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Abstract

Purpose: The aim of this bachelor thesis is to investigate the relationship of online subcultures, electronic trust, electronic word-of-mouth, and purchase intention towards a special event within selected Facebook Pages.

Background: Given the increasing impact of social media platforms in communications not only between consumers, but also consumers and companies, this study takes a deeper look at the influence that companies can exercise on consumer’s purchase intention for a special event through these platforms. The background is based on previous researches and existent theories related to products, which are tested for a special event.

Method: In order to fulfill the purpose of this study a cross-sectional design is applied. A deductive approach is followed, and a quantitative method is used through the application of questionnaires in order to collect the empirical data necessary to answer the given research questions. The questionnaires were distributed to the selected sample, which is anyone who “likes” the following Facebook Pages: Sweden Rock Festival, Göteborg Horse Show, Hultsfred, and Swedish Speedway Grand Prix.

Conclusion: Based on the background a modest to strong relationship was expected between the measured variables. This however has been disconfirmed by the results, thus showing a weaker relationship than has been previously tested with regards to a product. The main finding is that when it comes to special events, the organizer is seen as a more reliable source, thus it is more influential than fellow members of the Facebook Page.
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1 Introduction

In this chapter the introduction follows a funnel approach; deriving from a broader marketing perspective to the specific area of research. It is then followed by a problem discussion where the concepts of electronic trust, electronic word-of-mouth, online subculture, and purchase intention are presented and from which a purpose for this study is constructed. The purpose is followed by definitions which are useful for understanding this thesis as well as delimitations of the study.

This bachelor thesis measures the relationship between electronic-word-of-mouth (eWOM), electronic trust (eTrust), online subculture, and purchase intention towards special events.

Social media has become a tool for influencing consumer behavior concerning “awareness, information acquisition, opinions, attitudes, purchase behavior, and post-purchase communication and evaluation” (Mangold & Faulds, 2009 p. 358). According to them, social media has now a vital role within the promotion mix. The first significant role of social media is that companies nowadays can interact with consumers through online platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, and others. The second role is that customers can communicate with one another creating eWOM. According to research eWOM plays an important role in marketing as it influences and forms consumer behavior; i.e. customer attitudes and behavioral intentions (e.g. Chevalier & Amazylin, 2006).

Subculture within social media is another variable which influences consumer behavior. Burgh-Woodman and Brace-Govan (2007, p. 203) define subculture as “(...) a social subset of individuals bound together by a common activity, unique philosophy and outlook which finds its origins in cultural, historical and social influences”. The internet has allowed people within subcultures to socially interact online, enabling them to communicate values and beliefs in new dimensions (Green, 2001).

Getz and Fairley (2004) argue that eWOM is a successful marketing tool in promoting and creating awareness for special events. Influence can be exercised from managers’ and consumers’. An example is consumer-originated online reviews which have relevant use for others when gathering pre-purchase product information (Adjei, Noble & Noble, 2010) and forming purchase intentions (Zhang & Tran, 2009).

According to many scholars eTrust plays an important role within the “cyber world” and has become a prerequisite for consumers to purchase online (Kim, Ferrin & Rao, 2008). Bickart and Schindler (2001) argue that information generated from a trustworthy source is more persuasive to consumers.

This paper will measure the chosen variables with a focus on Facebook Pages which are administrated by event organizers.

1.1 Problem

Social media platforms vary in form (forums, blogs, social network communities, etc); however all of them have a common point which is a two-way communication between participants. This allows consumers to share experiences and opinions towards a subject of common interest, thus generating eWOM. Further on, companies can also participate in this two-way communication which can be beneficial for them (Bambauer-Säche & Mangold, 2011).
Prendergast, Ko and Yuen (2010) concluded that purchase intention is directly related to the source similarity and to the forum’s persuasiveness. They tested the influence of eWOM on purchase intention and measured the persuasiveness of online forums, the similarity of the forum’s interests to the receiver’s interests, and the receiver’s attitude towards the forum.

Even though Prendergast et al. (2010) only focus on online forums, it is believed in this study that their theories could be applied to other online platforms. It is also assumed that consumers express their interest for and membership of a subculture through online platforms such as Facebook Pages. Participants are believed to have common interests and therefore identify themselves with other members. It is also expected that they trust each other and thus exercise some kind of influence on each other’s purchase intention. Therefore this research will be examining Facebook Pages which are related to special events and representative of subcultures.

This study investigates the relationship between eTrust, eWOM, online subculture, and purchase intention towards a special event. If proven true, it could have managerial relevance given the internet usage among the Swedish population is high (85%), with the majority below 45 being part of a social network, firstly Facebook (Findahl, 2010).

1.2 Purpose

The aim of this bachelor thesis is to measure the relationship between online subcultures, eTrust, eWOM, and purchase intention towards a special event within selected Facebook Pages.

1.3 Research Questions

RQ1: How does eWOM work within an online subculture on Facebook Pages?

RQ2: How is the reliability of the information within Facebook Pages of special events perceived by members?

RQ3: How do different sources within Facebook Pages of special events influence consumer’s purchase intention?

1.4 Delimitation

In this study a special event is considered to be a service. However, since theories and models for product marketing are the most available, and given the lack of research and theories regarding the recent phenomenon of social media, the background will be based on previous studies and theories related to products.

The researchers have taken into consideration the fact that behavior, and therefore purchase intention, is difficult to measure and it can be influenced by other variables. That is why this study is restricted to four variables. The aim is to understand how subculture, eWOM, eTrust are interconnected and their relationship with purchase intention. They acknowledge other variables which can have an influence on purchase intention within an online context but that will not be considered in this study such as webpage ease-to-use, functionality, etc.

This thesis will specifically focus on a few selected Facebook Pages. Other social media platforms will not be included because of their vast number, the lack of relevance to the
empirical study, and the time constraint. Furthermore, no distinction is made between positive and negative eWOM. It is important mentioning that this study is pertinent in the present time. Social media platforms are relatively new (e.g. Facebook opened in 2004) and are progressively becoming more popular (with 500 million users nowadays). Managers are gradually implementing social media as a marketing tool and are therefore on an experimental phase.

1.5 Definitions

1.5.1 Special Event
The following definition is the most suited for this study (Matthews, 2007):

- The event is limited to a certain period, most likely hours or days
- The event should be one-off or occasional, usually annual
- The event must be unique
- The event has to include one or more organizers
- The event requires the finishing to be designed and controlled
- The event must contain live audience apart from the organizers at the physical event location

1.5.2 Social Media
Henning-Thurau et al. (2010, p.132) define social media as “websites and other digital communication and information channels in which active consumers engage in behaviors that can be consumed by others both in real time and long afterwards regardless of their spatial location”.

1.5.3 Purchase Intention
“The likelihood that a consumer will buy a particular product resulting from the interaction of his or her need for it, attitude towards it and perceptions of it and of the company which produces it” (Bradmore, 2010).

1.5.4 Online subculture
Solomon (2004) explains subculture as a group whose members share beliefs and common experiences that distinguish them from others in the larger culture. Each group reveals its own unique set of norms, vocabulary, and produce insignias. He adds that consumers take part in many subcultures and that membership can be based on similarities in age, race or ethnic background, place of residence, or from a strong identification with an activity or art form.

1.5.5 eWOM
Kotler & Armstrong (2010, p. 436) define eWOM as the “personal communication about a product between target buyers and neighbors, friends, family members, and associates”. This definition will be applied to the online context, thus calling it eWOM. Even though their definition only includes communication about a product, in this study it is assumed that the same happens for a service, and more specifically for a special event.
1.5.6 eTrust

McGuire (1969) defines trust as being the perceived source’s motivation to communicate knowledge within a field without being biased. Trust is particularly important in the case of online retailing, where the buyer and the seller are physically separated, contingencies are difficult to predict and incorporate into contracts, relationships are difficult to monitor, and cyber-laws are not well defined (Mukherjee & Nath, 2007).
2 Theoretical Background

In this section the needed theoretical background will be presented and discussed. The background is then related to the empirical data in order to form the analysis. The discussed theories deal with research within the fields of electronic trust, electronic word-of-mouth, online subculture, and purchase intention. There will be relevant concepts highlighted in accordance to the subject in focus.

According to Bryman and Bell (2003) theory “in its most common meaning is an explanation of observed regularities” (p.7). They recognize however, that relevant background literature is often used as theory, and that it guides the topic of research. The latter approach will be followed in this study and the background will be formed based on non-tested ideas and overlooked aspects of the topic.

Consumers influencing consumers is something that can be seen from real life examples. In 2009 musician Dave Carroll uploaded a satirical video on YouTube about his bad experience with a company. He had claimed for nine months to be compensated for a deliberately damaged guitar by United Airlines. The video hit more than 1.3 million views within five days (CBC News, 2009) and bad reputation stroke.

