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**INTRODUCTION**

The brand community is a special form of consumer community (Muniz & O’Guinn, 2011), that has a specific brand in its center (Woisetschläger et al., 2008). It enables many-to-many communication, which can be regarded as precursors of today’s online social networking sites (SNSs) (Hanna et al., 2011). On SNSs, the brand community has a positive effect on value creation practices, which enhances brand’s loyalty (Laroche et al., 2012). It represents a core determinant of the purchasing decisions and behavior toward the advertisements (Ducoffe, 1995). Based on that and due to the role of SNSs in marketing, many researchers have explored SNSs as a marketing and advertising media (Kazienko et al., 2013, Hopkins, 2012, Park and Cho, 2012, Hansson et al., 2013). Researchers consider mass customization, global access and proliferation of SNSs as main advantages to explore SNSs as advertising platforms. For example, Face book on the fourth quarter of 2014 had about 1.35 Billion monthly active users and 510 63 registered brands around the world (statista.com, 2015).

Despite a growing body of research knowledge on SNSs as a marketing tools and its value for marketing, few researchers have contributed directly to the consumers’ assessment of SNA’s (Logan et al., 2012, Saxena & Khanna, 2013, Yakoop et al. 2013, Deraz et al., 2015). Moreover, the theoretical foundations underlying the assessments of SNA’s, as perceived by brand communities’ consumers (BCCs) were not yet explored. As identified from the empirical findings of this study, most of the previous studies on the assessments of SNA’s skewed younger SNSs’ users from university students as a main research sample. Consequently, the present paper aimed to extend the literatures on the assessments of SNA’s to identify how BCCs on SNSs assess SNA’s, and to identify the main characteristics of the BCCs on SNSs.

**RQ1**: What are the main dimensions for the assessment of SNA’s, as perceived by BCCs?

**RQ2**: How do those dimensions predict the BCCs’ assessments of SNA’s, in conjunction with each other?

This paper is structured as follows: following the introduction is a literature review, which is followed by the theoretical
concepts that led to explore the main dimensions for assessing SNAs. This is followed by a methodology that contains descriptions of the research sample, variables, and the dimensionality and the reliability tests. Finally, there is discussion about the theoretical and the empirical implications of the study.

2. Literature review

2.1 Brand communities on SNs

Researchers about brand communities on SNSs had three main research streams. The first stream relates to the conceptual aspects and structures of the brand communities on SNSs (Brogi, 2014; Chen et al., 2011; Zaglia 2013). In this stream, researchers connected between brand communities and SNSs by identifying; definitions, benefits and structure of each of them. The second stream relates to the consumer behavior within the brand communities on SNSs (Brodie et al. 2011; de Vries et al. 2012; Gensler et al., 2013; Guumerus et al. 2012; Li & Li 2014; Smith et al. 2012). In this stream, researchers have more intention on structure of SNSs’ consumers’ engagement on the brand communities. Finally, the third stream focused on the outcomes of brand communities, for both consumers and the brand itself. The impact of electronic word of mouth (eWOM) is the most investigated outcome (Brown et al., 2007; Hung & Li, 2007; Royo-Vela & Casamassima, 2010). Trust, commitment, satisfaction and consumers’ loyalty are other explored outcomes within the context of SNSs’ brand communities (Habibi et al., 2014; Jung et al., 2014; Laroche et al., 2012; Lyu, 2012). Customers’ equity is other identified outcome of the marketing activities on SNSs’ brand communities (Kim & Ko, 2011). From the reviewed literature, none of the previous studies on SNSs’ brand communities had explored the assessment of SNAs, as perceived by BCCs, which can be seen as a clear gap in the literature of SNSs’ brand communities and literature of the assessment of SNAs.

