks and social media users have more than doubled in size (Statista) and their rapid growth is generating a new marketing obstacle: noise. In particular, noise has developed a growth of ad aversion among online users that caused paid advertisements on social media to steadily become less effective (Dinesh, 2017). Furthermore, the open, big, and messy Web leads year over year more people to become adblock software users; 615 million global devices are blocking ads and there is a 30% global growth in adblock usage on a yearly basis (PageFair, 2017). Adblock users have caused serious damage in the marketing and advertising sphere, considering that the loss of global revenue due to blocked advertising was $21.8 billions during 2015, a figure that will most probably rise further, placing the digital advertising industry in a difficult position (PageFair, 2015). PageFair also reports that 77% of adblock users are willing to view some ad formats, but this noisy scenery discourages them. A valuable insight derived from this percentage is that users want to have an organic, genuine connection with the brands and adverts that will naturally show up in their lives. All these new developments are thrusting marketers to reconsider their advertising strategies and find new effective techniques to utilize. Thus, there is a constant strive for marketers to find the best way to influence the customers, and utilize marketing techniques to “camouflage” the advertisement. Consumer-oriented marketing strategies, such as product placement, native advertising, content marketing and influencer marketing are some examples of what they use in order to avoid that noise.
Consumer-oriented marketing offers a new experience, in contrast to traditional marketing, which is directed towards business client. Kotler and Armstrong (2012) define consumer-oriented marketing as “the philosophy of enlightened marketing that holds that the company should view and organize its marketing activities from the consumer’s point of view”. Likewise, influencer marketing is mostly used in attempts to impact a customer. New concepts and objectives are raising such as awareness, loyalty, and engagement.

The concept of word-of-mouth communication that minimises this noise has received significant attention in the digital ocean and communication through social media has become a cultural phenomenon. As electronic word-of-mouth increases, influencer marketing becomes one of the most effective and promising marketing techniques. A spectacular difference can be identified by google’s keyword tool, which displays that the term “influencer marketing” is searched nowadays well over 4,400 times on average per month, while this keyword in 2013 had less than 50 average monthly searches. The same enormous upgrowth had been noticed on Google Trends.

The purpose of this study is to identify the consumers’ perception of influencer marketing and influencers in general and to address the attributes that they find appealing, along with their positive or negative effects, as well as the reasons why a campaign might change their impression about a brand. The study is conducted in collaboration with a Greek retailer, an online footwear and clothing store named ‘Arte Piedi’. The aim is to discover Greek consumers’ perception of influencer marketing and to identify whether it can act in favor or against a certain brand.

Outline of the thesis

The introduction has shed light into the phenomenon of influencer marketing and its relation to the new social web (Web 2.0) and the new age of advertising. The thesis continues with a literature review, as the second chapter, which provides an analysis on previous researches on relevant concepts. Literature review consists of seven subchapters and elaborates word-of-mouth (WOM) and electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM), which are the core and inception of influencer marketing, followed by Web 2.0 and social media, influencer 2.0, the types and characteristics of influencers, marketing benefits, challenges and risks, brand equity, the consumer behaviour and attitudes, and source credibility theory and halo effect theory. The research methodology is presented in the third chapter along with the research strategy, study design, and data collection. Results are presented in the fourth chapter, while chapter five includes discussion and conclusion.
2. Literature Review

2.1 Word-of-Mouth & Electronic Word-of-Mouth

Word-of-Mouth (WOM) is the action of informally sharing experiences and spreading information among consumers, whenever they are satisfied or dissatisfied with specific products (Anderson 1998, Mangold et al. 1999). Customers are used to exchanging their opinions and experiences in and outside their personal social network. This marketing technique utilizes the consumers’ networks in order to increase brand awareness, through self-replication and message diffusion (Kiss and Bichler, 2008), and limits the risk of customers’ buying decision making process (Godes and Mayzlin, 2004). Several studies have identified the power of interpersonal influence through word-of-mouth communication. Therefore, Word-of-Mouth is considered the most valuable, influential and persuasive form of marketing in both business and academic communities. Nielsen’s global trust in advertising report of 2015 has shown that 83% of consumers trust recommendations from friends and family over all forms of advertising, proving that word-of-mouth is the most effective marketing model.

Although the influential role of word-of-mouth communication has been known for decades, recently there is an emergence of explicit organizational efforts to stimulate “buzz”; i.e. contagious word-of-mouth commentary about products, services, brands and ideas (Walker, 2004). Walter J. Carl (2006) divides word-of-mouth into two types; everyday word-of-mouth and institutional word-of-mouth or buzz. Buzz marketing organizations either pay people or seek volunteers to try new brands and then promote them among their social networks as part of an organized WOM campaign. Buzz marketing is defined as “cultivating opinion leaders and getting them to spread information about a product or service to others in their communities” (Kotler and Armstrong, 2012) and is reported as an one of the earlier forms of influencer marketing.

The emergence of the Web 2.0, or Social Web, has enabled new forms of communication platforms that further empower both providers and customers to share information and opinions both from Business to Consumer (B2C) and Consumer to Consumer (C2C). This led to a radical change in the traditional marketing communication models. Whereas traditional marketing media follow a one-to-many communication model, the Internet introduced a
many-to-many communication model which is interactive; dialogue instead of monologue (Hoffman and Novak, 1996).

These newly formed media channels have offered fertile ground for electronic word-of-mouth communication. Online user reviews influence other users’ perception of product through social networking and social media sites and could be considered as part of the eWOM marketing (Duan et al. 2008). Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) define eWOM communication as “any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, or former customers about a product or company, which is made available to a multitude of people and institutions via the Internet”. Furthermore, they note that eWOM may be less personal as it is not face-to-face but it is more powerful because it is immediate, has a significant reach and is accessible by others.

2.2 Web 2.0 & Social Media

The term Web 2.0 was initially introduced by Tim O’Reilly and Dale Dougherty in the O’Reilly Media Web 2.0 Conference in 2004 (Graham, 2005). It does not consider to be an update of any technical features rather than to the way that websites are designed and used in comparison to Web 1.0 or to the first generation of World Wide Web. A number of authors argue that the terms social media, Web 2.0 and creative consumer are often used interchangeably and imprecisely, as they are related and most significantly, interdependent (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Berthon, Pitt, Plangger & Shapiro, 2012). Their relationship is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Web 2.0, Social Media and Creative Consumers
As shown in Figure 1, the three elements are differentiated in focus. Web 2.0 can be considered as the technical infrastructure that enables the social phenomenon of collective media and facilitates consumer-generated content, while social media focuses on content, and consumer generation on the creators of that content. In other words, Web 2.0 enables the creation and distribution of the content via social media (Berthon, Pitt, Plangger & Shapiro, 2012).

Tapscott and Williams (2007) note that Web 2.0 had two main consequences for marketers; initially it gave rise to ‘social media’, and then it allowed the ‘creative consumer’ to flourish. As it has been already mentioned, the main concept of Web 2.0 is many-to-many content. Social media and social media networking sites are actually the essential vehicles needed to carry this content, and it is usually the customers who produce all the value-added content in social media and their connections -friends, family and associates- that comprise the audience. This is known as user-generated content (UGC) or consumer-generated media (CGM). It is a content in the form of words, text, images and videos, generated by millions of users-consumers globally, which can be inspired to create value, from a marketing point of view. This value range begins as informal discussions about products and services, progresses to users creating structured reviews, suggestions and evaluations in texts or videos, and eventually consumers become involved in the promotion or demotion of brands (Berthon, Pitt, McCarthy & Kates, 2007). Additionally, consumers become involved in the modification of proprietary products and services and the distribution of these innovations (Berthon, Pitt & Campbell, 2008).

Taking into consideration the constant rise of ad blocking softwares, based on PageFair report of 30% yearly growth on ad block usage, marketers need to discover new ways to reach and influence customers without relying on traditional display, search and social ads. This is why social media marketing and user-generated content are rapidly becoming the most widely preferred and efficient online marketing strategies.
2.3 Influencer Marketing

2.3.1 Influencers 2.0

The rise of the Social Web has had a clear impact on how businesses, both business to business (B2B) and business to consumer (B2C), engage with their audience. As the marketing scene is constantly changing, there are a lot of new paid advertising techniques that leverage online communication to influence brands’ target audience, engage it, and ultimately prompt consumers to purchase the product.

As mentioned previously, several studies have shown that customers trust a third party (WOM) more than the brand itself. Word-of-mouth can be easily confused with influencer marketing: when a customer spreads a message through WOM, influencer marketing is the process and WOM is often the medium (Markethub, 2016). There is a lack of academic definition of the term “influencer marketing” because of its recent entry in the literature. Social media influencer marketing is a term that refers to leveraging the ability of key people to support a brand and spread the word to their followers. It has been established as a highly-effective method for brands to build and engage with audiences on social media. This marketing technique requires the collaboration between the brand and an influencer. Influencer marketing is not a completely new concept as, for many years, celebrities, athletes and other leaders were the sole influencers in their fields and brands would collaborate in order to promote their products or services. The strategic marketing technique of the traditional influencer campaign of the past regarded recruitment of a celebrity spokesperson. Nowadays, the challenge is to exploit an influencer who can motivate his followers to acquire user generated images, which include a brand’s product or service. Real life influencers, everyday people, who are passionate about the products that they suggest have a noteworthy following and an enormous number of buying conversations and conversions. A McKinsey study proves that consumers are more likely to trust and follow this kind of product endorsement.

The way that social media communication has recently changed the scene and gave everyone the opportunity to share their voice, opinion, and content made influencer marketing unique. This is actually the reason why a lot of marketing blogs and reports are referring to it as “Influencer 2.0” or “Word-of-Mouth 2.0”, in order to emphasize that it is the
future influence marketing and its connection with Web 2.0 ('Influence 2.0', Report by Altimeter and Traackr).