Henning-Thurau, et al. (2010, p.313) say that companies “were able to avoid negative mass media coverage having almost complete control over the brand-shaping messages and, as a result, relationship outcomes such as customer retention through their own activities”. They further suggest that marketers no longer have control over the brand since information is “multidirectional, interconnected, and difficult to predict”; and that instead they interact with consumers in a “conversation” about the brand (Deighton & Kornfeld, 2009). This can be extended to the flow of opinions and experiences regarding a service and a special event. As a conclusion, Mangold and Faulds (2009) suggest that marketers can no longer disregard the social media phenomenon because it has become the tool for consumers to spread the word about products and services.

Having this as a trigger to gain knowledge, the background will be formed. The variables eWOM, eTrust, and subculture have been chosen based on the study of Lin and Lu (2010). Even though they focus on trust in an offline environment, it is believed to be a relevant study within the similar field as this research. However, this study focuses on purchase intention for special events in an online environment; therefore the variables have been adapted to this context.

The buyer decision process will now be described. The following variables are then related: subculture and eWOM, eWOM and eTrust, and finally eWOM within a subculture to purchase intention.

2.1 The buyer decision process

In order to understand purchase intention one must first understand the buyer decision process. Kotler and Armstrong (2004) and Kotler and Armstrong (2010) are used as a reference to describe this process, and their proposed path with adaptations for the online environment is presented next.
2.1.1 Need recognition & problem awareness

The first step in the buyer decision process is to recognize a need or a problem which can be set off by internal or external stimuli. Marketers should understand consumers’ needs and problems, how they arise, and what leads them to a particular product or service. In this way marketers can develop a product or service in accordance.

2.1.2 Information search

Kotler and Armstrong (2004) argue that information search may or may not occur depending on consumer’s will and availability of a satisfying product. When proceeding with a search consumers can turn to different sources from the following: personal sources (e.g. family, neighbors and friends); commercial sources (e.g. advertising, salespersons, displays); public sources (e.g. consumer rating organizations and mass media); and experimental sources (e.g. examining, handling, using the product). It is argued that although most information is accessed through commercial sources, personal sources are seen as more legitimate sources because of its consumer-generated aspect. This step relates to this study as it is assumed that consumers within an online community take into account others’ opinions when doing a search for a product or service, which can influence their purchasing process.

2.1.3 Evaluation of alternatives

Even though Kotler and Armstrong (2004) talk about brands, in this study it is generalized to all product and service options, including special events. They argue that consumers process information in order to attain a bundle of final choices. The evaluation procedure is not always the same as it depends on the individual and the specific buying situation. It can be based on calculation and logical thinking as well as on impulse and intuition. In this stage the consumer will rank options and form purchase intentions. This is why it is important for managers to know how consumers evaluate the alternatives and what influences the final decision.

2.1.4 Purchase

Consumers will usually buy the highest ranked option, however there are two factors that can interfere with purchase intention and the actual decision of purchasing. The factors are the attitude of others; and unexpected situational factors such as expected income, expected price, and expected benefits. In this study the focus is to measure the impact of the attitude of others, expressed through eWOM, on purchase intention.

2.1.5 Post-purchase evaluation

This consists of the evaluation of perceived performance in comparison to expected performance of a product or a service. If there is a gap consumers are dissatisfied, if
expected performance is met consumers are satisfied, and if they are exceeded consumers are delighted. The result of post-purchase evaluation will be shown through either positive or negative WOM depending on the satisfaction, and the same goes for the online context.

2.2 eWOM created by interactions of an online subculture

WOM was initially referred to the person-to-person conversations between consumers about different products or services (e.g. Chatterjee, 2001; Sen & Lerman, 2007). WOM includes both positive and negative statements, it can be about products or services, and it is provided by potential, actual as well as former customers. Many authors believe the main reason for WOM communication is when a product or service expectations are disconfirmed (Anderson, 1998).

With the internet more present than ever, WOM has taken new dimensions. eWOM is consumer-generated information that describes the product or experience from a consumer perspective, communicating feelings and satisfaction, making it easier for other consumers to relate to in comparison to marketer-generated information (Chen & Xie, 2008). According to Dellarocas (2003, p. 1407) "word-of-mouth is being given new significance by the unique property of the Internet". eWOM is formed through online media such as forums, social network sites, blogs and other online platforms, and it has the possibility to reach a much larger number of recipients. As Mangold and Faulds (2009, p. 359) argue “instead of telling a few friends, consumers now have the ability to tell hundreds or thousands of other people with a few keystrokes!” One example of the stretch of eWOM is Facebook. Up to date Facebook is the largest social network platform with more than 500 million active users, of which 200 million access the Page both through computers and mobile phones. Further on, the average user is connected to 80 community pages, groups and events, and creates 90 pieces of content each month (Facebook, 2011).

Kotler and Armstrong (2010) propose that people with different subcultures have different wants and needs. They define subculture as “cultures within cultures” which “can be based on anything from age to ethnicity” (p.184), and are claimed to have different values and lifestyles. Further on, Burgh-Woodman and Brace-Govan (2007, p. 203) define subculture as “(...) a social subset of individuals bound together by a common activity, unique philosophy and outlook which finds its origins in cultural, historical and social influences”. As Solomon (2004) (see 1.5.4 Online Subculture, p.3) they agree that this unity is practiced through a common language, and the formation of a dialogue that shapes values and customs, consumption, appearance, and social communities.

Subcultures manifest themselves online through blogs, forums and communities. Consumers take part in online communities in order to inform and influence others about products and services (Kozinets, 1999, Muniz & O'Guinn, 2001). This phenomenon arises because of consumer’s enjoyment in networking with people with similar interest and desires as one’s own (Mangold & Faulds, 2009). Bambauer-Sache and Mangold (2011) argue that companies can benefit from these engagements. Kelman (1961) suggests that consumers perceive information shared by fellow members of an online community group as more reliable and influential as they can identify themselves with the people posting the messages.

Balasubramanian and Mahajan (2001) propose three types of social interaction utilities that occur when considering economic and social activity in a virtual community: focus-related utility, consumption utility, and approval utility.
Focus-related utility occurs when the consumer adds value to the community through his or her contribution. eWOM contributions could be reviews and other comments about services and products. Further on many online community members engage in eWOM communication since it increases their feeling of belongingness to the communities (McWilliam, 2000).

Consumption utility is the second distinguished. It refers to people who gain value through “direct consumption of the contributions of other community constituents” (Balasubramanian & Mahajan, 2001, p. 125). This mainly concerns those who seek advice and others’ opinions with regards to a product or service.

The third is approval utility. It explains the satisfaction one gains when others praise the help attained through information posted by he or she. In their study of consumer opinion platforms Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, & Gremler (2004) defined two concrete motives for approval utility namely self-enhancement utility, and economic reward. Self-enhancement utility is reached through the positive recognition from other members. Economic reward on the other hand occurs when people get an economic compensation (usually from the platform operator) as a gesture of appreciation for the information posted.

The following hypotheses are proposed:

H1: There is a direct correlation between feeling part of a subculture and sharing eWOM

H2: There is a direct correlation between feeling part of a subculture and reading eWOM created by fellow members of the Facebook Page

H3: There is a direct correlation between sharing and reading eWOM

2.3 The relationship between online eTrust and eWOM on purchase intention

Sources are perceived as more trustworthy if expertise is possessed and if the information is unbiased (Brown, Broderick, & Lee, 2007). This is in line with the trustworthiness definition by McGuire (1969) (see 1.5.6 eTrust, p.4). When highly credible sources share information online they are perceived as valuable and reliable which makes it easier to transfer knowledge to the receiver (Ko et al., 2005).

There are different ways of generating eTrust within the “cyber world”. Kim et al. (2008) argue that the influence on consumer’s eTrust is gained through affect-based aspects such as e.g., recommendations, buyer’s feedback, eWOM, and reputation. According to Arndt (1967) consumer-generated information is perceived as a more reliable source than firm-generated communication. Dellarocas (2003) states that the best use of online feedback generated by consumers is building trust within electronic markets. Therefore, the information found on online discussion groups have a higher probability to gain consumer’s attention, and to influence purchase through eWOM (Bickart & Schindler, 2001). Kim et al. (2008) further argue that eTrust affects purchasing intention directly and indirectly, and it has a strong positive effect if present.