2.2 Online Ads Value (OAV)

Online advertisements (ONAs) have a critical effect on the consumers’ purchasing behavior. According to the Hierarchy-of-Effects approach, the ONAs function as a cognition factor in making the online consumers aware of a specific product or service, and then as an affecting factor by attracting and persuading the targeted consumers and, finally as a behavioral factor by moving these consumers toward the decision of purchasing (Schuman and Thorson, 2007). This approach highlighted the importance of the ONA as a predicting factor on the consumers’ purchasing intention, and to gain current understanding of how the online consumers perceive the ONAs. Ducoffe (1995) identified study is one of the first bodies of research that have contributed to the assessment of the OAV. Ducoffe’s (1995) focused on the effects of the perceived value of the online consumers’ on the attitude towards ONAs. According to that study, the distinction between OAV and attitudes toward online advertisements gives validity to consumers’ responses by measuring the contribution of entertainment, in formativeness and irritation values. Brackett and Carr (2001) validated Ducoffe’s model by extending it to include credibility and consumer demographics. Two years later, Wang et al. (2003) identified interactivity and consumer motives as additional dimensions that contribute to the attitudes toward the ONA, as perceived by online users.

2.3 Assessment of Social Network Sites’ Ads (SNAs)

Logan et al. (2012) measured the assessment of advertisements on SNs and TV. The researchers used Ducoffe’s (1995) model with its three main variables (irritation, entertainment and informativeness values). According to Logan et al. (2012), information and entertainment values predicted strongly the assessment of SNAs, while irritation value did not predict the assessment of SNAs. Saxena and Khanna (2012) used the same model to assess SNAs, as perceived by Indian students. The results of that study have confirmed that, the information and the entertainment values are predicting positively the consumers’ assessment of SNAs, while irritation value had a negative significant effect. Advertisements’ credibility and interactivity have been introduced by Deraz et al. (2015), to confirm that information, entertainment, credibility and interactivity values are the main variables of the assessment of SNAs. According to Swedish university students’ perception, that study confirmed the finding of Logan et al. (2012) that irritation value did not have a significant effect on the assessment of SNAs.

More studies have contributed to the value of SNAs while they are assessing consumers’ attitudes toward SNAs. Van der Waldt et al. (2009) introduced credibility to the informativeness, entertainment and irritation values depending on Brackett and Carr (2001) model. According to the perception of South African young people, that research identified informativeness, entertainment, irritation and credibility values of SNAs as the main variables that predict the consumer attitudes toward SNAs. Taylor et al. (2011) explored factors that predict consumers’ attitudes toward SNAs. The researchers identified that entertainment value and informativeness of advertisement predict the value of SNAs, as perceived by postgraduate management students in the USA. Finally, the study of Mir (2012) confirmed that information and entertainment values of SNAs were significant correlated to the attitude toward SNAs, as perceived by Pakistani consumers on SNSs.

A clear gap was identified by Logan et al. (2012), as the researchers have observed from their analysis that Ducoffe’s model is not providing a god fit to assess the SNAs. Even, advertisements’ credibility and interactivity have been introduced as additional variables for the assessment of SNAs (Deraz et al., 2015) but those variables need to be confirmed by additional studies. Moreover, all the identified research about the assessment of SNAs depended on the younger users of SNSs from different universities as main research samples, no study about the assessment of BCCs. Based on the above; this study aimed to explore how BCCs assess SNAs.

3. Theoretical Concepts

In keeping with the identified literature, the topic of SNAs had been investigated mainly based on five main dimensions
3.1 Brand Communities on SNSs

Kozinets (1999:254) defined the virtual communities in general as "an affiliated group of peoples that have an online interaction based on sharing enthusiasm for, and knowledge of a specific consumption or related group of activities". Within SNSs, this form of interaction has a specific brand in its center (Woisetschläger et al., 2008). In consequence, consumers can participate within these communities to gather information, to ask for advice or to review the opinion of expert users before they are making a certain purchase decision (Valck et al., 2009). This kind of interaction on SNSs may have a vital effect on the consumers’ purchasing behavior among a specific brand. Moreover, consumers participating on these brand communities become pivotal authors for creating brand stories (Gensler et al., 2013). That can highlight the importance of interactivities on SNSs’ brand communities to increase the brand popularity (de Vries et al., 2012). As an additional advantage of SNSs’ brand communities, participants on the brand communities may represent a good source to collect information about consumers for the companies themselves (Facebook.com, 2015).

