DO NATIVE ADVERTISEMENTS ATTRACT MORE ATTENTION FROM FACEBOOK USERS?
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ABSTRACT

Due to the development and popularity of social media, marketers are increasing their budgets for social media. The types of advertising on social media sites are becoming more diverse. The newest type of advertising is native advertising, and it is more effective than traditional advertising. However, there are few studies of the effect of social advertising. This study establishes an optimum combination of advertising types and products on social media. Its framework measures the effects of social advertising on social media advertising types, products and consumers’ behavior. Enterprises and marketers can use these findings to make decisions about social media.

A web survey will be administered to collect samples. ANOVA will be used to compare the effectiveness of different kinds of social media advertising. This study will use these results as a basis for in-depth discussions of social marketing effects via several platforms and product types. Conclusions and implications will be also discussed.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Social media is part of Web 2.0\(^1\). With the prosperity of Web2.0, social media is gradually developing completed. Enterprises deliver messages to consumers, and consumers can interact on the platform\(^2\). This type of platform, for example, like social network, forums, video sites, blogs, micro-blogs, etc., users can share and exchange views on these platforms. This platform is growing rapidly. Advertising on social media is called social media advertising. Social media advertising will be quite a potential for new marketing tools since social media is everywhere in our lives.

With the promotion of the use in social media advertising, social media advertising has become diversified. Advertising which combined with social media elements proposed a form of advertising that named native advertising. In the past, online advertising, like banners, pop-up ads, its content is not limited and it is annoying to some users. But native advertising aims to reduce interference from advertising content and promote user attention to advertising content. So this kind of advertising is considered more effective. According to Online Publishers Association (OPA) three-quarters of US advertisers’ publishers used native advertising in 2013\(^3\).

The most popular social media advertising business community platforms are Facebook, YouTube, Twitter and LinkedIn\(^4\). These platforms use native ads. But are they working? Nielsen, the online marketing consulting firm, indicated 33 percent of American users think social media advertising is more annoying than traditional ads. There is much research about effectiveness of word of mouth\(^5\), awareness of user after viewing advertising and behavior of user after viewing advertising research\(^6\). AIDMA (Attention, Interest, Desire, Memory, Action) and AISAS (Attention, Interest, Search, Action, Share) models were developed to measure the effectiveness of traditional and online advertising\(^7,8\). But there is no model to measure effectiveness of social media advertising. Social media advertising is new. There are few discussions of its benefits. In particular, social media advertising contains native concepts. It’s worth investigating whether native social media advertising is better than online advertising.

This study compares advertising effectiveness and consumers’ subsequent behaviors through different social media advertising types (such as native advertising and non-native advertising). We will use variety of emerging forms of social media advertising to design empirical study, finally, try to find the best combination of social media advertising strategy.
This study has the following purposes: (a) to propose social media advertising types and social media advertising effectiveness by reviewing literature, (b) verify and discuss effectiveness of advertising in different social media advertising and product types (search product and experience product), (c) present the conclusions and make recommendations for enterprises forming social media marketing strategies.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Social media advertising

Study mentions that social media advertising is extensively defined as advertising be placed in the social media to get more network traffic and attention. Furlow indicates that social media advertising is a new marketing communication. Park et al. defines social media as a platform that allows enterprise to sell products or services. At the aspects of benefit, Hennig-Thurau et al. pointed out that social marketing can help enterprise to explore more consumers. Wright, Khanfar, Harrington, and Kizer found that social marketing establishes better relationships with customers. Native advertising is the most common social media advertising pattern.

2.2 Types of social media advertising

2.2.1 Native advertising

Wilson proposed a concept based on innovative media marketing at OMMA Global New York. This concept is called Native Advertising. Native advertising combines technology and contents in their own media platform. Solve media indicates that native advertising is a specific business model to deliver relevant and valuable content. Fahad thinks native advertising needs to combine with its platform. Mitch indicates user experience is fundamental; not only the creative side of the ad, but also the content. This means the content that matches with the user’s interests Users can decide to browse the ads that interest them.

IAB shows a common form of native advertising that is divided into paid search units, recommendation widgets, promoted listings, custom units, and in-Feed Units. This study will focus on the in-Feed Units which are the contents of the message. Because this type is more common on social networking sites including Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest and other major social networking sites. We identify three categories: native content advertising, native suggested advertising, and native share advertising.
2.2.1.1 Native content advertising

Users must be interested in a product or a brand, and subscribe to its fan page. After you subscribe to the enterprise page, the enterprise has the latest news that will immediately appear on the user's timeline. The message is not only text but also photo or video. Compare with traditional online advertising, native content advertising can avoid being treated as spam. These types of advertising on social media includes Twitter’s "following messages", Pinterest’s "PIN message", and Facebook messages from fan page.

2.2.1.2 Native sharing advertising

Refers to User experience and product message preferences users share ads spontaneously. These ads will urge customers to pay attention to the ads. For example, when customers see an advertising or others information on Facebook. They will participate in activities, share this information, comment. These behaviors will mention advertising to attract social network users. Facebook provides service of keyword for ad such as tracking who share, like and comment on post. It will impact on user’s friends, like share information, comment. These types of advertising will show words of retweet in Twitter.

2.2.2 Non-native advertising professor

Non-native advertising is traditional kind of online advertising. This type of advertising delivers messages directly, and is usually placed on website blocks. Therefore, whole website becomes unnatural because of these ads. Users usually ignore these non-native advertising. There are many common non-native advertising such as banner, web widget, pre-roll advertising.