In order to clarify what influencer marketing is, an overview of the term influencer itself is necessary. As mentioned above, these terms are relatively new, therefore several definitions and points of view currently exist. Peck defines influencers as “a range of third parties who exercise influence over the organization and its potential customers” (Peck et al., 2004). Brown and Hayes (2008) published the book “Influencer marketing: Who really influences your customers?”, in which they define an influencer as “a third party who significantly shapes the customer’s purchasing decision, but may never be accountable for it”. Keller and Berry (2003) state that influencers are activists, are well-connected, have impact, have active minds, and are trendsetters, though this set of attributes is aligned specifically to consumer markets. These definitions refer to influencers as friends and kith who recommend something to each other or via online reviews in forums. A more general definition has recently been given by the Word of Mouth Marketing Association (WOMMA) and refers to an influencer as “a person who has a greater than average reach or impact through word of mouth in a relevant marketplace” (WOMMA, 2017). This paper will use the definition suggested by Freberg et al. (2011) as it is more specific -referring to social media marketing- and recent; “Social Media Influencer (SMI) is a new type of independent third party endorser who shape audience attitudes through blogs, tweets, and the use of other social media”.

Overall, marketing agencies themselves have created definitions of what this marketing technique is all about and how it reflects the daily usage. Tapinfluence, one of the leading influencer marketing companies, describes it as “a type of marketing that focuses on using key leader to drive brand’s message to the larger market” (Tapinfluence, 2017). Similarly, Markethub presents it as “recruiting through leaders and authorities within the niche to broadcast a message to a wider audience” (Markethub, 2017).

2.3.2 Types of influencers

Current literature is characterized by a marked frustration derived from various attempts to clarify the role and the effectiveness of this new phenomenon (social media influencer) on the customer’s purchase decisions. It has been argued that SMI functions as “a digital opinion leader, showing that he is perceived as a member of an online community with the ability to influence others due to expertise on the relevant topic” (Cho, Wang and Lee, 2012). Some
authors support that he (see Kapitan & Silvera, 2016; Khamis, Ang and Welling, 2016; Pedroni, 2016) functions as “a micro-celebrity person who desires visibility and attention and is influential through his admirability and high social status”. Moreover, other studies refer to the Social Media Influencers as social leaders; “people that through their large social capital lead the online community and set the standard with regards to the values and behaviour of its members” (Forsyth, 2015; Langner, Hennigs & Wiedmann, 2013).

Since there is no conclusive definition of influencer and SMI types, each article and report segment them on their own way. For the purposes of this study, the major types of influencers are distinctly defined below.

**Mega-Influencer or Celebrities**

As mentioned above, influencer marketing is not a new concept at all. Celebrities have been influencing a large-scale of consumers for many years now. Mega-influencer includes celebrities, actors, artists, athletes and consists the initial form of influencer before the appearance of social web. Celebrities used to be either the image of a brand or its advocate via the media. According to Mavrck (2016), a renowned influencer marketing agency, even if mega influencers have enormous reach (up to one million followers), they drive to extremely low engagement (2%-5%). They provide high topical relevance but low brand relevance. They also have the lowest ability to drive the desired actions from the audience on behalf of a brand, although they are best for impression and awareness.

**Macro-Influencer or Opinion-Leader**

Opinion leaders or market mavens (Feick and Price, 1987; Kozinets et al. 2010) has been an term often used to explain influencer marketing, however they actually differ from the rest of influencers by an alternative consumer behaviour of ongoing communication between ordinary consumers and a mass audience of strangers (McQuarrie, Miller and Phillips, 2012). From a more psychological perspective, opinion leaders are strategically situated individuals in social networks in all levels of society, who are often influential on one or several topics (Buttle, 1998). The reliability that they radiate comes from a combination of knowledge and expertise in a product or service category they are highly involved in (Feick and Price, 1987). They are also described as innovators. According to Mavrck (2016) they might be executives, bloggers or journalists with a great resonance and engagement and ability to deliver a
desired action from their audience. Furthermore, they provide higher product and lower topic relevance and have a large influence on consumers purchasing behaviour. Hsu, Lin, and Chiang (2015) found that when customers want to buy something new and for the first time, the recommendation of an opinion leader helps them reduce the risk of buying something unfamiliar.

Micro-Influencer

Theresa Senft (2008) defines microcelebrity as “a new style of online performance that involves people ‘boosting’ their popularity over the Web using technologies like videos, blogs and social networking sites”. In contrast to common entertainment industry celebrities, who can be public idols with many followers, microcelebrity “is a state of being famous to a niche group of people” (Marwick, 2013) and involves the creation of a persona that feels authentic, trustworthy and original to users. Unlike the traditional celebrities, micro-influencers have a small audience that they strategically maintain through consistent communication (Pedroni, 2016). Micro-influencers are “next door” people described as successful, talented, and attractive with admiration, association and aspiration (Djafarova and Rushworth, 2017). According to Lv et al. (2013), they are highly capable of triggering consumers’ desire for a brand and can have a positive impact on brand attitude and loyalty as they can pass on their recommendations to their large scale of followers. They are themselves everyday consumers, with the ability to drive to high engagement (26%-60%) and conversions (Mavrck, 2016).

2.3.3 Influencer Characteristics

Besides the special attributes of each type of influencer, there are some fundamental characteristics essential for all influencers, as Keller and Berry (2003) describe in their book “The Influentials”. According to them “the influential” has to have an ACTIVE profile:

- Ahead in adoption
- Connected (socially and electronically)
- Travellers
- Information Hungry
- Vocal
- Exposed to media
The title “ACTIVE” appropriately describes social media influencers, as they are people radiating energy. They are most probably authentic volunteers, with an activist mindset, and usually highly educated but not at the highest level of education. They get involved into several activities and are not likely to spend their time passively, as in by watching television. They are open-minded and love to travel, explore new cultures and absorb information. They are people that are leaders by nature, liable for innovation and constant progress. Social media influencers are ahead in adoption, are exposed to media, express their voice through media and have a powerful list of followers (Keller & Berry, 2003).

Trusted influencers could lead consumers to accept suggestions and make purchases in e-commerce. Therefore, identification of trusted influencers and effective influencer campaigns has become a popular marketing topic. From this point of view, according to the source credibility theory, the 3 R’s are three other factors that an active social media influencer must have:

- Reach - The ability to deliver content to a target audience.
- Relevance - Strength of connection to a brand or topic.
- Resonance - Ability to drive a desired behaviour from an audience.

2.3.4 Influencer Marketing Benefits

Marketing strategies, in order to be specific and efficient, should set objectives and goals and support them with the appropriate actions, in order to fulfill them (Kotler & Armstrong, 2012). Accordingly, there are plenty of objectives that could be achieved in an influencer campaign through successful collaborations. For example, sales promotion and traffic increase, brand awareness and recognition, new customers acquisition and niche audience reach, satisfactory relationship maintenance, good corporate image and reputation, competitive advantage, lasting relationships with existing customers, information communication to the public.

According to a study conducted by Nielsen and the TapInfluence agency in 2016, influencer marketing offers a return on investment (ROI) eleven times higher than traditional forms of online marketing. This study also found that customers exposed to influencer marketing tend to purchase significantly more products in each purchase occasion than those who being exposed to traditional online marketing. Furthermore, influencer marketing provides much more benefits than typical social media marketing campaign, as well as generally digital marketing campaign. Throughout a campaign, the brand has bigger reach, given that it takes
advantage of the already built relationships, trust and credibility between influencers and their followers. It also creates a halo effect, which is carried over to the brand for which the influencer creates content. This cannot happen with display ads, since users are aware that such advertising, even when it appears on an influencer’s website, is not endorsed by or associated with the influencer (Nielsen and TapInfluence, 2016). Through relevant influencers, a brand’s content is placed in the view of social users that are already interested in this niche target. There is no need of spending additional funds on testing and finding the appropriate audience - the influencer has already fostered this audience on social media. As noted, it could also highly expand brand awareness through reach and positioning online. Social users are willing to know more about the brand, its story, and the offering solutions.

Brands are harnessing the power of influencer marketing in a variety of ways, usually by matching the influencer’s audience to the brand’s target market. An Influencer Marketing Report studied brands using influencer marketing, and found that 69% of them “affirm that either their influencer actions have been effective or have provided the desired results” (“Status of influencer marketing”, 2014). Brands partner with online influencers for services such as product launching, content distribution, and event promotion. One benefit of influencer marketing is reduction of negative consumer feedback from customers who feel overwhelmed by unsolicited marketing messages. Zhang states that “by sending a message only to a carefully selected group of consumers who are likely to be interested in the product/service, a company can reduce the amount of negative feelings generated” (Zhang et al., 2013). Consumers are more likely to favorably respond to a targeted message from someone they trust than a mass-media advertisement.

2.3.5 Challenges & Risks

As noted above, influencer marketing is one of the most recent, effective and promising marketing techniques. Nevertheless, there are a lot of challenges and risks that brands have to overcome in order to achieve a successful campaign. There is no existing academic research for unsuccessful influencer campaign. The following cases are reported in prestigious and renowned electronic sources. According to MediaKix, there are some hidden and unexpected obstacles that could lead to failure. Influencer marketing relies greatly on the influencers themselves, so it is crucial for the brand to partner with the appropriate influencers for their campaigns, share the same culture and allow them some degree of creative control for better results. Besides quantity, affiliation of followers to the brand is a very important aspect that needs to be taken into consideration when selecting an influencer. Furthermore,
program management and control is vital for the success of a campaign. Many programs lack focused objectives, aligned with brand or marketing objectives. Having no certain goal hinders proper execution of a campaign and does not allow for measurement of its effectiveness and success. A lack of quality content or brand messaging is also another factor that could certainly lead to unexpected results and a lot of noise, since the right and relevant content is a key part of the efficacy of this marketing technique.