Consumers’ engagements in brand communities involve specific interactive experiences between the brand and their fans, and between the members of the community (Brodie et al., 2013). This engagement may involve the consumers’ trust (Hollebeck, 2011), satisfaction (Bowden, 2009), commitment (Chan & Li, 2010), and empowerment of consumers value (Schau et al., 2009). In consequence, that may affect the consumers’ feelings of credibility among the brand, and decrease their feeling of irritation. Based on the pervious discussion, the present authors argued that the consumers’ engagements on the brand communities will affect their level of assessment toward SNAs. For that, it is important to explore how the BCCs assess SNAs.

3.2 Informativeness of SNAs

E-commerce provides significant advantages for consumers to seek information they desire or to ignore other information they do not need (Gordon and De Lima-Turner, 1997: 366). Further developments in the e-commerce are significantly affecting the information seeking behavior of the online consumers (Kulkami et al., 2012). This proves the importance of informativeness of ads as one of the main driving factors on the assessment of ONAs. Informativeness of the ONAs is defined as the ability to effectively provide relevant information in the advertising context, as perceived by the online consumers (Blanco et al., 2010:4). In this regard, researchers reveal the importance of informativeness by ascertaining the consumers’ perception towards the information value while they were assessing the OAV (Ducoffe 1995, Schlosser et al. 1999, Brackett and Carr 2001, Wang et al. 2003, Wang and Sun, 2009). On SNSs’ brand communities, to collect information is one of the main customer interaction characteristics (de Valck et al., 2009), as well as information and entertainment are considering from the main aims of any brand post on SNSs (de Vries et al., 2012). Furthermore, the informativeness of SNAs has been identified as being positively correlated to the consumers’ perception toward SNAs (Taylor et al., 2011, Saxena and Khanna, 2012, Van der Waldt et al., 2009, Mir, 2012). In this study, the following hypothesis was used to identify how informativeness predicts the BCCs’ assessment of the SNAs.

H0: Informativeness of SNAs predicts the consumers’ assessment of SNAs.

3.3 Entertainment Value of SNAs

The entertainment value of the ads represents the degree of pleasure and involvement during the interaction with a specific advertisement (Hoffman & Novak, 1996). Advertisers believe that, entertainment increases the effectiveness of the advertisements’ message, and generates a positive attitude toward the brand (MacKenzie and Lutz, 1989, Shavitt et al., 1998, Logan et al., 2012). The entertainment oriented advertisements aim to keep consumers occupied in a manner which is designed to encourage repeat visit (Dan & Dan, 2011:78). According to Ducoffe’s (1995) OAV depends on the levels of entertainment of the online advertisement. This is particularly noticeable with SNAs, where entertainment value was identified as a main factor on the assessment of SNAs and the attitudes towards SNAs (Hadija et al., 2012, Logan et al., 2012, Saxena and Khanna, 2012). Moreover, Taylor et al. (2011) identified that SNAs’ users seek enjoyment, relaxation and to pass time which relates to the nature of SNSs as an entertaining activity sites. That leads the BCCs’ to consume, create or contribute to the brand content online (Muntinga et al., 2011). As concluded by de Vries et al., (2012) if a brand post is entertaining, the BCCs’ motivations to participate or to consume the content are met, and the brand posts become more popular. Based on these facts, this study included entertainment value of SNAs as a vital variable in the
assessment of SNAs, as perceived by BCCs. That was tested by the following hypothesis.

H12: Entertainment value of SNAs is predicting the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

3.4 Credibility Value of SNAs

Credibility toward the ONAs represents the degree to which the consumers perceive claims made about a brand in a specific advertisement to be truthful and believable (Prendergast et al., 2009:321). Back to Brackett and Carr (2001), credibility value of ONAs was an essential dimension of the assessment of OAV, the authors identified that credibility was directly predicting the consumer assessment of the OAV. Based on this finding, many researchers have considered the ads credibility as a premier dimension while collecting the consumers’ assessment of OAV, and their attitudes toward the ONA (Prendergast et al., 2009, Clewley et al., 2009, Sun and Wang, 2010, Breitsohl et al., 2010). Yaakop et al. (2013) found that credibility of ads had no effect on the consumers’ perceptions towards Facebook ads, as perceived by Malaysians’ university students, but Wang et al. (2009) found credibility of ONAs as a predicting factor. In keeping with that, Zernigah and Sohail (2012) found that credibility value was the most powerful predictor on the consumers’ perceptions toward SNAs.