Research proved that more independent websites are preferred by consumers (e.g. Alba, et al., 1997, Bakos, 1997, Lynch, 2000), and that consumers question recommendations from endorsed sources (e.g. Folkes, 1988, Mizerski, Golden, & Kernan, 1979). However, Vilpponen, Winter and Sundqvist (2006) interestingly found only partial support to their
assumption that “strong ties, which are believed to be more trustworthy and credible, would result in relatively earlier adoption” (p.73). They therefore concluded that “all connections in virtual electronic environments are equal in their effectiveness and persuasiveness” (p.73).

Literature argues that attendees take into account if they know someone who will go to the event, if someone they trust invites them, or if the organization which invites them is trustworthy (Paris, Lee, & Seery, 2010). Although from theory it would be assumed that consumer-generated information on a Facebook Page would most likely be preferred, the researchers suspect that for special events there might be a contrary effect, where organizers are seen as more reliable sources. Given that on the chosen Facebook Pages the event organizers are the page creators and act as a source of information, this suspicion will be tested.

This study looks at the relationship between eTrust and eWOM and how it influences the decision to attend an event. Facebook Pages are used as an example in this study. These reach millions of people giving them the opportunity to interact with each other, which creates a sense of community for the participants. Paris, et al. (2010) argue businesses should use Facebook to build eTrust with their consumers, and to be most effective Facebook Events should be straightforward and interactive as they can influence consumer’s actual intentions to attend an event.

The following hypotheses are proposed:

\( H4: \) Consumer-generated information is perceived as more reliable than marketer-generated information

\( H5: \) There is a direct correlation between trusting others members’ information and purchase intention towards a special event

\( H6: \) There is a direct correlation between trusting the organizer’s information and purchase intention towards a special event

2.4 eWOM within an online subculture and its relationship to purchase intention

WOM has an influence on the majority of all purchase decisions (e.g. Brooks, 1957, and Dichter, 1966). According to Bambauer-Sache and Mangold (2011, p. 38) “Word-of-Mouth communication is generally acknowledged to play a considerable role in influencing and forming consumer’s attitudes and behavioral intentions”. The main reason for this influence is, as previously mentioned, consumer-generated information is seen as more reliable than marketer-generated information.

Senecal and Nantel (2004) found that online product recommendations greatly influenced consumer’s product choices, and that consumers who perceived themselves as more familiar with the recommended product were more keen on following recommendations than those who did not perceive themselves as familiar with the product. As Dwyer (2007) suggested it is believed in this study that people search for information through online communities not only to obtain information, as well as to connect with members with similar interests thus boosting their satisfaction after purchasing and using a product or service, or for example having attended an event. Dwyer (2007) found that within online communities little attention is given to the source in regards to content of high value, and that while similarity of interest is found on these communities, it is not an initiator for attachment. However, Alstyne and Brynjolfsson (2005) noted that "separation in virtual
knowledge space can divide special interest groups...[where]... people must choose some information contacts over others" (p. 851). Further on, Rogers (1995) proposes that referral behavior which influences adoption may be more significant among people with similar beliefs, education, and occupation. Since the Facebook Pages looked at in this study are believed to represent an online subculture, it is expected that members would feel familiar with the events and thus that they would be influenced by the information and recommendations found on these pages.

According to Nelson (1970) goods can be classified as possessing either search or experience qualities. Search qualities are those that “the consumer can determine by inspection prior to purchase,” and experience qualities are those that “are not determined prior to purchase” (Nelson, 1974, p. 730). Given that it is more difficult to appraise experience products before purchase, consumers should be more reliable on and primarily take in consideration product recommendations for experience products than for search products. Since a special event can be considered an experience service, for which evaluation is practically impossible before attendance, like most services, it is supposed that information and recommendation have an impact on the intention to attend a special event.

The following hypothesis is proposed:

H7: There is a direct correlation between reading eWOM generated by other members and purchase intention for a special event
3 Research Methods

This chapter describes how the study was carried out. In addition to introducing the specific methods used for collecting and analyzing the necessary data to answer the research questions, it briefly covers relevant theory so as to motivate the choice of methods.

3.1 Population and selected sample

The population consists of Facebook members who “like” Facebook Pages related to special events in Sweden. Demographic variables such as age and gender are not taken into account. The aim is to understand how online consumers perceive the chosen variables (eWOM, eTrust, subculture, and purchase intention) within these pages. However, since it is not feasible to survey the whole population a representative sample is chosen in order to be able to generalize the results.

In determining the sample the population is narrowed down to members of a few chosen Facebook Pages. The choice has been made based on the identification of a subculture within the Pages, the number of members, and on the interactivity between them. The aim is to get as many respondents as possible from the following: Sweden Rock Festival, Göteborg Horse Show, Hultsfred, and Swedish Speedway Grand Prix which have respectively around 26, 13, 12, and 1 thousand “likes”. The sample includes all the people who “like” these Pages, embracing those who actively post comments and those who only read the generated information. After conducting the questionnaire the researchers intend to recognize how and to what extent the variables are relevant in influencing each other, and finally purchase intention. Generalization is not intended beyond this sample.

The internet is used as means to access the selected sample. As Poynter (2010, p. 3) argues “the largest impact of online market research so far has been in the area of quantitative survey research, both in terms of volume and value”. Using the internet makes it easy to reach hard-to-find groups and it gives flexibility for respondents to reply at their convenience. Two other significant factors are the speed offered by the media, and its cost effectiveness (Poynter, 2010). For these reasons and the subject at stake the internet is the most relevant tool of data collection for the empirical research. With the help of Qualtrics, an online tool, the questionnaires will be created and distributed to the target sample.

The questionnaire is self-administered and is posted on the selected pages. This gives a standard to the study since all respondents experience the same type of social network. The administrators uploaded the questionnaire on the Göteborg Horse Show’s and the Swedish Speedway Grand Prix’s Pages; whereas on the Sweden Rock Festival’s and the Hultsfred’s the link was posted by the researchers. In an attempt to increase the number of responses the link was posted once a week for three weeks.

3.2 Data collection

In order to measure the variables and to be able to test the proposed hypotheses the data collection follows a quantitative approach. The data is further analyzed and the results related to the background. This process is known as a deductive approach to research, which usually follows a linear process: theory, hypothesis, data collection, findings, hypothesis confirmed or rejected and revision of theory (Bryman & Bell, 2003).

Holme and Solvang (1997) argue that a quantitative approach should be chosen if the researcher is interested in showing how strong relationships there are between variables, or
if he or she wants to say something about the selected sample in order to understand the selected population. For these reasons a quantitative approach is followed which transforms the information gained into numbers and values that are further statistically analyzed.

It is important to note that, according to Cooper and Schindler (2011 p.160) to understand “what happened, or how often things happened” a quantitative research method is suitable; whereas in order to understand “the different meanings that people place on their experiences” a qualitative method is more appropriate since it better captures people’s “hidden interpretations, understandings, and motivations”. The researchers understand that a qualitative research method could have been more appropriate to understand consumer behavior and revealing their intrinsic values and opinions for the chosen variables. Nevertheless, given the time constraint and the purpose of this study that is to measure the strength of the relationship between the variables, a quantitative approach is better suited.

There are some criticism to quantitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2003) including the possibility that respondents may interpret the questions differently, thus generating poor validity of results. This problem can be partially solved by offering a set of fixed answers such as in a Likert scale. Another aspect arisen by Cicourel (1982) relates to ecological validity and regards whether respondents have the necessary knowledge to answer the questions, and if they place similar importance to the topic in their everyday lives. In this research this issue is minimized since the people within the sample assumedly identify themselves with the subculture. However, they can still value this engagement differently. The additional criticism is that quantitative methods may drive a correlation between variables; however it may not clarify how this is formed, therefore disregarding the meaning of such correlation for people in their real lives (Bryman & Bell, 2003).

This study follows a cross-sectional design. This design is characterized by: the variation in respect of respondents and the Facebook Pages; the collection of data at one point in time through questionnaires where all answers are given at once; the quantification of results that allows ascertaining the variations between cases; and it enables patterns of association between variables. However, external factors other than the studied variables cannot be excluded to have influenced the results.