2.4 Brand equity

A brand is generally defined as “a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or combination of them which is intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors” (Kotler, 1991). These individual components are also called “brand identities”, and all of them consist “the brand”. The significance of consumers’ acknowledgment in decision making has been well documented (Alba, Hutchinson, and Lynch 1991). It is fundamental for the brand to have a clear content which provokes certain reaction in the consumer’s mind, i.e. in response to marketing activity.

Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) initially discovered the basis of the consumer-based brand equity. Keller (1993) considers brand equity as “the differential effect that brand knowledge has on consumer response to the marketing of the brand”. For this reason, it is essential for the brand to provide value to customers in order for it to ensure a high equity. The strength of a brand relies upon customer’s information and feelings towards a brand acquired over time (Keller, 2003). In general, it is about consumer’s perception of the overall dominance of a product/service carrying that brand name when compared to other brands (Lassar et al., 1995). There are many dimensions or assets (Aaker, 1991) proposed in the analysis of brand equity. One of the most common classifications suggested by Aaker (1991) consists of five dimensions: awareness, associations, perceived quality, brand loyalty and other brand-related assets.

Brand awareness is the first stage towards creating brand equity. This dimension refers to the ability of consumers to recall or recognise a brand and is related to the strength of a brand’s presence in consumers’ minds (Aaker, 1996). Brand awareness contributes to brand equity in four different ways: by creating a brand node in customer’s memory, by providing a sense of familiarity with the brand in his mind, by acting as a signal of trust towards the brand and by being a reason for the customer to opt for the brand again. Therefore, brand awareness is the result of consumers’ exposure to a brand (Alba and Hutchinson, 1987) and it is usually
measured through brand recognition and recall (Aaker, 1996; Keller, 2003). Brand awareness involves linking the brand to different associations in one’s memory (Keller, 2003).

Brand associations are “anything linked in memory to a brand” (Aaker, 1991), and they represent the meaning of the brand for the consumer. This dimension is closely related to brand awareness, since both dimensions result from the consumer-brand contact (Aaker, 1991; Fournier, 1998). In addition, every new experience with a brand creates, strengthens or modifies an individual’s associations (Keller, 2003). There are various types of the customer’s relationship to the product features, both tangible and intangible, namely type of consumer, lifestyle, etc. (Aaker, 1991; Biel, 1992; Keller, 1993; Park and Srinivasan, 1994). Associations have to be unique, strong and favourable in order to create positive feelings towards the brand (Lassar et al. 1995; Keller, 2003). Moreover, brand associations should also control and stop a consumer from searching further information before making a purchase decision (Van Osselaer & Alba, 2000). Hamann et al. (2007) claim that consumers often support and are willing to pay premium prices for branded products even if they can choose from other products of equal quality. Eventually, they identify themselves with the brand and form an emotional bond and connection (Lassar et al., 1995).

According to Zeithaml (1988), perceived quality is “the consumer’s judgment about a product's overall excellence or superiority”. The best way for a brand to increase its perceived quality is to invest in improving its real objective quality. Each company has to communicate the quality of its brands through quality signals in its marketing actions. Consumers perceive brand quality through their direct experiences with the brand and the information obtained by peers (Gronroos, 1984; Yoo et al., 2000). Therefore, there are several factors contributing to perceived quality; such as reliability, durability, appearance, performance, serviceability, etc. (Parasuraman et al., 1985; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Brucks et al., 2000).

Oliver (1997) defines brand loyalty as “a deeply held commitment to rebuy or repatronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same-brand set purchasing despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviour”. A loyal customer to a product or brand considers it as his first option and he is not influenced or affected by the strategies that are employed by competitor brands to tempt him and get his attention (Tong and Hawley, 2009) Brand loyalty develops from actual buying and usage of the product or brand (Baldauf et al., 2003). Brand loyalty is formed by two different and complementary components: attitudinal and behavioural
(Dick and Basu, 1994; Taylor et al., 2004). The attitudinal component shows that loyalty formation is caused by a positive bond between consumer and brand, and this attitude arises from the coincidence between the brand attributes and the consumer’s preferences. The behaviour component explains loyalty formation by the consumer’s prior purchases resulting in a certain purchase habit (Dick and Basu, 1994).

2.5 Consumer-User Behaviour & Decision Making Process

Influencer marketing is most commonly used to impress and effect the potential buyer. It has managed to radically change marketing for customers to marketing with people; often referred to as consumer-oriented marketing. Kotler and Armstrong (2012) define consumer-oriented marketing as “the philosophy of enlightened marketing that holds that the company should view and organize its marketing activities from the consumer’s point of view”. A brand should focus their marketing messages and choose the best suited marketing promotion channels based on the consumers of their products. In order for an organization to conduct efficient consumer-oriented marketing, it is vital to identify and understand their target group.

People differ in their eagerness to try new products and based on this difference they can be classified into adopter categories shown in figure 2. The five adopter groups have different values. Innovators are adventurous — they try new ideas at some risk, early adopters are guided by respect — they are opinion leaders in their communities and adopt new ideas but carefully. The early majority is deliberate — they rarely are leaders but they adopt new ideas before the average person. The late majority is sceptical — they adopt an innovation only after a majority of people have tried it. And finally the laggards are tradition bound — they are suspicious of changes and adopt the innovation only when it has become something of a tradition itself (Kotler & Armstrong, 2010). Influencers are mostly innovators and early adopters and usually affect the intentions of the other categories.
A post on social media usually contains both visual and verbal content, which can have significant cognitive effects on consumer’s attitudes and purchase intentions (Kim and Lennon, 2008). According to Shaouf, Lu and Li (2016) the characteristics of visual and verbal content can be the key ingredients of designing effective marketing messages. The customers who follow social media influencer to inspire their future purchase are called social shoppers (Chahal, 2016). These are the consumers who actively use social media platforms to find new products.

Figure 3 shows the stages of the buying decision process, which starts long before the actual purchase and continues long after it. In the first stage, the consumer recognizes a problem or a need. Internal stimuli, such as hunger or thirst, lead to a drive when risen to a high level. External stimuli, like an advertisement or a discussion with a friend, can also create a need and lead to a drive. In the second stage, the consumer is aroused to search for more information related to the need. One can obtain information from several sources, such as personal (family, friends), commercial (advertisements, salespeople, websites), public (consumer rating organisations, reviews, social media, internet searches) and experiential sources (handling, using the product) (Kotler & Armstrong, 2012). The most effective sources tend to be the personal ones. Commercial sources usually inform the buyer but personal evaluate products for the buyer. The more information is obtained, the customer’s awareness and knowledge of the brands and features increase. The next stage is evaluation of alternatives for which the customer uses the obtained information to evaluate the alternative
brands in the choice set. The evaluation depends on the individual and the specific purchasing situation. Sometimes they make purchase decision on their own, sometimes they turn to friends, and/or online reviews for buying advice. In this stage the consumer ranks brands and forms purchase intentions. Martinez et al. (2007) define purchase intention as a situation where consumer tends to buy a certain product under certain conditions. Then the purchase decision follows, in which the buyer selects the most preferred brand. There are two factors that lie between purchase intention and decision. The first one is the attitude of others. For example, when somebody believes that one should buy an inexpensive car, the chances of the latter purchase an expensive car are reduced. The second is unexpected situational factors. The purchase intentions an individual forms rely on factors such as expected income, price and product benefits. However, unexpected events might change this intention, like a friend reporting disappointment in the preferred product. (Kotler & Armstrong, 2010). Finally, postpurchase behavior refers to consumers’ further actions following the purchase, which depend on their satisfaction or dissatisfaction of their purchase.

![Figure 3: Buyer Decision Process](image)

### 2.6 Source Credibility Theory

Trustworthiness, attractiveness and expertise of the Influencer consist the source credibility theory (Ohanian, 1990), and define the extent to which the target audience views the source to gain expertise and knowledge in their understanding of the product or service (Ohanian, 1990; Teng, Wei Khong, Wei Goh, & Yee Loong Chong, 2014). Kutthakaphan and Chokesamritpol (2013) highlighted that the quality of the argument and persuasive strength of the influencer are required for the credibility of the source.

“Argument quality” concerns the power of persuasion of the arguments within an informational context (Teng et al., 2014). Thus, when reviews or statements related to products and services are credible, consumers develop a positive attitude towards the brand (Spry et al., 2011). When the reviews are unreal and mendacious, consumers develop a
negative attitude towards both the brand and the endorser (Cheung, Luo, Sia, & Chen, 2009). This quality is validated in terms of the strength of public perception of the celebrity, and other evidence like relevance and timeliness (Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017). ‘Relevance’ indicates that the reviews are relevant and applicable (Teng et al., 2014).

2.7 Halo Effect Theory

First introduced by psychologist Thorndike (1920), the halo effect is the tendency for an impression created in one area to influence opinion in another area, caused by cognitive bias (Long-Crowell, 2016). Thorndike (1920) conducted a social experiment and concluded that one’s perception of a third party can create a positive or negative “halo”, which then affects the whole attitude to the same direction (positive or negative). This can be illustrated briefly by the example of attractive people who are perceived as more intelligent, successful and better humans (Long-Crowell, 2016). All relevant studies conclude that individual’s personal qualities, appearance and mainly attractiveness can affect how others judge his character (Ohanian, 1990). The halo effect has been used extensively in the field of marketing to explain customer behaviour (Klein & Dawar, 2004). It refers to target customer’s bias to rate a product or service based on a review they receive from an individual who is potentially endorsing it (Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017).