Moreover, according to the Cyber-psychology studies, credibility is an essential dimension on the assessment of consumers’ responses toward a specific online brand community (Lee et al., 2011, Chatterjee, 2011). That makes a virtual brand community a powerful interactive engagement platform for consumer-to-consumer recommendations (Brodie et al., 2013). In return, the level of engagement on the brand communities increases the consumers’ feeling of safe, gratitude and trust among brand posts (Hollebeek, 2011; Brodie et al., 2013). In keeping with these findings, the credibility value of SNAs was considered by the present authors as one of the main predictors of the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs, which was tested by the following hypothesis.

H13: Credibility value of SNAs is predicting the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

3.5 Irritation Value of SNAs

Consumers’ irritation value with regard to the ONAs arises when the consumers experience discomfort while watching these ads (Saxena and Khanna 2013:19), or when they seem to be less likely to be persuaded by them. The consumers’ feeling of irritation plays a crucial role in their perception toward the ONAs (Rodgers & Thorson, 2000). It is one of the primary dimensions that had a negative contribution to the OAV, as perceived by online users (Ducoff, 1995). Irritation value of the ONAs includes descriptors such as confusing, annoying, irritating and deceptive (Logan et al. 2012:169). Moreover, it contributes to a loss of privacy in regards to SNAs (Taylor et al., 2011). In some research, the irritation value of SNAs does not predict the consumers’ assessment (Deraz et al., 2015; Logan et al., 2012; Zernigah & Sohail, 2012). Other study identified that irritation value is a high negative prediction on the consumers’ assessment of SNAs (Saxena & Khanna, 2012).

According to the uses and gratification (U&G) theory, participants on brand communities feel empathy, trust and safe (Brodie et al., 2013). Consumers are likely to join brand communities as they feel loyal and being customers of the brand (Gummerus et al., 2011). This engagement on SNSs’ brand communities has a crucial role in building brand trust (Habibi et al., 2014). Trust on brand may lead to trust on brand posts and in consequence will reduce feelings of irritation from these posts such as Ads. Based on this discussion, it is important to include irritation value as one of the main dimensions of the assessment of SNAs on SNSs’ brand communities. This was tested, in this study by the following hypothesis.

H14: Irritation value of SNAs has a strong negative effect on the assessment of SNAs, as perceived by BCCs

3.6 Interactivity Value of SNAs

Researchers defined interactivity from various perspectives, as the extent to which users can participate in modifying the messages they receive through ads (Steuer 1992), or as a means for the individuals to effectively communicate with each other (Ha & James, 1998) or to communicate with the brand (de Vries et al., 2012). On SNSs, interactivities have additional reactions; fans can interact with brand posts by liking or commenting on the ads, or by forwarding the brand posts through their networks (de Vries et al., 2012). However, according to Brackett and Carr (2001), the interactivity value predicted the consumers’ assessment of the ONAs. This was confirmed by Yaakop et al. (2013), as that study identified interactivity value of SNAs as a variable that predicts the consumers’ attitudes toward SNAs. In a same direction, Deraz et al. (2015) confirmed that interactivity value has the highest significant effect among other variables of the assessment of SNAs.

Regarding the engagement theory on virtual brand communities, the consumer engagement is an interactive process (Brodie et al., 2011), that was perceived by BCCs as one of the main factors that drives brand post popularity (de Vries et al., 2012). Moreover, as the objective of the brand posts on SNSs to motivate BCCs to react by clicking like or add comment, or share the post with others (de Vries et al., 2012), we expect that higher degree of the interactivity value will predict positively the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs. In this study, this was tested by the following hypothesis.