The questionnaire is based on previous similar studies such as Lin and Lu (2010) and Brown, Broderick and Lee (2007). The questions can be seen in Table 1, p.13 and the questionnaire for each Facebook Page can be seen under Appendix A. It is assumed that people answering the questionnaire have an interest for the online subculture as they are willing to spend time and effort reading and sharing opinions about the event.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subculture</td>
<td>(Subculture 1) I have a big interest in…</td>
<td>Self-made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Subculture 2) I feel part of the … subculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Subculture 3) I like to discuss … online with people with the same interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eTrust</td>
<td>(eTrust 1) The information on the … Facebook Page feels trustworthy</td>
<td>(Kim et al. 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(eTrust 2) I search for information on the … Facebook Page because I find it more trustworthy than other webpages about the event</td>
<td>(Lin &amp; Lu 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(eTrust 3) I trust the information written by other members on the … Facebook Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(eTrust 4) I trust the information written by the organizers of … on their Facebook Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM</td>
<td>(eWOM 1) I read the information written by other people on … Facebook Page</td>
<td>Six-item Attitude Toward the Site scale and the 22 content adjectives (Chen, Clifford, &amp; Wells, 2002); perceived usefulness (Lin H.-F., 2007); (Lin &amp; Lu 2010); (Brown, Broderick &amp; Lee 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(eWOM) The … Facebook Page offers good opinions from earlier visitors of the event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(eWOM 3) I share my opinions regarding the … on their Facebook Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>(Purchase Intention 1) I will buy a ticket to the …</td>
<td>Three-item scale (Putrevu &amp; Lord, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Purchase Intention 2) I will recommend … to my friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Research Quality

3.3.1 Reliability

According to Bryman and Bell (2003) reliability is mostly important to quantitative methods where researchers are concerned about whether the measures are stable or not. Reliability refers to the capability of repeating a study in order to reach consistency. Holme and Solvang (1997) define reliability as the degree of which the values will be the same if the measurement is repeated on the same sample.

Within reliability there is stability, which is the correlation between more than one observations given to the same sample at different times. This is often hard to measure since many factors such as social and economical changes overtime may alter responses. In this study a stability test is not done due to the time constraint. Researchers also worry about internal reliability, which refers to the coherence of the measured variables, meaning that they relate to each other. In order to test internal reliability the Cronbach’s Alpha test will be applied.

3.3.2 Validity

Validity should not be confused with reliability, and according to Bryman and Bell (2003) it is one of the most important criterion of research. Validity refers to the integrity of the results of a research. Paulsson (1999) explains validity as to which degree the study actually measured what it intended to measure, and the selected sample will only give valid information if such is achieved (Holme & Solvang, 1997). There are many types of validity as suggested by Bryman and Bell (2003).

Measurement validity, often referred as construct validity, is whether the questions used to measure a variable really represent it. In case this is not complied the results will be doubtful, thus if a measure is unstable it will generate invalid results; therefore validity implies reliability. To make sure measurement validity is attained the questionnaire is based on previous researches, however, questions are adapted and modified to the context of special event and online subculture. On the other hand, given that a suitable measurement for subculture was not found, questions related to this variable are self-made.

Internal validity deals with whether the independent variables at stake are the ones having influence on the dependent variable, and not another external factor. In a cross-sectional research however internal validity is usually weak since “causal direction from the resulting data” cannot be determined (Bryman & Bell, 2003, p. 49).

On the other hand external validity relates to whether the results generated by a research can be extended beyond its context, and at this point the sample selection becomes critical: when a random sample is selected external validity is strong. Conversely, in this study a purposive sampling is used (a non-probability sampling method); based on the researchers’ judgment the chosen sample is the one that best helps to fulfill the purpose (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2007). In order to have a better understanding of the whole population, four homogeneous Facebook Pages were chosen. Although, Saunders et al. (2007) argue that this kind of sampling cannot be statistically representative of the whole population.

Ecological validity raises the question “are the findings representative of people’s everyday lives, their values and attitudes?” Having people answering to a questionnaire already makes
the results fairly ecologically invalid even if the research reaches measurement, internal and external validity (Bryman & Bell, 2003). In this research ecological validity is believed to be relatively high since people’s engagement on Facebook Pages comes from their own choice and interest.

3.3.3 Generalizability

Researchers are concerned with the generalizability of their findings, especially those that adopt a quantitative research approach through a cross-sectional design (Bryman & Bell, 2003). The findings of this study are aimed to be generalized to the sample previously defined as anyone who “like” the selected Facebook Pages. No generalization is expected further than this.

3.3.4 Replication

Researchers want to make sure that others are able to replicate their study for a matter of validation, particularly those who take on a quantitative approach. If the study cannot be replicated the results become questionable as well as the researcher’s neutrality. Therefore it is common that a clear description of the process of the study is stated in the report so others could replicate it. A clear description of the process used in this research can be found earlier in this section.

3.4 Statistical analysis

In this study the variables can be categorized as ordinal variables; i.e. there is order within the categories ranging from “definitely not” to “definitely”, however we cannot assume that the distance between each category is the same. When using Likert scales this becomes a matter of disagreement, since it is sometimes said that Likert scales can be considered as interval variables. Interval variables have identical distances between the categories. Since the age range is measured into categories it also becomes an ordinal variable. Gender exceptionally falls into dichotomous variable since it only allows two categories (male and female) (Bryman & Bell, 2003).

The data is inserted in PASW (Predictive Analytics SoftWare) Statistics, and thereafter a descriptive analysis is conducted for each item. When proceeding with a descriptive analysis of a Likert scale it is recommended to use the mode and the median instead of the mean. The mode is the most common answer within the categories (Salkind, 2000), while the median is the point in the middle of the frequency distribution of the data (Aczel & Sounderpandian, 2009). A descriptive analysis is also done in order to measure H4.

Factor analysis is then performed to reduce the dimensionality of the data. This is done through the identification of “unobserved factors that explain patterns of correlations within a set of observed variables” (Mooy & Sarstedt, 2011, p. 202). Thus, the most correlated items will form a factor. A confirmatory factor analysis is done since the researches measure four variables that are expected to be independent, i.e. the most desired outcome would be to obtain four factors. The factors are rotated to simplify the structure making it easier to interpret the results (Cattell, 1978, & Thurstone, 1947). Varimax rotation is used, which is the most common type of orthogonal rotation. It maximizes the distribution of loadings within the factors. In this study, when few factors are extracted loadings of 0.5 or higher are expected (Mooy & Sarstedt, 2011).

Next is to interpret the factors, and decide the correlation level for acceptance. An
additional measure is used to resolve if the items are sufficiently correlated. This is the anti-
image which “describes the portion of an item’s variance that is independent of another
item in the analysis” (Mooi & Sarstedt, 2011, p. 207). Since all items are expected to be
highly correlated, their anti-images should be small. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO)
statistic and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity are measures of the anti-image concept. KMO
indicates if observed correlations between items can be explained by correlations between
other items in the data set. The Bartlett’s tests the null hypothesis that in the population
analysis each item correlates perfectly with itself but has no correlation with the other
items. Given that some items will always be correlated, it is practically impossible not to
reject the null hypothesis, therefore KMO can be used to test if the data are appropriate for
factor analysis. The adequacy of the KMO values taken into account in this study is
proposed by Mooi and Sarstedt (2011) and can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2 - KMO Values (Mooi & Sarstedt, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO value</th>
<th>Adequacy of the correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 0.50</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50–0.59</td>
<td>Miserable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60–0.69</td>
<td>Mediocre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70–0.79</td>
<td>Middling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80–0.89</td>
<td>Meritorious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90 and higher</td>
<td>Marvelous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to measure the internal consistency of a set of items the Cronbach’s Alpha
coefficient is used. This is done by comparing the performance of each individual item with
the overall individual performance (Salkind, 2000). The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient varies
from 0 to 1, and while 0.7 is considered a low limit, exception is made for exploratory
studies where 0.60 is acceptable. George and Mallery (2003, p. 231) suggest the following
consistency levels which will be considered in this study (see Table 3, p.17).
Table 3 - Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient Consistency (George & Mallery, 2003, p. 231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;0.9</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.89&gt;0.8</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.79&gt;0.7</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.69&gt;0.6</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.59&gt;0.5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.5</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For testing the other hypotheses Spearman’s rho (ρ) correlation analysis is carried on which is the most commonly used rank correlation (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). Correlation measures how values of one variable change in response to values of the other variable (Salkind, 2000). Bryman and Bell (2003) stress that relationship between variables is different from causality, where one variable induces the other. When measuring relationships between ordinal variables correlation analysis is considered to be more efficient. Therefore neither regression analysis nor Chi-square test are applied (Bryman & Cramer, 2005).

The correlation coefficient ranges from -1 to +1 and reflects the direction and strength of the relation between the variables. If ρ is positive there is a direct correlation (the two variables increase in concert), however if the index is negative there is anticorrelation (i.e. one variable increases when the other decreases) (Salkind, 2000). The closer to -1 and +1 the coefficient is, the stronger the correlation. ρ = 0 indicates no correlation at all. Cohen and Holliday (1982) proposed the following Correlation Coefficient Index:

Table 4 - Correlation Coefficient Index (Cohen & Holliday, 1982)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient Index</th>
<th>Correlation Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.19 and below</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20 to 0.39</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40 to 0.69</td>
<td>Modest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70 to 0.89</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90 to 1</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Empirical findings and hypotheses testing

This chapter presents the empirical data that was collected in order to fulfill the purpose of this thesis. A descriptive analysis of each item from the questionnaires will be presented first, followed by the factor analysis, and thereafter the results for the hypotheses testing will be presented. To further understand and better visualize the latter cross tabulation bar charts will be used.