Brands usually adopt the Halo Effect to their advantage; they use the “halo” of their reputation to justify their premium prices for basic products (Smith et al., 2010). Obviously, this is also the case with brands that cooperate with influencers with a positive “halo” to create a positive connection with a particular product (Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017). Halo Effect and Source Credibility Theories are complementary theories as they are based on attributes like attractiveness and trust, used to assure the credibility of the source.
3. Research Model & Hypotheses

This chapter covers the research methodology that has been selected for this study. It outlines the research approach and strategy, design, data collection methods, sampling methods, research criteria, data analysis and the limitations associated with the chosen methodology.

The major aim of this study is to expose the influencer marketing phenomenon, the consumers’ perception of influencers and how they can improve or decline brand’s equity. Current literature has identified multiple types and roles of the social media influencer (SMI). This research is focused on the perception of the consumers about influencer marketing, how this new phenomenon affects positively or negatively each brand. Therefore, the hypothesis, based on the research question, is proposed as:

\[ H_1: \text{Influencer marketing affects brand’s reputation, image and its customer relationship.} \]

3.1 Methodology

For the purposes of this study, two similar questionnaires were designed and each one was distributed to a group of respondents. One group of respondents was formed by subscribed consumers of the Greek footwear and clothing retailer Arte Piedi, while the second group were consumers chosen randomly via social media. The aim of both questionnaires is to find any existing correlations among the types of influencers, their characteristics and customer’s aspects about influencer marketing, that can create customized patterns about the optimization of this marketing technique. The questionnaires were conducted through an online survey by Google Forms. A questionnaire is a data collection tool setting a certain set of questions in a predetermined order to which a person is asked to respond (Saunders et al., 2012). When designed properly, questionnaires can be an excellent method to obtain data about consumers’ attitudes, values, experiences and past behaviour (Bell, 1999), while at the same time they enable the collection of a significant amount of data at relatively low costs (Bryman & Bell, 2007).
3.2 Pilot test

Before executing any survey, it is essential to check its quality and effectiveness. For this reason, a pilot test was implemented before the main study. A pilot test is a small scale preliminary study which aims to minimize obstacles such as respondents misunderstanding the questions or facing problems answering, thus securing the validity and reliability of the results (Saunders et al., 2012; Fink, 2013).

The preliminary, pilot, experiment of the current study was distributed to eight (8) respondents, two from each predetermined age groups. The questionnaire was given to the testers, and each one had to fill it in and give feedback in relation to their understanding of the questions. The main goal was to observe and discuss the whole process with the respondents in order for the research to recognize every necessary detail. At first, the experiment revealed that the questionnaire was interesting but time consuming. Respondents commented on the large number of questions they had to answer. Being time consuming could prevent them from answering the questionnaire properly. Another problem occurred with some specific marketing terms which some of the testers found difficult to understand.

Utilizing the information and feedback gained from the pilot study the questionnaire was changed and became shorter, more descriptive and meaningful.

3.3 Data Collection

Two separate questionnaires were conducted in order to acquire data for this research study. The questionnaires can be found in Appendix 1. The first group of respondents was the registered consumers of the footwear retailer Arte Piedi. The second group was a random sample of internet users, friends and colleagues that was recruited from social media and university email database. The intention was to reach the respondents in a setting relative to the nature of the current research, so the questionnaires were sent in a digital form.

3.4 Questionnaire design

The questionnaires were written in Greek language as all respondents derived from a Greek population. Both questionnaires were structured accordingly:

- Introduction,
Introductory questions,
Main questions,
Conclusion note.

In particular, the introduction was in the form of a cover letter, describing the purpose and explaining the importance of this study. It included a note assuring the confidentiality of the survey, the expected time for completion and an acknowledgement for participation. The purpose of introductory questions was to collect data for the demographic characteristics of the participants as well as their behaviour with regards to internet usage. Participants were randomly selected irrespective of their age and further classified into the following age groups depending to the generation to which they belong:

- Generation Z: mid-1990 to mid-2000,
- Generation Y or Millennials: mid-1980 to early 2000,
- Generation X: early to mid-1960 to early 1980, and
- Baby boomers: early to mid-1940 to early 1960.

This segmentation allows detection of differences derived from diverse ages. Close-ended questions were used to identify users online purchasing behaviour. Besides that, the indirect purpose of these questions was to familiarize the respondent with the general idea of the survey and to prepare him for the subsequent parts of the questionnaire. For the group of the randomly selected respondents, the introductory questions regarded their intention to purchase via Internet, if they follow brands and influencers on social media, if they notice peers or others endorsing products or services and how this affects product’s image. For the other group, the introductory questions were relevant to the specific brand as well as the brand’s influencers. In particular, the queries were more specific about their purchases from the store, how they found out about it, if they follow the brand on social media, if they have noticed influencers advocating the products and how it affected their purchases and their impression about Arte Piedi store. This introductory section provides a framework of online purchase behaviour of both groups of respondents which helps the core of the analysis and creates customized patterns.

The main section includes questions about influencers and this marketing technique. It is used to approach participants’ impression of influencers and which of their characteristics they find most influential, thus identifying the attributes that could be beneficial or not. The first query is about the type of influencer preferred. Criteria for structuring the given answers were the types of influencers analyzed in the literature review: celebrities as
macro-celebrities, experts or mavens as opinion leaders and peers as micro-influencers (or micro-celebrities). The next question is about the preferable social media content and the given answering options were formed depending on the several available types of content, such as photographs, videos, informative posts, reviews on products etc. The following set of questions regards the attributes of an influencer that could have a positive or a negative effect on the respondent. The given options were based on source credibility theory and several characteristics of influencers. More questions explore further this issue; the factors that an influencer and this type of campaign could damage consumer’s perception about the brand and prevent them from purchasing. Answers relied on the previous theory and on attributes that may affect the brand equity, such as lack of quality content as well as stereotyped or offensive content (racist, sexist concepts etc.). One question examines the trust an influencer inspires and how this can lead consumers to purchase other products that he endorses, revealing this way respondent’s intention and the halo effect that an influencer could create for other products/services or brands. Furthermore, there is a question which helps to understand participant’s awareness of organic and sponsored posts. The aim is to find out if he knows about the different types of influencer marketing campaigns and if this makes any difference to his impressions. The possible responds to the question whether all influencers get paid capture the consumer’s perceptions about financial issues involved in influencers’ activity. The aim is to identify whether paid content affects the user in a different manner compared to the organic results. All of the included questions have multiple choice values while some of them also have an open-ended option “other”, to give the opportunity to the respondents who are not cognizant of the used terms or this marketing phenomenon in general, to answer to all of the questions.

The rest of the questionnaire includes phrases regarding the beliefs of consumers about influencers, influencer marketing campaign and brands for which the respondents have to state if they agree or disagree, using a 5-point Likert scale (Likert, 1932). These phrases are similar yet more precise and descriptive compared to the previous questions. Their objective is to obtain a more targeted view on certain issues and to control whether the respondents’ answers coincide with the ones given in the former part of the questionnaire. The statements can be found also on the Appendix 1.

The statements are the following:

- ‘Peer reviews are more reliable than company-controlled reviews’,
- ‘My favorite influencers and I share the same interests’,
- ‘My favorite influencers will not purposefully endorse a brand that will harm me’,
‘If I were to find out that my favorite influencer had been paid for their endorsement it would not negatively impact my perception of their credibility”,
‘I make purchases based on recommendations by reliable people”,
‘I actively seek out online reviews before making a purchasing decision’,
‘I believe that a campaign is unsuccessful when it has insulting content’,
‘A failed campaign does not affect the image and reputation of the brand’,
‘I trust more everyday people rather than celebrities’,
‘I use to ignore brand’s culture and beliefs’,
‘A brand is improved when touches social problems’,
‘When a brand does not follow stereotypes is more attractive for me’, and
‘Through the internet advertising and marketing is more direct and real’.

3.5 Limitations

Limitations of the current study include the small number of the applied questions and the close-ended type of the answers. Although the questions were precise and targeted, a bigger number of them would reveal more in-depth information with regards to the issue that is being investigated. Similarly, open-ended options would provide a better understanding of consumers views, feelings and overall perception of influencers. Furthermore, possible lack of respondent’s experience and familiarization with this phenomenon is hard to evaluate and could impair his reaction to the survey, which leads to inaccurate replies and alters the results.
4. Results

This chapter presents the results and their statistical analyses. The analysis was conducted through the use of SPSS Statistics (version 24.0.0, IBM Corp.). The Spearman correlation coefficient test was performed to compare the answers given by the two groups. The tables are presented in the Appendix 2.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Group Arte Piedi

Descriptive statistics describes the data in a sample through a number of summary procedures and statistics (McCornick et al., 2015). The first experiment had N= 215 respondents, most of which were women, due to the fact that Arte Piedi e-shop focuses on women footwear and clothing. Age and gender distribution is summarized in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>16 - 22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>5,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 - 32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td>32,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 - 52</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>64,2</td>
<td>96,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>98,1</td>
<td>98,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Age and Gender Distribution

The vast majority of participants were women of is 33–52 years of age. Furthermore, 98.1% of the respondents were women, and 1.9% men, with is reasonable. Participants aged 23–32 years old were 27.4%, and those aged 33–52 years old were 64.2%. The other two age
groups, 16–22 and 53+ were a minority (5.1% and 3.3%, respectively). There were not any missing values from the questionnaire.

A great percentage (78.6%) follows the brand on social media, of which 46.5% is aware that Greek online personalities and celebrities endorse Arte Piedi’s products. These endorsements affect perceptions negatively in only 7.5% of the respondents. It is crucial to identify that almost half of the sample (48.4%) stated that endorsements had no effect on their perception about the brand, while 44.2% were positively affected. Likewise, a small percentage (6.5% and 7.4%) stated that it also negatively affected their purchases, more than half (52.1%) said that it did not affect their purchases in any way and a relatively big amount (17.2% and 16.7%) answered that it positively affected their purchases.