H15: Interactivity value of SNAs is predicting positively the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

4. MATERIALS AND METHODS

4.1 Subjects and procedures

In keeping with the purpose of this study, a quantitative approach was regarded as being the most appropriate approach. It was guided by the functional or positivist paradigm (Cassell and Symon, 1994). To achieve the construct
validity of the collected data, the questionnaire was constructed based on the research’s conceptual framework of the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs, to measure what is supposed to be tested as recommended by McBurney and White (2009). Moreover, the authors carried out a pilot study by distributing the questionnaire to two groups of people; the first group was five participants from the surrounding community of Halmstad University-Sweden, and the second group was five researchers from the Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Helwan University-Egypt. Based on the two pilot groups’ feedback, the questionnaire was refined. This enabled the researchers to gain some assessment of the question's validity and reliability of the collected data (Saunders et al., 2009). The questionnaire was administered online on SurveyMonkey.com. The program enabled us not to allow participants to fill out the questionnaire more than once. After that, the questionnaire was distributed by using two different sampling techniques; web distribution by uploading the questionnaire directly from the administrative web site to eight brand communities on Facebook. The second used distribution technique was a convenience distribution by sending personal invitations to active participants on those brand communities. The target population consisted of people who were members on Facebook’s brand communities of eight different hotels in Red-Sea region. These hotels are: Club Paradiso Hotel El Gouna, Dawar el Omda Boutique Hotel - El Gouna, Grand Plaza Hotel & Resort, Mirage New Hawaii, Panorama Resort, Sea Star Beau Rivage, The Three Corners Royal Star, and Three Corners Ocean View. These hotels had around 17500 BCCs on Facebook.

673 questionnaires were obtained. After deleting those uncompleted questionnaires and those from the respondents who answered all the questions with the same value, we had 590 completed questionnaires. The sample covered BCCs’ from 18 different nationalities from the targeted population. The respondents nationalities are; Germany 17.1%, Netherlands 10%, United Kingdom 8.7%, Slovakia 7.9%, Belgium 7.6%, Russian 7.5%, Egypt 6.2%, Poland 5.8%, Hungary 4.7%, France 4.5%, Serbia 4.2%, Sweden 3.1%, Italy 3%, Switzerland 2.4%, Czech Republic 2.3%, United State 1.8%, Georgia 1.8% and Denmark 1.3%. The genders of the sample were 51% women, and 49% men. The largest age range of the sample was 35-44 (28.4%), followed by 45-54 (26%), 20.5% were from age range 25-34, 12.9% were from the age range 17-24, 11.6% were from the age 55-64, and 0.6% over 64 years old.

4.2 Measures

The survey respondents provided answers of their assessments towards variables of SNAs according to a 5-points Likert scale as follows: Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly Agree = 5. The sources of the items of the six main dimensions of the research conceptual framework were based on their utility in previous research as follows:

- Informativeness (INF) of SNAs. Items were borrowed and modified from scales developed by Logan et al. (2012) and Taylor et al. (2011).
- Entertainment value (ENT). Items were borrowed and modified from scales developed by Logan et al. (2012), Taylor et al. (2011) and Hoffman and Novak (1996).
- Irritation value (IRR). Items were borrowed and modified from scales developed by Logan et al. (2012) and Taylor et al. (2011).
- Credibility value (CRE). Items were borrowed and modified from scales developed by Sun and Wang (2010), Wang et al. (2009) and Yaakop (2013).
- Interactivity value (INT). Items were borrowed and modified from scales developed by Wang et al. (2002).
- SNAs’ value (VAL). Items were borrowed and modified from scales developed by Logan et al. (2012).

The principle component analysis (PCA) method of factor extraction with varimax rotation was used, to remove items that load heavily on more than one construct factor or weak items. Just one item of the BCCs’ perceptions of SNAs’ value was deleted. This item had code (VAL03), to perceive the SNAs’ as important. This item did not have strong loading with other items of the same construct factor that represents SNAV. From table (1) six latent constructs were extracted with almost a strong factor loading over 0.65. As claimed by Kline (2014) “it is usual to regard factor loadings as high if they are greater than 0.6”. The remaining items are averaged to obtain each variable score. Moreover, the internal consistency reliability coefficients of each of the remained items are tested by using Cronbach’s Alpha statistical method. A summary of these tests and as well as descriptive analyses for the six used variables are found in table (1).

4.3 Data Analysis

4.3.1 Regression Analysis

The five identified predictors were used in a multiple regression analysis to identify the factors behind the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs. In addition, the multiple correlation coefficients (R), coefficients of determinations (R²), and F-ratio were examined to predict the goodness-of-fit for the following regression model:

\[
Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5
\]

where \(Y\) is the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs, \(\beta_0\) the constant value, \(X_1\) the informativeness, \(X_2\) the entertainment value, \(X_3\) the interactivity value, \(X_4\) the credibility value, \(X_5\) the irritation value and \(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_5\) are the regression coefficients of factors 1-5.