4.1 Data response and demographics

The questionnaires generated 93 respondents from Göteborg Horse Show, 37 from Swedish Speedway Grand Prix, and 22 responses from both Hultsfred and Sweden Rock Festival. This makes up a total of 174 responses from which six were incomplete. This gives 168 responses that will be analyzed. Most responses came from the Göteborg Horse Show’s and the Swedish Speedway Grand Prix’s Facebook Pages. The reason could be that the links to the questionnaire on these pages were posted by the event organizer, who is also the page administrator.

Most respondents (68.45%) were women. The majority of respondents were in the age ranges of under 18, 19-29, 30-39, and 40-49 (86.2%), while the ranges 50-59 and above 60 account for 13.7% The demographical variables will not be considered in this study. See Table 5 below for a summary of the data.

Table 5 - Summary of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18&lt;</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-29</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Page</td>
<td>Sweden Rock festival</td>
<td>(21) 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Hultsfreds Festival</td>
<td>(22) 13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gothenburg Horse Show</td>
<td>(91) 54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speedway Grand Prix</td>
<td>(34) 20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Descriptive Analysis

4.2.1 Subculture 1

I have a strong interest in ...

The frequency distribution shows that the vast majority of respondents have strong interest for the subjects within the Facebook Pages. It can be seen that no one has responded
negatively to this question, which confirms the earlier stated supposition that all members share an interest for the given subject.

Table 6 - Frequency Distribution Subculture 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Subculture 2

I feel part of the ... subculture

From the frequency distribution it can be seen that the majority of respondents feel part of the subculture in question. However, 17% score average or below. Comparing to Subculture 1 it can be concluded that even though all of the respondents have some interest for the subject on the Facebook Page, not all view themselves as being part of the subculture.

Table 7 - Frequency Distribution Subculture 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Subculture 3

I like to discuss about ... online with people with the same interest

The frequency distribution shows a spread, although most responded answered positively to this question. Overall the majority enjoys discussing with people with the same interest within the online context.
Table 8 - Frequency Distribution Subculture 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 eTrust 1

The information on the ... Facebook Page feels trustworthy

The frequency distribution shows that the majority of respondents trust the information found on the Facebook Page. A minority of 13% score between 1 and 3.

Table 9 - Frequency Distribution eTrust 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 eTrust 2

I search for information on ... Facebook Page because I find it more trustworthy than other WebPages about the event

The frequency distribution shows a spread with most respondents answering 3, suggesting most people are ambiguous about Facebook Pages being more trustworthy than other pages. More respondents scored 4 - 5 than 1 - 2.
Table 10 - Frequency Distribution eTrust 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.6 eTrust 3

I trust the information written by other members on the … Facebook Page

eTrust 3 and eTrust 4 address differences between the perceived trustworthiness of the information provided by different sources. In this case fellow members’ trustworthiness was measured. The frequency distribution shows a normal distribution centered on 3, revealing ambiguity.

Table 11 - Frequency Distribution eTrust 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.7 eTrust 4

I trust the information written by the organizers of ... on their Facebook Page

From looking at the frequency distribution it can be seen that the majority of respondents find the information generated by the organizer trustworthy. There is a small proportion of 14% who are ambiguous to this question. It is interesting to see that no one completely distrusts the information from the organizer, and only 2% answered negatively. This makes a strong statement about trusting the information from the organizer.
Table 12 - Frequency Distribution eTrust 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.8 eWOM 1

I read the information written by other people on ... Facebook Page

The frequency distribution is evenly spread between 2 to 5, with a smaller proportion of respondents implying they definitely do not read the information shared by fellow members on the Facebook Page.

Table 13 - Frequency Distribution eWOM 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.9 eWOM 2

The ... Facebook Page offers good opinions from earlier visitors of the event

The frequency distribution shows that the majority of respondents answered positively to this question between 4 and 5, even though most respondents answered ambiguously. Further on only 9% of the total answered negatively indicating that a small proportion believe that the opinions given are not good.
### Table 14 - Frequency Distribution eWOM 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.10 eWOM 3

**I share my opinions regarding the ... on their Facebook Page**

The frequency distribution shows the majority of respondents score average and below, thus they do not strongly engage in eWOM on these Facebook Pages. Most respondents are ambiguous, and 29% responded positively between 4 and 5.

### Table 15 - Frequency Distribution eWOM 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.11 Purchase Intention 1

**I will buy a ticket to the ...**

The frequency distribution below shows that 72% fall within the high scales 4 and 5, thus indicating that most of the people answering the questionnaire will most likely attend the event. Only 10% answered negatively, while 16% are ambiguous.
## 4.2.12 Purchase Intention 2

**I will recommend ... to my friends**

From the frequency distribution it can be seen that the vast majority of respondents will recommend the event to their friends. Looking back at Purchase Intention 1 it is clear that people are more positive to recommend the event than to purchase a ticket. This could be due to various reasons, one of them is believed to be the impossibility to attend, e.g. geographical distances.

### Table 17 - Frequency Distribution Purchase Intention 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Factor Analysis and Cronbach’s Alpha

Since the aim is to measure four variables when conducting the factor analysis a fixed number of factors were forced with a Varimax rotation. The KMO and the Bartlett’s Test are automatically generated by PASW Statistics. The KMO value is middling according to the proposed adequacy of the correlation values (Table 2, p.16), thus confirming the data are appropriate for factor analysis.
Table 18 - KMO and Bartlett's Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling</th>
<th>.784</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>552.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed factors can be seen in the Rotated Component Matrix below. All items have a loading of above 0.50 as suggested by Mooi and Sarstedt (2011). However, the internal reliability of three of the factors (Table 21, p.26) are not acceptable according to George and Mallery (2003, p. 231). Further on, after revising the questions within each factor it was concluded that some items are not appropriate to measure the intended variables. Therefore, the factor analysis is disregarded and followed by a correlation analysis using the independent questions in order to maintain their individual explanatory power. As some items are more appropriate in answering the hypotheses than others, the following items are disregarded:

Table 19 - Disregarded Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Why it is disregarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subculture 1</td>
<td>It is already assumed that members of Facebook Pages share the same interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subculture 3</td>
<td>The question formulation strongly relates to eWOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM 2</td>
<td>The question formulation strongly relates to eTrust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eTrust 2</td>
<td>It is irrelevant for testing the proposed hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Intention 2</td>
<td>The question formulation strongly relates to eWOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 - Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Subculture 1)</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subculture 2)</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subculture 3)</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Trust 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Trust 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Trust 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Trust 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eWOM 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eWOM 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eWOM 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Hypotheses testing

4.4.1 H1: There is a direct correlation between feeling part of a subculture and sharing eWOM

Subculture 2 and eWOM 3 were correlated since they are the best fitted items for answering this hypothesis. Subculture 2 specifically asks about feeling part of the subculture, while eWOM 3 relates to sharing information. The results of the correlation analysis can be seen in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subculture 2</th>
<th>eWOM 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>0.314**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation is significant; thus the null hypothesis is rejected implying that there is a correlation between the variables. The correlation coefficient gives a low direct correlation according to the proposed correlation index (Table 3, p.17). Given the results H1 is accepted.

The direction of the correlation can be easily clarified by the cross tabulation chart on p.27. It shows that the more one feels part of the subculture, the more positively the distribution is, and the less one feels part of the subculture, the more negatively the distribution is. The low correlation on the other hand can be explained by the large spread throughout the data.
4.4.2 H2: There is a direct correlation between feeling part of a subculture and reading eWOM created by fellow members of the Facebook Page

Subculture 2 and eWOM 1 were correlated. As with H1, they are chosen due to the belief that they are the most accurate measurements for this hypothesis. The results of the correlation analysis can be seen in the table below:

Table 23 - Spearman's Rho Correlation Subculture 2 vs. eWOM 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Subculture 2</th>
<th>eWOM 1</th>
<th>Subculture 2</th>
<th>eWOM 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM 1</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The correlation is significant; thus the null hypothesis is rejected suggesting correlation between the variables. The correlation coefficient, according to the proposed correlation index (Table 3, p.17), suggests a very low direct correlation. Nevertheless, given the results H2 is accepted.
The direction of the correlation can be clarified by the cross tabulation bar chart below. It can be seen that the more one feels part of the subculture, the more positive one is to reading eWOM. However, it is harder to see a negative pattern from those who do not feel part of the subculture, which could explain the low correlation.