With regards to the type of influencer, collected data revealed that only 13% prefer celebrity influencers, 36.3% prefer experts and 67.4% prefer people next door. The most preferable type of content are photographs (60%), followed by contests (47%), product reviews (39.5%), informative type of posts (39.1%) and video or vlog (video-log) (13.5%). Almost half of the respondents (47.9%) stated that a good, real, aesthetic and useful content is the most important element for their engagement with the influencer. Other components are the authenticity (68.4%) and truthfulness (56.3%) of an influencer and his active (20.5%) and activist (18.1%) personality elements. Factors that could be claimed as weaknesses of an influencer are his overexposure (49.8%), the product overexposure (42.8%), a big promotion activity (27.9%) and most critical, dishonesty (73%).

According to the influencer marketing campaigns, a fake campaign impacts negatively 60% of the respondents, unreliable campaigns 44.7% of them, pretentious campaigns 31.6%, offensive campaigns 31.2%, unattractive and referring to a different target group 20.9% and 15.8% respectively. Moreover, the main reason that could damage brand’s perception via its influencers are unreal endorsements of products/services (66.5%), provocative influencer’s opinions (44.7%), influencer’s personality (18.6%) and lifestyle (14.4%).

Additionally, 74.4% of the respondents stated that they would probably trust an influencer and buy/try the other products that he endorses. An impressing finding was that 60% of the sample could not distinguish an organic from a sponsored post. From the remaining 40%, 32.1% of respondents said that there is no difference between organic and paid posts, 35.3% noted that there is an actual difference and 24.7% said that they do not know what the
difference is. Another important finding is that 72.1% of the sample believe that all the influencers on social media are paid for either to promote, endorse or use a product.

The data also shows that half of the respondents (50%) actively seek out trends on social media, 41.9% search for online reviews before making any purchase, 60% actually buy recommended products from reliable sources, 40% advise particular profiles before making a purchase and also 45% state that they are more likely to buy a product or brand when their favorite influencer endorses it. Another important point is that a great number of the respondents (73.5%) trust peer reviews more than any company-oriented campaign.

Moreover, the descriptive analysis shows that 82% consider a campaign unsuccessful when it has offensive content. For the 43.7% an unsuccessful campaign would not damage their perception about the brand in contrast to 36.7% who stated the opposite. Similarly, a failed campaign would not prevent the 28.8% of the respondents from purchasing a product, but it would do so for the 41.9%. A significant percentage (39.1%) state that they do not actually care for the culture of the brand that they prefer. However, 46.5% find a brand more attractive when it engages with social responsibilities and 49.8% of the respondents are not willing to support a brand which follows stereotypes.

**Group Random**

The second experiment had N=87 participants, who were chosen randomly. As shown in table 2, the majority of the participants (73.6%) were women aged 23–32 years old. 26.4% of the respondents were men. The dominant age group was 23–32 years old (50.6%), followed by 33-52 old (24.1%), 16–22 years old (17.2%), and 53+ years old (8%). Table 2 summarises the demographic characteristics of this group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 - 22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 - 52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost all of the respondents were active online consumers (89.7%) and who follow pages of brands on social media (75.9%). 55.2% followed influencers’ profiles and 92% has noticed independent profiles endorsing products or brands, however this observation would not affect their brand perception since 47.1% of the respondents stated that they feel neutral about it. In contrast, 28.7% were positively affected, whereas only 14.9% were negatively affected.

Experts and everyday people seem to be more popular than celebrities as the preferable type of influencer for this sample. In detail, 75.9% preferred experts, 37.9% everyday people and only 12.6% celebrities. The most preferable type of content was reviews (59.8%) followed by informative posts (58.6%), photographs (46%) and videos or vlogs (44.8%). A great percentage (67.8%) replied that a good, real, aesthetic and useful content is the most essential influential element. Other important elements were authenticity (72.4%), truthfulness (67.8%) and influencer’s directness (49.4%). Those characteristics that could have the opposite results were both influencer’s (66.7%) and product’s (55.2%) overexposure, dishonesty (81.6%) as well as endorsing and promoting many different products (35.6%).

Moreover, factors that could harm an influencer campaign is offensive content (50.6%), unreliable (65.6%) or pretentious (51.7%) image and irrelevance to the target group (39.1%). The respondents also stated that the reasons that could damage their perception about a brand are mostly a fake promotion or endorsement (79.3%), provocative opinions (51.7%) and disagreement with influencer’s lifestyle (19.5%).

The respondents were more likely to trust their favorite influencer for other products that he might use or promote and try them (72.4%). It is important to note that 27.6 % of this sample could not distinguish an organic from a sponsored post, another 27.6% did not mind whether it is an organic or paid posts while it did matter for the 37.9%. Additionally, 66.7% strongly believed that all influencers are paid for any endorsement or promotion of products or services on social media.
Furthermore, 77% stated their strong agreement that peer reviews are more reliable than company-controlled campaigns, 29.9% argued that their favorite influencer shares the same interests with them, and 57.5% would certainly buy recommended products from reliable sources. Interestingly 57.5% claimed that their favorite influencer would not endorse products that could harm them. For the 26.8% of the sample, paid campaigns and sponsored posts had a negative impact.

The descriptive analysis shows that 68.9% considered a campaign with offensive content unsuccessful. 70.1% of the respondents are concerned for the culture of the brand they prefer. Finally, 49.4% found a brand more attractive when it engages with social responsibilities and 60.9% of the respondents were not willing to support a brand which follows stereotypes.

### 4.2 Correlations

For further data analysis, a correlation analysis was performed. Considering that almost all variables are nominal, the appropriate correlation model for this analysis is Spearman's correlation coefficient, which reveals the statistical dependence between the ranking of two variables and assesses the importance of the relationship between them. It is also known as bivariate correlation and can exhibit patterns that possibly exist. Spearman correlation coefficient test was used to compare variables within the same group of respondents. Level of statistical significance was set at $p = .01$.

For the first experiment (Group Arte Piedi), types of influencers were initially compared with each other. Among all the combinations tested a statistically significant negative correlation was found between experts and micro-celebrities ($r = -.203$, $p = .003$). Splitting the data according to age, it was found that the above correlation was significant in groups 23-32 ($r = -.440$, $p = .000$) and 33-52 ($r = -.583$, $p = .000$). Secondly, types of influencers were compared with types of content and a statistically significant correlation was found between micro-celebrities and photographs ($r = .223$, $p = .001$) which was significantly profound in age group 23-32 ($r = .341$, $p = .008$). Types of content were also compared but no statistically significant correlation was found. When comparing types of influencer and their characteristics, a significant correlation was found between celebrities and personality ($r = .350$, $p = .000$). The correlation was mostly significant in the age group 33-52 ($r = .329$, $p = .000$).
Characteristics of influencers were also compared and activists were statistically significantly associated with action exposure (r = .330, p = .000). Significant age group in this comparison was 23-32 (r = .379 p = .003). Another statistically significant association was found between being trustful and approachable (r = .194, p = .004). Types of influencers and their negative elements were compared but no significant correlation was found between them. However a statistically significant negative correlation was found between influencer’s overexposure and poor quality content (r = -.247, p = .001). The age group that was significant for this correlation is 33-52 (r = -.291, p = .001). Another statistically significant association was found between influencer’s and product’s overexposure (r = .420, p = .000) Types of influencers were compared with the reasons that they could damage perception of consumers about a brand. A statistically significant correlation was found between celebrities and provocative opinions (r = .181, p = .008). Another statistically significant correlation was found between micro-influencers and their lack of interest on their followers (r = .199, p = .003). Types of influencers were also compared with fix phrases in the last section of the questionnaire. Two statistically significant associations were found. At first, micro-celebrities were statistically significantly associated with the phrase ‘peer reviews are more reliable than company-controlled campaigns’ (r = .338, p = .000). Interestingly, the second statistically significant negative association was between celebrities and the same fix phrase (r = -.314, p = .000).

A comparison analysis was also performed for the answers given (agree/disagree) to the fix phrases in the last section of the questionnaire. The following statistically significant correlations were found: ‘I seek out trends on social media’ and ‘I make purchases based on recommendations of reliable influencers’ (r = .342, p = .000), ‘I do not mind about brand’s culture’ and ‘an unsuccessful campaign will not prevent me from buying’ (r = .203, p = .003), ‘an unsuccessful campaign will not prevent me from buying’ and ‘an unsuccessful campaign does not affect my perception about a brand’ (r = .272, p = .000), ‘I seek out trends on social media’ and ‘I advise certain profiles before making a purchase’ (r = .399, p = .000), ‘I seek out trends on social media’ and ‘I am more likely to buy my favorite influencer’s suggestion’ (r = .406, p = .000), ‘I advise certain profiles before making a purchase’ and ‘I make purchases based on recommendations of reliable influencers’ (r = .345, p = .000), ‘I advise certain profiles before making a purchase’ and ‘I am more likely to buy my favorite influencer’s suggestion’ (r = .553, p = .000), ‘I make purchases based on recommendations of reliable influencers’ and ‘a campaign with offensive content is unsuccessful’ (r = .231, p = .001), ‘I seek out trends on social media’ and ‘an unsuccessful campaign does not affect my perception about a brand’ (r = .244,
\[ p = .000 \], ‘Peer reviews are more reliable than company-controlled campaigns’ and ‘a campaign with offensive content is unsuccessful’ \( (r = .308, p = .000) \), ‘I find a brand more attractive when it does not follow stereotypes’ and ‘I seek out trends on social media’ \( (r = .204, p = .003) \), ‘I find a brand more attractive when it does not follow stereotypes’ and ‘peer reviews are more reliable than company-controlled campaigns’ \( (r = .293, p = .000) \).