The correlation coefficients of the five independent variables on the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs was 0.591, suggesting approximately 59.1% of the variations in the respondents assessments of SNAs could be explained by the five extracted factors (informativeness, entertainment, credibility, interactivity, and irritation values) as shown in table (2). The value of F-ratio was 623.538 (significant = 0.000), which means that the results of the regression model by the five independent variables did not occur by chance. From the beta coefficients, the entertainment value had the highest weight (beta value = 0.239, significant = 0.000), followed by irritation value (beta value = -0.231, significant = 0.000), than the credibility value (beta value = 0.184, significant = 0.000), interactivity value (beta value = 0.155, significant = 0.000), and the last factor was the informativeness (beta value = 0.125, significant = 0.000).
Based on the standardized coefficients from table 2, as perceived by BCCs:

**4.3.2 Hypotheses text**

Based on the standardized coefficients from table 2, as perceived by BCCs:

**Table 1. Dimensionality test, reliability test and descriptive statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated Component Matrix</th>
<th>VAL</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>ENT</th>
<th>IRR</th>
<th>CRE</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCCs perceived SNAs as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL01- Is Useful</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL02- Is Valuable</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.509</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL04- Is interesting</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF01- Offers valuable information</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF02- Offers timely information</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.801</td>
<td>0.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF03- Offers updated information</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.711</td>
<td>0.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF04- Good source for information</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.727</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT01- Entertains me</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT02- Is enjoyable for me</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.532</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT03- Pleases me</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.337</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENT04- Is amusing</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.194</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE01- Is trustworthy</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.194</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE02- Is credible</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.303</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE03- Is believable</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.013</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE04- Is accurate</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>0.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT01- Facilitates two-way communication</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT02- Is a fast communication tool</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.402</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT03- Is an easy way to interact with others</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.820</td>
<td>0.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT04- Provides a smooth interactive experience</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.576</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR01- Confuses me</td>
<td>-0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.672</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR02- Irritates me</td>
<td>-0.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.267</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR03- Annoys me</td>
<td>-0.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.373</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR04- Deceives me</td>
<td>-0.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.605</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Results of the regression analysis of BCCs’ assessment of SNAs based on the perceived factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of fit</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.769a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R square</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>0.59032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value</td>
<td>623.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant F</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>3.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritation</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>3.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>1.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>1.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>1.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informativeness</td>
<td>a. Predictors: (Constant), Irritation, Credibility, Interactivity, Entertainment, Informativeness</td>
<td>b. Dependent Variable: SNAV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the tolerance statistics (Tol.) of the predictors ranged between 0.303 and 0.636. As explained by Menard (1995), the tolerance statistics should be more than 0.2 to avoid high multi-collinearity. In addition, the variance inflation factor (VIF) of the predictors ranged between 1.27 and 3.305 and it should be less than 10 to avoid any collinearity problem (O’Brien, 2007). Based on the coefficients analysis, the line regression of the research model of the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs was in best fit, when x=0 at constant level (1.131), to have the following construct equation:

\[
SNAs = 1.131 + 0.125 INF + 0.239 ENT + 0.184 INT + 0.155 CRE – 0.231 IRR (2)
\]

The informativeness of SNAs, as perceived by BCCs’ had the lowest positive coefficient on the assessment of SNAs in conjunction with the other four variables, as 12.5% of the variations on SNAs were counted by variations of the informativeness. However, this significant coefficient result can reject the null hypothesis, \(H_0: \) Informativeness of SNAs does not affect the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs. This result could support the first hypothesis, \(H_1: \) Informativeness of SNAs predicts the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

The entertainment value of SNAs had the highest positive coefficient on the assessment of SNAs, as 23.9% of the variations on SNAs were counted by variations on the entertainment value. This result rejected the null hypothesis,
H$_{01}$: The entertainment value of SNAs does not affect the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs. This could support the second hypothesis,

H$_{02}$: Entertainment value of SNAs predicts the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

The credibility value of SNAs had a coefficient of 0.155 on the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs. This result gave a regression value of 15.5%, at which variations on the assessment of SNAs were counted by variations on credibility value. This result could reject the null hypothesis,