**Graph 2 - Cross Tabulation Bar Chart Subculture 2 vs. eWOM 1**

![Cross Tabulation Bar Chart Subculture 2 vs. eWOM 1](image)

### 4.4.3 H3: There is a direct correlation between sharing and reading eWOM

To test this hypothesis a correlation analysis is done between the two aspects of eWOM that are sharing information, and reading information by fellow members. Therefore eWOM 1 and eWOM 3 are used. The results of the correlation analysis can be seen in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>eWOM 3</th>
<th>eWOM 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.538**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The correlation is significant; the null hypothesis is rejected, thus there is a correlation between the two aspects. Additionally, the correlation coefficient suggests a modest direct correlation between the two aspects. Consequently it can be said that if one scores high on reading eWOM, he or she generally scores high on sharing eWOM, and vice-versa. Given the results H3 is accepted.
The direction of the correlation can be clarified by the cross tabulation chart below. It can be seen that the more one reads eWOM, the more one generates, making a positive distribution. This is also valid the other way around, the less one reads eWOM, the less one generates it, thus generating a negative distribution. The modest correlation can be explained by the spread that still remains in the data.

**Graph 3 - Cross Tabulation Bar Chart eWOM 3 vs. eWOM 1**

---

4.4.4 **H4: Consumer-generated information is perceived as more reliable than marketer-generated information**

The mode and the median of questions eTrust 3 and eTrust 4 are compared. Given the higher mode and median for eTrust 4, it can be stated that people in general trust more the information shared by the organizer. Based on the results this hypothesis is rejected even though it contradicts what has been argued in the background. Nevertheless, this is an interesting finding and it confirms the researchers’ suspicions that for a special event the organizer may be seen as a more reliable source of information.

**Table 25 - Statistics for eTrust 3 and eTrust 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>eTrust 3</th>
<th>eTrust 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>5,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To take a deeper look and have a better clarification of results the cross tabulation bar chart below is presented. It can be clearly seen that respondents generally trust the organizer, however those who scored low and relatively low on trusting the organizer also scored low on trusting other members. From this it is concluded that some people out of the sample do not trust neither nor.

*Graph 4 - Cross Tabulation Bar Chart eTrust 4 vs. eTrust 3*

This result gives the suggestion to further look at eTrust 1 which is a question regarding the general trust on information in the page with disregard to the source. Given the similar pattern of responses to eTrust 1 and eTrust 4, a correlation analysis between the two questions is carried on. The result gives a significant modest direct correlation. This is logical since the organizer is the page administrator, thus generating a great deal of posts. Some members can then perceive the organizer as the main source, proven by the correlation between eTrust 1 and eTrust 4 which can be seen in the table below:

*Table 26 - Spearman's Rho Correlation eTrust vs. eTrust 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>eTrust 1 Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>eTrust 4 Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eTrust 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.471*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eTrust 4</td>
<td>.471*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

To better understand and visualize this correlation a cross tabulation bar chart is presented on p.31. A clear pattern can be seen when one answers positively towards one of the questions, he or she generally answers positively towards the other question.
4.4.5  **H5: There is a direct correlation between trusting others members’ information and purchase intention towards a special event**

A correlation is carried on between Purchase Intention 1 and eTrust 3. These are the most appropriate questions in testing this hypothesis given that Purchase Intention 1 specifically asks for the intention to purchase a ticket, and Trust 3 refers to trust on the information posted by other members. The results of the correlation analysis can be seen in the table below:

**Table 27 - Spearman’s Rho Correlation Purchase Intention 1 vs. eTrust 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI 1</th>
<th>eTrust 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>1.000 tight</td>
<td>0.009 loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.007 tight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation analysis is insignificant, thus the null hypothesis is accepted and no correlation is found between the two items. This is further confirmed by the extremely low correlation coefficient. Based on this result H5 is rejected.

To further understand the lack of correlation between the variables a cross tabulation bar chart is presented on p.32. Given the very few respondents on scales 1 and 2 for purchase intention the focus is put on the other scales. A similar pattern can be seen on eTrust 3 with a similar spread on each of the scales 3, 4, and 5 for Purchase Intention 1. This explains that eTrust on other members has no impact on their purchase intention.
4.4.6 H6: There is a direct correlation between trusting the organizer’s information and purchase intention towards a special event

A correlation is made between Purchase Intention 1 and eTrust 4. Given that we specifically want to measure the intention to attend the event, and trust on the information generated by the organizer, these are the most accurate items for this hypothesis. The results of the correlation analysis can be seen in the table below:

*Table 28 - Spearman's Rho Correlation Purchase intention 1 vs. eTrust 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI 1</th>
<th>eTrust 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 1</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eTrust 4</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.228**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The correlation analysis is significant, the null hypothesis is rejected, thus proving a correlation between the questions. The correlation coefficient gives a low direct correlation. H6 is accepted.

To further understand this correlation a cross tabulation bar chart is presented on p.33. One can see a progressive slight positive pattern; the higher respondents score on purchase intention, the more they trust the organizer. However most people still trust the information no matter if they plan to attend the event or not. This could explain the relatively low correlation.
4.4.7 **H7: There is a direct correlation between reading eWOM generated by other members and purchase intention for a special event**

A correlation analysis is carried on between Purchase Intention 1 and eWOM 1. These are the most suitable items in testing this hypothesis as eWOM 1 asks about trusting the information generated by other members, and Purchase intention 1 measures their intention to attend. The results of the correlation analysis can be seen in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PI 1</th>
<th>eWOM 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eWOM 1</th>
<th>PI 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation analysis is insignificant, the null hypothesis is accepted thus suggesting no correlation between the questions. This is further confirmed by the extremely low correlation coefficient. Hence H7 is rejected.

In order to understand the lack of correlation between the variables a deeper look can be taken at the cross tabulation bar chart on p.34. The only positive pattern can be seen within those who replied “definitely” on purchase intention, as for the others, a similar spread of eWOM 1 can be seen on all scores from 1 to 4 on purchase intention. This explains that it does not matter if they read or not eWOM, it has no relation to purchase intention.
Graph 8 - Cross Tabulation Bar Chart Purchase Intention 1 vs. eWOM 1
5 Analysis

In this section the researchers will analyze the information gathered from the empirical investigations. This will be done by discussing the findings of our research taking the previous mentioned theories into consideration.

Based on Mangold and Faulds (2009) who suggest that online subculture arises because consumers enjoy to network with others that share similar interests, we expected to find a correlation between feeling part of the subculture and eWOM. We then proposed RQ1 (How does eWOM work within an online subculture on Facebook Pages?) in order to better understand this relationship.

H1 (there is a direct correlation between feeling part of a subculture and sharing eWOM), and H2 (there is a direct correlation between feeling part of a subculture and reading eWOM) were developed to answer RQ1. Given the background, we expected a higher correlation than what we obtained in both hypotheses.

In H1 this expectation was formed based on what is argued by McWilliam (2000). He says that members of online subcultures like to share their opinions because it gives them a sense of belongingness. This is further suggested by Balasubramanian and Mahajan (2001) who says that by adding value to the online community members gain focus-related utility.

From the frequency distributions of Subculture 2 (4.2.2. Subculture 2, p.19) we know most members of the selected Facebook pages feel part of the subculture. However, given the low correlation they probably do not feel the need to generate eWOM. This result contradicts what has been earlier suggested by Mangold and Faulds (2009). We believe this can be explained with the help of H4 (consumer-generated information is perceived as more reliable than marketer-generated information), from which we concluded that organizer-generated information is seen as more reliable than customer-generated information.

Because what is posted by the organizer is seen as reliable, we suppose that most people tend to take in this information without commenting or asking questions. This could further be explained by the unique aspect of a special event. All of the pages looked at are related to annual events, and we believe the creation of eWOM might be temporary, more specifically closer to the event and after. This is in accordance to what is suggested by Dwyer (2007) that members in an online community connect with each other to boost their satisfaction after having consumed a product or service, and in our case having attended the event.

Based on the consumption utility suggested by Balasubramanian and Mahajan (2001) we also expected a higher correlation in H2. This is given that people would gain from reading eWOM written by fellow members when seeking for advice and recommendation with regards to the event. We could also interpret this result with the help of H4. We believe that since people do not find the information posted by other members as reliable as the organizer’s, even if they share the same interests, it would decrease their willingness to read them.

Even though both hypotheses produced a low correlation, generating eWOM is slightly stronger correlated to subculture than reading. We believe this difference is due to the effort implied in generating eWOM which would be understandable doing so if one feels a strong attachment to the subculture. As for reading, since it does not take as much effort, even if one does not feel such attachment he or she can still read the information.
We found a modest correlation in H3 (there is a direct correlation between sharing and reading eWOM) which was formulated out of curiosity to see the correlation between generating and reading eWOM. This makes sense since in order to create valuable eWOM, which includes responding to posts and creating new ones, one has to be familiar with what has already been said. This is shown in the cross tabulation bar chart on p.29 where those who create the most eWOM are also those who score high in reading.