For the second experiment (Group Random), types of influencers were compared with each other. A statistically significant negative relation was found between experts and micro-celebrities \( (r = -.445, p = .000) \). Splitting the data according to age, it was found that the correlation is significant in the age group 23-32 \( (r = .356, p = .018) \). Types of influencers were compared with types of content and a statistically significant correlation was found between micro-influencers and videos \( (r = .312, p = .003) \). In addition it was found that the about correlation was significant in age group 33-52 \( (r = .730, p = .000) \).

Characteristics of influencers were also compared an a statistically significant association was revealed between activists and their action exposure \( (r = .0324, p = .001) \). Product exposure was also statistically significantly associated with authenticity \( (r = -.338, p = .001) \). Types of influencers and their negative characteristics were compared but no significant correlation was found between them. No statistically significant correlation was found comparing the negative elements of campaigns with each other. Comparing types of influencers with the reasons an influencer could damage a brand, a statistically significant negative relation was found between celebrities and reliability \( (r = -.306, p = .007) \). The reasons were also compared to each other and it was found that pretentious campaigns were statistically significantly associated with campaigns lacking on interest \( (r = .287, p = .007) \).

Finally, a correlation analysis was also performed for the answers given (agree/disagree) to the fix phrases in the last section of the questionnaire. The following statistically significant correlations were found; ‘my favorite influencer and I share the same interests’ and ‘my favorite influencer will not endorse any product that could harm me’ \( (r = .315, p = .003) \), ‘my favorite influencer will not endorse any product that could harm me’ and ‘If I were to find out that my favorite influencer had been paid for their endorsement it would not negatively impact my perception of their credibility’ \( (r = .334, p = .002) \), ‘my favorite influencer will not endorse any product that could harm me’ and ‘I seek out online reviews before making a purchasing
decision’ ($r = .348$, $p = .001$), ‘I seek out online reviews before making a purchasing decision’ and ‘I make purchases based on influencer’s recommendation’ ($r = .413$, $p = .000$), ‘my favorite influencer and I share the same interests’ and ‘A campaign is unsuccessful when it has offensive content’ ($r = .297$, $p = .005$), ‘I trust more micro-celebrities rather than celebrities’ and ‘I find a brand more attractive when it does not follow stereotypes’ ($r = .462$, $p = .000$), ‘a failed campaign does not affect the image and reputation of the brand’ and ‘I do not mind about brand’s culture’ ($r = .286$, $p = .007$).

5. Conclusion

5.1 Findings & Discussion

The results of this study confirmed that the phenomenon of influencer marketing is one of the most effective marketing techniques at present, as it is thoroughly analysed in the literature review. Furthermore, the results shows some interesting points of which an influencer campaign could lead to failure.

An initial finding is about the most preferred type of influencer. In the first experiment, micro-celebrities come first followed by opinion leaders, whereas in the second one, it was found the opposite. A possible explanation of this difference between the two groups is that the participants, who were randomly selected, had not a specific example of influencer/product/brand on their minds, in contrast to the other group. This fact probably made their responses unbiased. Correlation analysis in both surveys have shown a negative association between opinion leaders and micro-celebrities, which means that people who trust experts tend not to trust micro-influencers. This negative relationship derives from the aim that people have and the reason they select certain influencers. For example, one interested in tech products and gadgets tend to trust experts more than peer influencers. Opposite to this is someone interested in fashion trends and suggestions, as he is more likely to select micro-celebrities rather than an expert. Celebrities are the less preferred type for all of the respondents. Although correlation analysis revealed that to follow a celebrity is significantly associated with his personality.

Familiarization with the internet and influencer marketing are being revealed through the high majority of the respondents who are following brands and influencers on social media. Most of them supported that they find attractive and affects positively their purchases, while only a pretty small percentage stated that they do not like influencer marketing techniques. As far as
the preferred content is concerned, the surveys have shown that the content relies on product/service. The respondents of the Arte Piedi group stated that they prefer visual content (images) followed by contests, reviews, informative posts, and videos while the others prefer primarily reviews followed by informative posts, images, videos, and contests. Correlation analysis has shown that consumers prefer micro-influencers to upload visual content like photographs and videos of their everyday life. Interestingly, the following results are common to all of the respondents. They are much more affected by good, real, aesthetic and useful content as well as the authenticity and truthfulness that an influencer inspires. In addition, the analysis has shown that consumers want an activist influencer to expose his actions.

Dishonesty and overexposure of products and influencer himself cause negative effect on the followers. Similarly, a negative view is occurred by fake campaigns with pretentious and unreliable content, and incorrect target group. Correlation analysis revealed a negative significant association between product exposure and authenticity, which means that a product overexposure tend to harm influencer’s authenticity. People prefer to engage with an influencer who does not barrage them with products. Another negative relation was also found between poor quality content and influencer’s overexposure, which means that consumers are not willing to follow and see poor quality content at a large extend.

A significant finding is that influencers can create a *halo effect as three out of four* participants would trust an influencer of the other products that he endorses. Despite the fact that the sample is aware and interested in influencers, it cannot distinguish a sponsored from an organic post; only one out of three knows the difference. Furthermore, three out of four argues that all influencers are getting paid for every endorsement they do. Though this does not prevent all of the respondents from fully trusting influencers. This confidence is another result of the halo effect that an influencer creates. Furthermore, one out of two search for trends on social media, while two out of five actively seek out reviews before any purchase, they advise certain profiles before any purchase and they finally purchase a suggested product by a credible influencer. Correlation analyses have revealed that the vast majority of the trend seekers are purchasing recommended products from their favorite influencer. Three out of four of respondents supports that peer (micro-celebrity) reviews are more reliable than any company-oriented campaign. Interestingly, correlation results have shown that the respondents, who claimed that they find peer reviews more reliable than company-related campaigns, had also chosen micro-celebrities as their most preferred type of influencers. A
negative association was also found between the statement and celebrities, which means that all participants answered the questionnaire intently.

As it already mentioned, an offensive content may harm consumer’s perception about a brand. Four out of five of the participants describe unsuccessful a campaign with offensive content. Additionally, an unsuccessful campaign would actually affect negatively two out of five of the participants while it would not affect one out of three of them. The results revealed that consumers find more attractive a company engaged with social responsibilities and they are not willing to receive stereotyped content. Opposite to these findings, two out of five of the respondents do not mind about the culture of a brand. Through correlation analysis the following significant association was found; people who do not care about brand’s culture are related with those for which an unsuccessful campaign would not prevent them from buying. However, a vast majority of the participants stated that they disagree with these two fix phrases. Obviously the correlation exists but with the opposite meaning, namely people who care about brand’s culture are significantly associated with those who an unsuccessful campaign would actually prevent them from purchasing.

To sum up, an influencer campaign could lead to failure and negatively affect brand equity unless marketers and brands, in general, avoid the following major points. Firstly, a company should be totally aware of its target market and their characteristics. Working with an influencer means that a brand takes advantage of his audience. If this audience is irrelevant to company’s target market, all the efforts would lead to failure. Choosing the right influencer is a great issue that companies often face. The decision about the right influencer depends on marketing objectives and goals of the brand along with the type of the industry (fashion, technology etc.). Secondly, comes the content. It is crucial for companies to allow influencers to create the content, based on their guidance. The research has shown that a vast majority of people follow micro-influencers and argue that are more reliable than any company-controlled campaign. The important clue is the influencer to present his own content, full of his traits. By doing this, his followers are more likely to engage with the product or brand. Even though companies should inspire influencers to create their own content, they should always observe if this content is relevant with their goals and, in general, with their culture. Furthermore, influencer has to deliver high quality, relevant and valuable content to attract, acquire and engage his followers and potential customers with the brand. An influencer that focuses too much on product and self promotion would lead to undesirable results. Undesirable results could lead to an unsuccessful campaign. Other factors that could damage an influencer
marketing campaign is stereotyped content (i.e. gender stereotypes), offensive content (racist, sexist concepts etc.), unreal and doubtful content along with influencer’s apathy about his followers and dishonesty about the endorsed products. Avoiding these false steps, an influencer marketing campaign would not drive to unsuccessfulness and consumer’s bad perception about brand.

5.2 Conclusion

Influencer marketing is currently the most popular marketing technique with a great ability to engage a highly relevant audience and create authentic content. It has been found that influencer marketing can create a return on investment (ROI) eleven times higher than any other technique of digital marketing (TapInfluence and Nielsen, 2016). There is a limitation on current literature since this marketing technique is relatively new. Furthermore, the aim of the present research was to explore consumer’s perception about this new phenomenon and identify if influencer marketing could help or damage consumer’s perception about a brand.

The chosen research methodology was qualitative through the conduction of two questionnaires, one referring to the consumers’ of a specific brand and the other to randomly selected participants. The purpose was to identify consumers’ perception about influencer marketing and examine the reasons a campaign could damage consumers’ perception about a brand. After a thorough analysis, the research findings indicate that there are some important challenges that have to be overcome in order a campaign to be successful, such as avoid irrelevant target audience, offensive and stereotyped content, product and influencer overexposure. Moreover, the results has shown that consumers are much more attractive to influencers than any other marketing technique. Consumers believe that an influencer has their best interests by heart. Statistically significant correlations were also found, such as follower are willing to follow an activist influencer who exposes his action. Halo effect and source credibility theories were also used in order to assure the credibility of the sources and explain a lot of the results. Lastly, this research was conducted not only to answer the research question but also to discover and clarify this new but promising marketing technique and encourage more research on this subject.
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Το παρόν ερωτηματολόγιο αποτελεί μέρος ακαδημαϊκής έρευνας στα πλαίσια της διπλωματικής εργασίας στο μεταπτυχιακό πρόγραμμα e-Business and Digital Marketing στο Διεθνές Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Όλες οι πληροφορίες συλλέγονται ανώνυμα και εμπιστευτικά.

Ο χρόνος ολοκλήρωσης του ερωτηματολογίου κυμαίνεται στα 10-15 λεπτά και αποτελείται από 5 ενότητες και συνολικά 21 ερωτήσεις.