H$_{03}$: The credibility value of SNAs does not affect the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs. This result could support the third hypothesis,

H$_{04}$: Credibility value of SNAs predicts positively the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

The irritation value of SNAs in conjunction with informativeness, entertainments, interactivity and credibility values had the highest negative coefficient on the assessment of SNAs. 23.1% of the variations on SNAs were counted by variations of the irritation value (significant = 0.000). This result could reject the null hypothesis,

H$_{05}$: The irritation value of SNAs does not affect the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs. This could support the fourth hypothesis,

H$_{06}$: Irritation value of SNAs has a strong negative effect on the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

Finally, the beta value of the interactivity value of SNAs had 0.184 coefficients on the assessment of SNAs. As around 18.4% of the variations on SNAs were counted by variations of the interactivity value at a significant = 0.000. This result could reject the null hypothesis,

H$_{07}$: Interactivity value of SNAs does not affect the assessment of SNAs, as perceived by BCCs. This could support the fifth hypothesis:

H$_{08}$: Interactivity value of SNAs is predicting positively the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

However, in conjunction with other predictors, the informativeness of SNAs had the lowest beta coefficient on the assessment of SNAs (0.125). In previous studies, the informativeness of SNAs had the highest beta coefficient (Logan et al., 2012; Saxena & Khanna, 2012; Deraz et al., 2015). The second predicted dimension was the entertainment value. The indicators used to measure the entertainment value of SNAs had an average mean 3.425 from the five-score scales. This result could confirm that SNAs can highly entertain and enjoy the BCCs more than as identified from previous studies (Taylor et al., 2011; Wang & Sun, 2010, Deraz et al., 2015). According to its coefficient (0.239), the entertainment value had the highest positive beta value on the assessment of SNAs. The third predicted dimension was the irritation value of SNAs. The irritation value of SNAs in this study had the lowest average mean (2.480) among the other predictors, this is confirmed by the paired t-test as the irritation value had p value = 0.000. In previous studies, the irritation value of SNAs had the highest mean among the informativeness and the entertainment value (Logan et al., 2012; Deraz et al., 2015).

Moreover, according to the coefficients analysis, the irritation value of SNAs had the highest negative beta value (-0.231). This result confirmed the result of Saxena and Khanna (2012), and contradicted with the findings of Logan et al. (2012) and Deraz et al. (2015) that irritation had no effect on the consumers’ assessment of SNAs. The fourth predicted dimension was the credibility value of SNAs. According to the collected data, the credibility value of SNAs had an average mean (3.098) from the five-score scales. That might prove, that the research sample from BCCs’ had more experience with SNAs, as identified by Morimoto and Chang (2006) that credibility was positively correlated to the internet users’ experience, and their ability to collect information, and to interact with the online ads. However, the credibility value of SNAs in this study had a positive beta coefficient (0.155). This result contradicted the results of Yakoop et al. (2013) that credibility had no effect on the consumers’ perception toward SNAs.

The last predicted dimension in this study was the interactivity value of SNAs. From table (1), the interactivity indicators had the second highest average mean (3.673), which shows that the BCCs were more counted to collect information and to interact than to use the SNAs as source of entertainment. This result is also confirmed by paired t-test between interactivity and entertainment and the p value = 0.000. Based on the coefficients analysis, the interactivity value of SNAs had the second highest positive beta value (0.184) on the BCCs’ assessments toward the SNAs. This result could support the fifth hypothesis, and confirmed that the interactivity value of SNAs is an important dimension of the assessment of SNAs.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study focused on exploring BCCs’ assessment of SNAs, by answering the following questions:

RQ1: What are the main dimensions for the assessment of SNAs, as perceived by BCCs?

RQ2: How do those dimensions predict the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs in conjunction with each other?