Given that many studies (e.g. Arndt, 1967, Bickart & Schindler, 2001, Kim et al. 2008) have proven that for a product consumer-generated information is seen as more reliable than marketer-generated information, we decided to measure this within the special event context, thus proposing RQ2 (How is the reliability of the information within Facebook Pages of special events perceived by members?). We had a suspicion that with regards to a special event the opposite may be the case, we therefore tested H4. Our results suggest that for a special event marketer-generated information is preferred and more trusted in comparison to consumer-generated information, thus confirming our suspicions.

This can be further analyzed with the help of Ko et al. (2005) who argue that credible sources are perceived to create valuable information. In our case this makes sense since one can assume that the event organizer has all the correct information about the event. However, for a product, consumer-generated information is perceived as more reliable, even though one would also assume that the producer also has all the correct information about the product. Given that, we then believe this difference could be due to the unique aspect of the special event. A special event can never be exactly the same as past ones, thus possibly making opinions from other members regarding previous events less valuable. When considering an upcoming event consumers may highly value the organizer information since it is the only accurate information.

In order to answer the RQ3 (How do different sources within Facebook Pages of special events influence consumer’s purchase intention?) we proposed H5, H6, and H7. We will look at H5 (there is a direct correlation between trusting other members’ information and purchase intention towards a special event) and H6 (there is a direct correlation between trusting the organizer’s information and purchase intention towards a special event) together, since they are related to each other and connected to H4.

The lack of correlation found on H5 contradicts Kelman (1961) in a sense that within an online community members which are assumed to share similar interests would rely on each other and exercise an influence on their purchase intention. It also goes against Bickart and Schindler (2001) who argue that consumer-generated information from a trustworthy source is more persuasive to consumers. However this is logical since from H4 it was confirmed that the organizer is seen as a more trustworthy source. We thus expected that the organizer would exercise more influence on purchase intention. This can be seen from H6, even though we only found a low correlation. A possible explanation for this could be based on Paris et al. (2010) who argue that people will attend an event if the organization who invites them is trustworthy, and if they know someone who will attend. The latter however has not been measured, therefore we might not have captured the whole aspects that influence purchase intention for a special event.

From H4, H5 and H6 we can conclude that more reliable sources are more influential on consumer’s purchase intention, and that for a special event the organizer is seen as the most trustworthy source, thus exercising at least part of this influence.

In H7 (there is a direct correlation between reading eWOM generated by other members
and purchase intention for an event) little correlation was found. Even though from the cross tabulation bar chart (p.34) we can see that most of those who have a high score on reading eWOM also have a high score on purchase intention, there is still a significant number of people who score high on purchase intention but only score from 2 to 3 in the scale in reading eWOM. We can again relate this result to H4 since eWOM generated by other members is not as trustworthy, therefore not as influential to purchase intention towards a special event.
6 Conclusion

The following section answers the purpose of this thesis which is to investigate the relationship of online subcultures, eTrust, eWOM, and purchase intention towards a special event within the selected Facebook Pages. The study was guided by research questions and by answering such, the purpose is fulfilled as can be seen below.

RQ1: How does eWOM work within an online subculture on Facebook Pages?

We found that in order to generate eWOM it is more likely that consumers feel a strong attachment to the subculture. On the other hand the belongingness to the subculture does not influence consumers to read eWOM. However we could see a modest relationship between reading and generating, thus those who read are the ones sharing.

RQ2: How is the reliability of the information within Facebook Pages of special events perceived by members?

Based on our results we can conclude that the organizer is perceived as the most trustworthy source within the chosen Facebook Pages. We believe this could be generalized to all Facebook Pages which are related to special events. Our findings are differentiated from previous studies regarding a product, therefore when talking about a special event this should be taken into account. We suggest event organizers should be aware of what they share on the Facebook Page. As this information is seen as reliable, the Facebook Page could be used as an informative source and a meeting point for interested people.

RQ3: How do different sources within Facebook Pages of special events influence consumer’s purchase intention?

Our results show that the event organizer exercise more influence on consumer’s purchase intention than fellow members of the Facebook Page. This relates to RQ2 where we found out that the organizer is seen as a more reliable source. In order to increase this influence, we propose that event organizers therefore can work on the relationship and interaction with members of the Facebook Pages.

To sum up, this study has shown that the researched variables exercise different influence on each other in regards to a Facebook Page related to a special event than to other online communities for a product as has been previously tested.
7 Critical Reflection

The purpose with this section is to discuss and criticize this research, the chosen methods, and whether they fitted with the purpose. It will also discuss what we as researchers found out to be interesting for further researches within this field.

This study is exploratory given that the selected variables have been previously tested towards a product, however not for a special event. This could be the reason why our results are not as strong as we expected, since both the background and the questionnaire were based on product related theories and studies.

We only generalize our findings to the sample. In order to conduct a more accurate study which could be generalized to the population, a larger and random sample would have been needed. We believe this could have generated different and more reliable results. However due to time constraints we were not able to obtain a larger sample size. Given the small sample we put the results from all different Facebook Pages together and treated them as one. For further research it could be valid to look at each Page separately, in order to see if there are patterns within each of them. We believe that since our variables were intercorrelated, internal validity could have been negatively affected.

Even so, we believe a qualitative approach could have been better in order to understand consumer's intrinsic beliefs and attitudes. This approach could be taken in future research. We should have conducted a pilot study in order to determine the usefulness and clarity of the questions. Given the factor analysis we believe this study would have been more reliable if there would have been more questions for each variable, as well as more specific questions towards the variables.

We still believe the attained results are relevant for event organizers who engage on Facebook Pages. Results show they are seen as reliable sources of information, and exercise an influence on consumer’s purchase intention through Facebook Pages. Organizers should then take into account that the measured variables apply differently for products than for special events.

Nonetheless, further research could be needed to better understand the reason behind these results. A netnography study could be conducted to understand why consumer-generated information is not perceived to be trustworthy in this context. Further on it could be worth looking at the interactions between fellow members and organizers; and how this could possibly influence consumer’s purchase intention. Additionally, given the annual aspect of a special event, it could be valid for organizers to know when is the right time to communicate with members, thus having a higher influence on their purchase intention.

It is important mentioning that all Pages looked at in this study are related to Swedish special events, and therefore results might be constraint to the Swedish culture and behavior. Therefore the results cannot be generalized to other cultures, other events than special events outside Sweden, or other social media platforms but Facebook Pages.
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Appendix

Appendix A - Questionnaires

Appendix A.1 - Hultsfred

Kön

Gender
- Man
- Kvinna

Ålder

Age
- under 18
- 19-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60+

Subculture 1 - Jag har ett stort intresse av Musikfestival

I have a big interest in music festivals
- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- 
- Definitivt

Subculture 2 - Jag känner mig som en del av "live musik kulturen"

I feel part of the "live music" subculture
- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

Subculture 3 - Jag gillar att diskutera live musik online med människor som har samma intresse
I like to discuss live music online with people with the same interest

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eTrust 1) Informationen på Hultsfreds Festivalens Facebook Sida känns trovärdig

(The information on Hultsfred’s Facebook Page feels trustworthy)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eTrust 2) Jag söker information om Hultsfreds Festivalen på deras Facebook Sida eftersom jag tycker den är mer trovärdig än andra hemsidor om eventet

(I search for information on Hultsfred’s Facebook Page because I find it more trustworthy than other WebPages about the event)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eTrust 3) Jag litar på information skriven av andra medlemmar på Hultsfreds Festivalens Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by other members on the Hultsfred’s Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eTrust 4) Jag litar på informationen skriven av organisatörerna av Hultsfreds Festivalen på deras Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by the organizers of Hultsfred on their Facebook Page)
(eWOM 1) Jag läser information skriven av andra människor på Hultsfreds Festivalens Facebook Sida

(I read the information written by other people on Hultsfred’s Facebook Page)

○ Definitivt inte
○
○
○ Definitivt

(eWOM 2) Hultsfreds Festivalens Facebook Sida erbjuder bra åsikter från besökare av tidigare Hultsfreds Festivaler

(The Hultsfred’s Facebook Page offers good opinions from earlier visitors of the event)

○ Definitivt inte
○
○
○ Definitivt

(eWOM 3) Jag delar med mig av mina åsikter angående Hultsfreds Festivalen på deras Facebook Sida

(I share my opinions regarding the Hultsfred Festival on their Facebook Page)