Διευκρίνιση:
Για την παρούσα έρευνα, ο όρος influencer αναφέρεται σε άτομα τα οποία μέσω των λογαριασμών τους στα social media προωθούν ή προβάλουν (επί πληρωμή ή όχι) προϊόντα, υπηρεσίες έως και καθημερινές συνήθειες και επηρεάζουν την αγοραστική συμπεριφορά των καταναλωτών.

(Influencer: o "επηρεάζων". Είναι το πρόσωπο που ακούσια ή εκούσια επηρεάζει μια απόφαση αγοράς)
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Με εκτίμηση,
Δίζα Έλλη
MSc in e-Business & Digital Marketing
International Hellenic University

Questions

Ηλικία
16-22
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Φύλο
Αρσενικό
Θηλυκό

Εκπαίδευση
Δευτεροβάθμια Εκπαίδευση
Τριτοβάθμια Εκπαίδευση
Ανώτατες Σπουδές (Μεταπτυχιακού/Διδακτορικού Επιπέδου)
Τοποθεσία
Open Question

Έχετε αγοράσει από το κατάστημα Arte Piedi;
- Ναι, πάνω από μία φορά
- Ναι, μία φορά
- Όχι
- Δεν γνωρίζω το κατάστημα

Πως εντοπίσατε πρώτη φορά το κατάστημα Arte Piedi;
- Φυσικό Κατάστημα
- eShop
- Social Media (Facebook & Instagram)
- Μου το σύστησε κάποιος φίλος
- Μέσω των Influencer του

Ακολουθείτε το Arte Piedi στα SM;
- Ναι
- Όχι

Έχετε παρατηρήσει celebrities ή δημοφιλείς Instagramers να φορούν προϊόντα Arte Piedi;
- Ναι
- Όχι

Σε τι βαθμό αυτό επηρέασε την εικόνα σας για το κατάστημα;
Likert Scale Answer 1 to 5, negative to positive

Επηρέασε τις αγορές σας;
Likert Scale Answer 1 to 5, negative to positive

Ποιον από τους παρακάτω τύπους Influencer θα εμπιστεύοσαταν περισσότερο;
- Διάσημους/Celebrities
- Ειδικοί/Experts
- Καθημερινοί Άνθρωποι/της διπλανής πόρτας

Τι είδους περιεχόμενο θα σας ενδιέφερε περισσότερο;
- Φωτογραφία
- Video
- Review
- Διαγωνισμός
- Πληροφορίες & Ενημερώσεις

Ποια τα βασικά χαρακτηριστικά που θα σας επηρέαζαν θετικά;
- Περιεχόμενο
- Υπερέκθεση Influencer
- Υπερέκθεση Προϊόντος
Προσωπικότητα Influencer
Δραστήριος Χαρακτήρας
Κοινωνικά Ενεργός - activist
Αυθεντικότητα
Εμπιστοσύνη
Αμεσότητα

Ποια τα βασικά χαρακτηριστικά που θα σας επηρέαζαν αρνητικά;
- Περιεχόμενο
- Προσωπικότητα Influencer
- Υπερέκθεση Influencer
- Υπερέκθεση Προϊόντος
- Προώθηση πολλών Brands
- Ανειλικρίνεια
- Προβολή διαφορετικής κουλτούρας από την εταιρεία

Ποιοι οι λόγοι που μια τέτοια καμπάνια θα χαλούσε την εικόνα που έχετε για την εταιρεία;
- Είναι προσβλητική
- Φαίνεται πλαστή/ψεύτικη
- Είναι βαρετή/μονότονη
- Δεν εμπνέει εμπιστοσύνη
- Είναι επιτηδευμένη
- Δεν απευθύνεται σε μένα

Ποια από τα παρακάτω θα κατέστρεφε την γνώμη σας για μια εταιρεία μέσω των influencer της;
- Προσωπικότητα Influencer
- Τρόπος ζωής
- Προκλητικές απόψεις
- Ψευδής προβολή
- Αδιαφορία
- Δεν γνωρίζω

Θα εμπιστευόσασταν έναν influencer και για τα υπόλοιπα προϊόντα που τυχόν χρησιμοποιεί και προβάλει;
- Ναι
- Ίσως
- Όχι

Αναγνωρίζετε αν οι δημοσιεύσεις είναι χορηγούμενες ή οργανικές;
- Ναι
- Όχι

Αν ναι, έχει διαφορά για εσάς αν είναι χορηγούμενες;
- Ναι
- Όχι
Πιστεύετε πως όλοι οι influencer αμείβονται από τις εταιρείες;  
Ναι  
Όχι  

Συμφωνείτε ή διαφωνείτε με τις παρακάτω φράσεις;  
Likert Scale Answer 1 to 5, strongly disagree to strongly agree

1. Ψάχνω για νέα trends στα social media.  
2. Έχω αγοράσει προϊόντα που συστήνουν τα πρόσωπα που εμπιστεύομαι (online & offline).  
3. Συμβουλεύομαι συγκεκριμένα profiles στα social media για τις αγορές ή τις χρήσεις διάφορων υπηρεσιών.  
4. Αν ο αγαπημένος μου blogger/online προσωπικότητα συστήνει μια εταιρεία είναι πιο πιθανό να την δοκιμάσω.  
5. Θεωρώ μια καμπάνια αποτυχημένη όταν έχει προσβλητικό περιεχόμενο.  
6. Μια αποτυχημένη διαφήμιση δεν επηρεάζει την εικόνα και το κύρος μιας εταιρείας.  
7. Οι αποτυχημένες διαφημίσεις δεν θα με απέτρεπαν από το να καταναλώσω ή να εμπιστευθώ μια εταιρεία.  
8. Σίγουρα θα αναζητήσω online reviews πριν από οποιαδήποτε αγορά.  
9. Εμπιστεύομαι περισσότερο καθημερινά παρά διάσημα πρόσωπα.  
10. Αδιαφορώ για την κουλτούρα και τις απόψεις που εκφράζει μια εταιρεία.  
11. Πιστεύω πως όταν μια εταιρεία θίγει κοινωνικά ζητήματα βελτιώνεται.  
12. Μια εταιρεία που δεν ακολουθεί στερεότυπα με προσελκύει  
13. Η προώθηση και διαφήμιση σήμερα είναι πιο άμεση και αληθινή λόγω του διαδικτύου.
Το παρόν ερωτηματολόγιο αποτελεί μέρος ακαδημαϊκής έρευνας στα πλαίσια της διπλωματικής εργασίας στο μεταπτυχιακό πρόγραμμα e-Business and Digital Marketing στο Διεθνές Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης. Όλες οι πληροφορίες συλλέγονται ανώνυμα και εμπιστευτικά.

Ο χρόνος ολοκλήρωσης του ερωτηματολογίου κυμαίνεται στα 10-15 λεπτά και αποτελείται από 5 ενότητες και συνολικά 21 ερωτήσεις.

Διευκρίνιση:
Για την παρούσα έρευνα, ο όρος influencer αναφέρεται σε άτομα τα οποία μέσω των λογαριασμών τους στα social media προωθούν ή προβάλουν (επί πληρωμή ή όχι) προϊόντα, υπηρεσίες έως και καθημερινές συνήθειες και επηρεάζουν την αγοραστική συμπεριφορά των καταναλωτών.

(Influencer: ο "επηρεάζων". Είναι το πρόσωπο που ακούσια ή εκούσια επηρέαζε μια απόφαση αγοράς)
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Questions

Ηλικία
16-22
23-32
33-52
53+

Φύλο
Αρσενικό
Θηλυκό

Εκπαίδευση
Δευτεροβάθμια Εκπαίδευση
Τριτοβάθμια Εκπαίδευση
Ανώτατες Σπουδές (Μεταπτυχιακού/Διδακτορικού Επιπέδου)

Τοποθεσία
Open Question

Χρησιμοποιείτε το διαδίκτυο για τις αγορές σας;
Ναι
Όχι
Ακολουθείτε τις σελίδες εταιρειών στα SM;  
Ναι  
Όχι

Ακολουθείτε bloggers ή online προσωπικότητες στα social media;  
Ναι  
Όχι

Έχετε παρατηρήσει ανθρώπους να προβάλουν προϊόντα ή υπηρεσίες στα social media?  
Ναι  
Όχι

Σε τι βαθμό αυτό επηρέασε την εικόνα σας για τα προϊόντα;  
5 point Likert Scale Answer, negative 1 to positive 5

Ποιόν από τους παρακάτω τύπους Influencer θα εμπιστευόσασταν περισσότερο;  
Διάσημους/Celebrities  
Ειδικοί/Experts  
Καθημερινοί Άνθρωποι/της διπλανής πόρτας

Τι είδους περιεχόμενο θα σας ενδιέφερε περισσότερο;  
Φωτογραφία  
Video  
Review  
Διαγωνισμός  
Blog post  
Vlog post  
Πληροφορίες & Ενημερώσεις

Ποια τα βασικά χαρακτηριστικά που θα σας επηρέαζαν θετικά;  
Περιεχόμενο  
Υπερέκθεση Influencer  
Υπερέκθεση Προϊόντος  
Προσωπικότητα Influencer  
Δραστήριος Χαρακτήρας  
Κοινωνικά Ενεργός - activist  
Αυθεντικότητα  
Εμπιστοσύνη  
Αμεσότητα

Ποια τα βασικά χαρακτηριστικά που θα σας επηρέαζαν αρνητικά;  
Περιεχόμενο  
Προσωπικότητα Influencer  
Υπερέκθεση Influencer  
Υπερέκθεση Προϊόντος  
Προώθηση πολλών Brands
Ανειλικρίνεια
Προβολή διαφορετικής κουλτούρας από την εταιρεία