From the data analysis, the first predicted dimension of the assessment of SNAs was the informativeness of SNAs. The indicators used to measure the informativeness of SNAs had the highest average mean (3.77) from Likert’s five-scales.
According to the collected data, just 12.9% were younger SNSs’ users from the age range 17-24. That could prove that, within the brand communities on SNSs, the university students and younger users were not the main active users as argued in previous studies (Taylor et al., 2011; Logan et al., 2012; Saxena & Khanna 2012; Hadija et al., 2012; Zernigah & Sohail 2012; Deraz et al., 2015). The regression analysis in this study, helped to identify five main factors for the assessment of SNAs, as perceived by BCCs. Four of these dimensions had positive effects on the BCCs’ assessment about SNAs. The fifth dimension was the irritation value, which had strong negative effect (-0.231) on the BCCs’ assessments. The positive four factors according to their coefficient strength were: the entertainment value (0.239), the interactivity value (0.184), the credibility value (0.155) and the informativeness value (0.125). According to the regression analysis, those five variables together had the best $R^2$ (0.591) at a significant change $= 0.000$. Nearly 59.1% of the variation on SNAs was explained by that model.

The findings of this study supported the following hypotheses:

$H_0$: Informativeness of SNAs predicts the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

$H_1$: Entertainment value of SNAs predicts the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

$H_2$: Credibility value of SNAs predicts positively the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

$H_3$: Irritation value of SNAs has a strong negative effect on the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

$H_4$: Interactivity value of SNAs is predicting positively the BCCs’ assessment of SNAs.

Finally, according to the hypotheses paired t-test of the empirical findings, the BCCs’ on SNSs were:

- Less irritated by the SNAs as they find those ads more credible.
- More information and interactive oriented than to see the SNAs as an entertainment factor.

7. Implications and Future Research

7.1 The Theoretical Implications

Our findings supported some of the findings from previous studies on the assessment of SNAs, and it contradicted with other findings. It contradicted with the findings of Logan et al. (2012) and Deraz et al. (2015), that irritation value had no effect on the assessment of SNAs. Also, it contradicted with the findings of the previous studies, that the informativeness value of SNAs had the highest positive effect on the consumers’ assessment of SNAs (Logan et al., 2012; Saxena & Khanna, 2012). In this study, informativeness had the lowest effect in conjunction with the entertainment, interactive, credibility and irritation values. Also, we found that irritation value had a high negative effect on the assessment of SNAs. Moreover, our findings contradicted with the finding of Yaakop et al. (2013) as credibility of SNAs did not affect the consumers’ assessment of SNAs, as perceived by university students. In this study, the credibility value of SNAs had a positive significant effect on the assessment of SNAs. Finally, this study confirmed the findings of Deraz et al. (2015), that credibility and interactivity have crucial roles while assessing SNAs.

7.2 Practical Implications

The research findings provided important evidence for the online advertisers about the characteristics and needs of the BCCs on SNSs. These findings have to be taken into consideration, while promoting or seeking to interact with this market segment. Online advertisers have to consider that, the BCCs are more information and interactive oriented than to use the SNAs as an entertainment tool. Also, they have to consider the age ranges of the more active users. Moreover, as the irritation value was highly predicting the consumers’ assessments of SNAs, marketers have to consider it, and to explore how to improve the credibility value of SNAs. As the brand communities in this study were hotels and resorts; hotel marketers, have to improve the entertainment value of SNAs, to increase the BCCs’ interaction with their advertisements.

7.3 Future Research

Previous studies on the assessment of SNAs had skewed younger users on SNSs as a main research sample. However, they had contradicted results. This study was first to go beyond that, by exploring the assessments of BCCs with different age ranges. It also contradicted with some results from the previous studies and confirmed others. The differences in culture and experiences may affect the consumers’ assessments. Accordingly, more studies are needed to identify the effect of culture on the consumers’ assessments of SNAs. Morimoto and Chang (2006) identified that credibility value of ONAs is positively related to the internet users’ experience, their ability to collect information, and to increase their interaction with the ads. Accordingly, more studies are needed to investigate the relation between the credibility value and users acceptance of the SNAs on the online brand communities. Most of the previous studies about the assessments of SNAs used Ducoffe’s (1995) model, or based on that model. For this reason the present authors argue that, for researchers to gain a deeper understanding of how SNSs’ users perceive SNAs, other models can be used to measure the consumers’ perception of SNAs, such as, the European Customer Satisfaction Index (ECSI) / the Extended Performance Satisfaction Index (EPSI) or the gap model (Bergman & Klefsjö, 2010).
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