○ Definitivt inte
○
○
○ Definitivt

(Purchase Intention 1) Jag kommer köpa en biljett till Hultsfreds Festivalen 2011

(I will buy a ticket to the Hultsfred 2011)

○ Definitivt inte
○
○
(Purchase Intention 2) Jag kommer rekommendera Hultsfreds Festivalen till mina vänner

(I will recommend Hultsfred to my friends)

○ Definitivt inte

○ Definitivt

Appendix A.2 - Sweden Rock Festival

Kön

(Gender)

○ Man
○ Kvinna

Ålder

(Age)

○ under 18
○ 19-29
○ 30-39
○ 40-49
○ 50-59
○ 60+

(Subculture 1) Jag har ett stort intresse av Rockmusik

(I have a big interest in rock music)

○ Definitivt inte

○ Definitivt

(Subculture 2) Jag känner mig som en del av "rockmusik kulturen"

(I feel part of the rock subculture)

○ Definitivt inte
(Subculture 3) Jag gillar att diskutera rockmusik online med människor som har samma intresse

(I like to discuss rock music online with people with the same interest)

(eTrust 1) Informationen på Sweden Rock Festivals Facebook Sida känns trovärdig

(The information on Sweden Rock Festival’s Facebook Page feels trustworthy)

(eTrust 2) Jag söker information om Sweden Rock Festival på deras Facebook Sida eftersom jag tycker den är mer trovärdig än andra hemsidor om eventet

(I search for information on Sweden Rock Festival’s Facebook Page because I find it more trustworthy than other webpages about the event)

(eTrust 3) Jag litar på information skriven av andra medlemmar på Sweden Rock Festivals Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by other members on the Sweden Rock Festival’s Facebook Page)
(eTrust 4) Jag litar på informationen skriven av organisatörerna av Sweden Rock Festival på deras Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by the organizers of Sweden Rock Festival on their Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eWOM 1) Jag läser information skriven av andra människor på Sweden Rock Festivals Facebook Sida

(I read the information written by other people on Sweden Rock Festival’s Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eWOM 2) Sweden Rock Festivals Facebook Sida erbjuder bra åsikter från besökare av tidigare Sweden Rock Festivaler

(The Sweden Rock Festival’s Facebook Page offers good opinions from earlier visitors of the event)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eWOM 3) Jag delar med mig av mina åsikter angående Sweden Rock Festival på deras Facebook Sida

(I share my opinions regarding the Sweden Rock Festival on their Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- 
- Definitivt
(PI 1) Jag kommer köpa en biljett till Sweden Rock Festival 2011

(I will buy a ticket to the Sweden Rock Festival 2011)

○ Definitivt inte
○
○
○ Definitivt

(PI 2) Jag kommer rekommendera Sweden Rock Festival till mina vänner

(I will recommend Sweden Rock Festival to my friends)

○ Definitivt inte
○
○
○ Definitivt

Appendix A.3 - Swedish Speedway Grand Prix

Kön

(Gender)

○ Man
○ Kvinna

Ålder

(Age)

○ under 18
○ 19-29
○ 30-39
○ 40-49
○ 50-59
○ 60+

(Subculture 1) Jag har ett stort intresse för Speedway

(I have a big interest in speedway)

○ Definitivt inte
○
○
(Subculture 2) Jag känner mig som en del av "speedway gemenskapen"
(I feel part of the speedway community)
- Definitivt inte
- Definitivt

(Subculture 3) Jag gillar att diskutera speedway online med människor som har samma intresse
(I like to discuss about speedway online with people with the same interest)
- Definitivt inte
- Definitivt

(eTrust 1) Informationen på Swedish Speedway Grand Prix Facebook Sida känns trovärdig
(The information on the Swedish Speedway Grand Prix’s Facebook Page feels trustworthy)
- Definitivt inte
- Definitivt

(eTrust 2) Jag söker information om Swedish Speedway Grand Prix på deras Facebook Sida eftersom jag tycker den är mer trovärdig än andra hemsidor om eventet
(I search for information on the Swedish Speedway Grand Prix’s Facebook Page because I find it more trustworthy than other webpages about the event)
- Definitivt inte
- Definitivt

(eTrust 3) Jag litar på information skriven av andra medlemmar på Swedish Speedway
Grand Prix Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by other members on the Swedish Speedway Grand Prix’s Facebook Page)

○ Definitivt inte

○

○

○ Definitivt

(eTrust 4) Jag litar på informationen skriven av organisatörerna av Swedish Speedway Grand Prix på deras Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by the organizers of Swedish Speedway Grand Prix on their Facebook Page)

○ Definitivt inte

○

○

○ Definitivt

(eWOM 1) Jag läser andra medlemmars inlägg på Swedish Speedway Grand Prix Facebook Sida

(I read the information written by other people on Swedish Speedway Grand Prix’s Facebook Page)

○ Definitivt inte

○

○

○ Definitivt

(eWOM 2) Swedish Speedway Grand Prix Facebook Sida erbjuder bra åsikter från besökare av tidigare Swedish Speedway Grand Prix event

(The Swedish Speedway Grand Prix’s Facebook Page offers good opinions from earlier visitors of the event)

○ Definitivt inte

○

○

○ Definitivt

(eWOM 3) Jag delar med mig av mina åsikter angående Swedish Speedway Grand Prix på deras Facebook Sida
(I share my opinions regarding the Swedish Speedway Grand Prix on their Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(PI 1) Jag kommer köpa en biljett till Swedish Speedway Grand Prix 2011

(I will buy a ticket to the Swedish Speedway Grand Prix 2011)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(PI 2) Jag kommer rekommendera Swedish Speedway Grand Prix 2011 till mina vänner

(I will recommend Swedish Speedway Grand Prix to my friends)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

Appendix A.4 - Göteborg Horse Show

Kön

(Gender)

- Man
- Kvinna

Ålder

(Age)

- under 18
- 19-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60+
(Subculture 1) Jag har ett stort intresse för hästar

(I have a big interest in horses)

- Definitivt inte
-
- Definitivt

(Subculture 2) Jag känner mig som en del av "häst gemenskapen"

(I feel part of the “horse community”)

- Definitivt inte
-
- Definitivt

(Subculture 3) Jag gillar att diskutera hästar online med människor som har samma intresse

(I like to discuss about horses online with people with the same interest)

- Definitivt inte
- Definitivt

(eTrust 1) Informationen på Göteborg Horse Show’s Facebook Sida känns trovärdig

(The information on the Göteborg Horse Show Facebook Page feels trustworthy)

- Definitivt inte
- Definitivt

(eTrust 2) Jag söker information om Göteborg Horse Show på deras Facebook Sida eftersom jag tycker den är mer trovärdig än andra hemsidor om eventet

(I search for information on Göteborg Horse Show Facebook Page because I find it more trustworthy than other webpages about the event)

- Definitivt inte
(eTrust 3) Jag litar på information skriven av andra medlemmar på Göteborg Horse Show’s Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by other members on the Göteborg Horse Show’s Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eTrust 4) Jag litar på informationen skriven av organisatörerna av Göteborg Horse Show på deras Facebook Sida

(I trust the information written by the organizers of Göteborg Horse Show on their Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eWOM 1) Jag läser andra medlemmars inlägg på Göteborg Horse Show’s Facebook Sida

(I read the information written by other members on the Göteborg Horse Show Facebook Page)

- Definitivt inte
- 
- 
- Definitivt

(eWOM 2) Göteborg Horse Show's Facebook Sida erbjuder bra åsikter från besökare av tidigare Göteborg Horse Horse Show Event

(The Göteborg Horse Show Facebook Page offers good opinions from earlier visitors of the event)

- Definitivt inte
- 
-
Definitivt

(eWOM 3) Jag delar med mig av mina åsikter angående Göteborg Horse Show på deras Facebook Sida

(I share my opinions regarding the Göteborg Horse Show on their Facebook Page)

Definitivt inte

Definitivt inte

Definitivt

Definitivt

PI 1) Jag kommer köpa en biljett till Göteborg Horse Show 2012

(I will buy a ticket to the Göteborg Horse Show 2011)

Definitivt inte

Definitivt

Definitivt

PI 2) Jag kommer rekommendera Göteborg Horse Show till mina vänner

(I will recommend Göteborg Horse Show to my friends)

Definitivt inte

Definitivt

Definitivt
## Appendix B - Factor analysis

### Appendix B.1 - Cronbach's Alpha

#### Appendix B.1.1 - Factor 1

eTrust 2, eTrust 3, eWOM 1, eWOM2, eWOM3, Subculture 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Appendix B.1.2 - Factor 2

Subculture 1 and Subculture 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Appendix B.1.3 - Factor 3

eTrust 1, eTrust 4, Purchase Intention 1, and Purchase Intention 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>