Ποιοι οι λόγοι που μια τέτοια καμπάνια θα χαλούσε την εικόνα που έχετε για την εταιρεία;
Είναι προσβλητική
Φαίνεται πλαστή/ψεύτικη
Είναι βαρετή/μονότονη
Δεν εμπνέει εμπιστοσύνη
Είναι επιτηδευμένη
Δεν απευθύνεται σε μένα

Ποια από τα παρακάτω θα κατέστρεφε την γνώμη σας για μια εταιρεία μέσω των influencer της;
Προσωπικότητα Influencer
Τρόπος ζωής
Προκλητικές απόψεις
Ψευδής προβολή
Αδιαφορία
Δεν γνωρίζω

Θα εμπιστευόσασταν έναν influencer και για τα υπόλοιπα προϊόντα που τυχόν χρησιμοποιεί και προβάλει;
Ναι
Ίσως
Όχι

Αναγνωρίζετε αν οι δημοσιεύσεις είναι χορηγούμενες ή οργανικές;
Ναι
Όχι

Αν ναι, έχει διαφορά για εσάς αν είναι χορηγούμενες;
Ναι
Όχι

Πιστεύετε πως όλοι οι influencer αμείβονται από τις εταιρείες;
Ναι
Όχι

Συμφωνείτε ή διαφωνείτε με τις παρακάτω φράσεις;
5 point Likert Scale strongly disagree 1 to strongly agree 5

1. Τα reviews από καθημερινούς ανθρώπους είναι πολύ πιο αξιόπιστα από "εταιρικά κατευθυνόμενα" reviews.
2. Οι αγαπημένοι μου influencers έχουν τα ίδια ενδιαφέροντα με εμένα.
3. Οι αγαπημένοι μου influencers δεν θα προβάλουν εν γνώσει τους κάποιο προϊόν που θα με βλάψει με τον οποιονδήποτε τρόπο.
4. Αν αντιληφθώ πως ένας αγαπημένος μου Influencer πληρώθηκε για κάποια προώθηση, αυτό δεν θα επηρεάσει αρνητικά την αξιοπιστία του.
5. Έχω αγοράσει προϊόντα που συστήνουν τα πρόσωπα που εμπιστεύομαι.
6. Συμβουλεύομαι συγκεκριμένα profiles στα μέσα κοινωνικής δικτύωσης για τις αγορές ή τις χρήσεις διάφορων υπηρεσιών.
7. Θεωρώ μια καμπάνια αποτυχημένη όταν έχει προσβλητικό περιεχόμενο.
8. Μια αποτυχημένη διαφήμιση δεν επηρεάζει την εικόνα και το κύρος μιας εταιρείας.
9. Εμπιστεύομαι περισσότερο καθημερινά παρά διάσημα πρόσωπα.
10. Αδιαφορώ για την κουλτούρα και τις απόψεις που εκφράζει μια εταιρεία.
11. Όταν μια εταιρεία θίγει κοινωνικά ζητήματα βελτιώνεται.
12. Μια εταιρεία που δεν ακολουθεί στερεότυπα με προσελκύει.
13. Η προώθηση και διαφήμιση σήμερα είναι πιο άμεση και αληθινή λόγω του διαδικτύου.
In this part of the appendix, Spearman correlation coefficient tables are presented. The level of significance was set at $p = .01$.

**Correlation Tables from Arte Piedi Survey**

Correlation among the three types of influencers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>CelebritiesTypeInfluencer</th>
<th>ExpertsTypeInfluencer</th>
<th>EverydayPeopleTypeInfluencer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-1.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CelebritiesTypeInfluencer</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpertsTypeInfluencer</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EverydayPeopleTypeInfluencer</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>-0.445**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

Correlation between the types of influencers and negative characteristics of influencers.
Correlation between the types of influencers and the fix phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencer Type</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-commerce bloggers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media influencers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand partners</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between the types of influencers and the fix phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencer Type</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-commerce bloggers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media influencers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand partners</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between the types of influencers and the fix phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencer Type</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-commerce bloggers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media influencers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand partners</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between the types of influencers and the fix phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencer Type</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experts</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-commerce bloggers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media influencers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand partners</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation between the types of influencers and reasons that could damage a campaign.

### Correlation between the types of influencers and type of content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Celebrities</th>
<th>Type of Influencer</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Consumers’ Perceptions</th>
<th>Experts’ Perceptions</th>
<th>Everyday People’s Perceptions</th>
<th>Public Type of Content</th>
<th>Review Type of Content</th>
<th>Context Type of Content</th>
<th>Information Type of Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
<td>df (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts’ Type of Influencer</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday People’s Type</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Type of Content</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Type of Content</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Type of Content</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Correlation between the types of influencers and type of content, splitted by age: 23-32.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Celebrities Type</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Type Influencer</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman rho</td>
<td>Celebrities Type</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Type Influencer</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between the types of influencers and type of content, splitted by age: 33-52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Celebrities Type</th>
<th>Expert</th>
<th>Type Influencer</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman rho</td>
<td>Celebrities Type</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Type Influencer</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

a. age = 23 - 32
b. age = 33 - 52
Correlation between the types of influencers and positive characteristics of influencers, splitted by age: 23-32.

Correlation between the types of influencers and positive characteristics of influencers, splitted by age: 33-52.
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### Correlation Tables from Random Questionnaire

Correlation among the types of influencers.

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>CelebrityTy peInfluencer</th>
<th>ExpertTy peInfluencer</th>
<th>EverydayPeopl eTy peInfluencer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CelebrityTy peInfluencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpertTy peInfluencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.445**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EverydayPeopleTy peInfluencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.445**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td></td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlation between types of influences and consumer’s internet behavior, split by age: 23-32.

#### Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CelebrityTy peInfluencer</th>
<th>ExpertTy peInfluencer</th>
<th>EverydayPeopl eTy peInfluencer</th>
<th>FollowBrandPage on SM</th>
<th>FollowBlog on SM</th>
<th>ValueOthersAdvocateProducts</th>
<th>AffectBrandPerception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-0.957</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CelebrityTy peInfluencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>-0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpertTy peInfluencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>-0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>-0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EverydayPeopleTy peInfluencer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.963</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>-0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FollowBrandPage on SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FollowBlog on SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ValueOthersAdvocateProducts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AffectBrandPerception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

a. Age = 23-32

---
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Correlation between types of influences and type of content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Types of Influencers</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Correlation Types of Content</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation between types of influences and type of content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation between types of influencers and negative characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**
### Correlation between types of influencers and types of content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Celebrities/Influence</th>
<th>Experts/Influence</th>
<th>EnthusiastTypeInfluencer</th>
<th>PeerReviewReliability</th>
<th>TeamMember</th>
<th>InfluencerActivity</th>
<th>PaidInfluencerEarnings</th>
<th>InfluencerReputation</th>
<th>SocialMediaInfluence</th>
<th>FakeCampaginInfluencing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrities/Influence</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: 1.000</td>
<td>-0.190, -0.084, -0.232, -0.825</td>
<td>-0.196, -0.160, -0.148, -0.129, -0.199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts/Influence</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.190, 1.000, -0.445, -0.064, -0.837, -0.320, -0.806, -0.061, -0.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnthusiastTypeInfluencer</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.084, -0.445, -1.000, -0.248, -0.839, -0.035, -0.057, -0.035, -0.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeerReviewReliability</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.442, -0.000, -0.021, -0.085, -0.745, -0.747, -0.597, -0.827, -0.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeamMember</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.325, -0.064, -0.264, -1.000, -0.120, 0.874, 1.451, 0.173, 0.565, 0.554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfluencerActivity</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.925, -0.267, -0.859, -1.200, -0.315, 0.849, 0.449, 0.900, 0.245, 0.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PaidInfluencerEarnings</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.760, -0.060, -0.035, -0.145, -0.848, -0.834, -1.000, -0.324, -0.358, -0.394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfluencerReputation</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.139, -0.004, -0.074, -0.110, -0.405, -0.413, -0.801, -0.924, -0.658, -0.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocialMediaInfluence</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.610, -0.281, -0.057, -0.173, -0.830, -0.846, -1.000, -0.413, -0.413, -0.413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FakeCampaginInfluencing</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient: -0.199, -0.234, -0.298, -0.207, -0.207, -0.134, -0.377, -0.190, -0.224, -0.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlation between types of influencers and negative characteristics of content.

- Correlation Coefficient: 1.000, -0.190, -0.084, -0.232, -0.825, -0.196, -0.160, -0.148, -0.129, -0.199
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.190, 1.000, -0.445, -0.064, -0.837, -0.320, -0.806, -0.061, -0.334
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.084, -0.445, -1.000, -0.248, -0.839, -0.035, -0.057, -0.035, -0.098
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.442, -0.000, -0.021, -0.085, -0.745, -0.747, -0.597, -0.827, -0.309
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.325, -0.064, -0.264, -1.000, -0.120, 0.874, 1.451, 0.173, 0.565, 0.554
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.925, -0.267, -0.859, -1.200, -0.315, 0.849, 0.449, 0.900, 0.245, 0.297
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.760, -0.060, -0.035, -0.145, -0.848, -0.834, -1.000, -0.324, -0.358, -0.394
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.139, -0.004, -0.074, -0.110, -0.405, -0.413, -0.801, -0.924, -0.658, -0.481
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.610, -0.281, -0.057, -0.173, -0.830, -0.846, -1.000, -0.413, -0.413, -0.413
- Correlation Coefficient: -0.199, -0.234, -0.298, -0.207, -0.207, -0.134, -0.377, -0.190, -0.224, -0.100

**Note:** The table above shows the correlation coefficients between different types of influencers and various characteristics of content. The values indicate the strength and direction of the relationship between these factors.
Correlation between types of influencers and positive characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencer Type</th>
<th>Positive Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity/Star</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert/Influencer</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Campaigns</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Others</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).