2.3 Effectiveness of social media advertising

Hall proposed the AIDMA model to measure traditional media marketing. The buyer is depicted as passing through the stages of Attention, Interest, Desire, Memory, and Action\(^7\). Attention is the first step in the AIDMA. Once attract consumer’s attention, the next step is to arouse the consumer’s interest in the advertised product. The consumer might desire to have the product and keep it in memory. Because of the online environment, Dentsu Incorporated modified the AIDMA model and named it AISAS. The new model included stages of search and share\(^8\). A customer looks for a product online, in order to find more information about it. And the customer
then shares the experience. In this study, we will focus on attention, action and sharing.

2.3.1 Attention

Hutter and Hoffmann\(^\text{21}\) indicated attention is very important to advertising because of the advertising message may have contributed to purchase behavior and positive attitudes. When the internet appeared, information was generated like a flood. Users pay attention only to what interests them. When customer pay attention to advertising, it will help to increase impression of products, brands, other information and increase purchase intention\(^\text{22,23}\). A successful ad is able to attract consumers’ attention.

2.3.2 Action

Meyers and Gerstman\(^\text{24}\) saw online advertising as a form of marketing, whose purpose is to convey marketing messages, purchase intention and online purchase behavior. Schaefer, Parker, and Haytko\(^\text{25}\) found that advertising contents will influence purchases. Purchase effectiveness is generated by word of mouth. Loureiro and Araújo\(^\text{26}\) used apparel brands to test whether buyers’ recommendations led other consumers to purchase. Recommendations were found to influence other consumers. Beside purchase, Lee et al.\(^\text{27}\) investigated different types of action in social media.

2.3.3 Share

Information sharing provides information to others. Whether active or request, information sharing leads to information that affects other people\(^\text{28}\). Social media quickly gathered a lot of people to share information\(^\text{29}\). People share advertising content or customer experience. They comment on advertising, products. These comments may be useful to other customers. A positive comment can help word of mouth\(^\text{30}\). Some users will give an assessment after browsing the content. And these assessments, such as the number of likes in Facebook can be reference for other customers. Dellarocas found high evaluation will lead to believe easily than low evaluation\(^\text{31}\). When user clicks on the like button, comment in Facebook and these behaviors will turn into message on Facebook timeline\(^\text{32}\).
3. MEASUREMENT

3.1 Study Framework

According to literature reviews, we will measure social media advertising effectiveness in terms of attention, sharing and action. This study suggests that different social media advertising have different effects on consumers’ behavior. In this study we included two stimulus factors (advertising types, product types) to explore differences between types of social media advertising (native content ads, native share advertising, native suggested advertising, native content, non-native advertising), types of product (search product and experience products).

3.2 Questionnaire design

Based on the literature review, this study developed an online questionnaire comprising 19 questions to measure the effectiveness of social media advertising. In order to avoid central tendency when respondent answering, all questions were measured on a six-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (6). In designing the stimulus, we added social media advertising types including native content advertising, native sharing advertising, native suggested advertising and native content, non-native advertising. We also added two product types -- search product (smart phones) and experience product (clothing). Each social media advertising type will combine with each product type individually (see Appendix A) and be distributed to respondents randomly. InsightXplorer (IX) survey and Cyberpanel system were used to collect samples.

3.3 Sample profile

A total of 1700 valid responses were obtained. The profile of qualified samples is shown in Table 1. In this study, product types are divided into two groups (search product and experience product). Each group had 850 respondents. Product types are divided into five groups of 170 (native content ads, native share advertising, native suggested advertising, native content and non-native advertising).
Table 1. Sample profile

| Gender | Frequency | Proportion |
|--------|-----------|------------|
| Male   | 815       | 47.9%      |
| Female | 885       | 52.1%      |

| Age                | Frequency | Proportion |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| 20-29 years old    | 493       | 29.0%      |
| 30-39 years old    | 609       | 35.8%      |
| 40-49 years old    | 379       | 22.3%      |
| Over 50 years      | 219       | 12.9%      |

3.4 Validity and reliability

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to extract the factors of effectiveness of social media advertising, and factor loadings were between 0.55 and 0.97, are greater than 0.5\(^4\). To verify the questionnaire’s reliability, all items should exceed a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.8\(^5\). Composite reliability and average variance extracted are shown in Table 2\(^6\).

Table 2. Summary of measurement scales

| Social media Ads effectiveness | Cronbach’s Alpha | Composite Reliability | Average Variance Extracted |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Attention                     | 0.956            | 0.964                 | 0.820                       |
| Action                        | 0.957            | 0.965                 | 0.822                       |
| Share                         | 0.971            | 0.977                 | 0.876                       |
4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Analysis of variance

To compare effectiveness of social media advertising in five groups from two types of products, a series of analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The purpose of ANOVA is to test for significant differences in average scores among independent groups. In this study, we use one-way ANOVA ($\alpha = 0.05$) to compare social media advertising in five groups (native content ads, native sharing advertising, native suggested advertising, native content and non-native advertising) from two types of products for significant difference in group means for the following variables: attention, action and share attitudes toward the stimuli. To compare five groups of social media advertising differences, post-hoc multiple comparison tests conduct Tukey’s HSD.

4.1.1 ANOVA results (search product)

Smart phones (HTC) were chosen as search product. We analyzed search product on five groups of social media advertising that evoked different social media advertising effectiveness. The results are shown in Table 3. We found that social media effectiveness include focus ($F = 60.28$, $p <0.01$), share ($F = 56.93$, $p <0.01$) and action ($F = 66.86$, $p <0.01$) all exist in different advertising. Furthermore, to discuss the effectiveness of social media advertising in five groups, we conducted post-hoc test by Tukey’s HSD. In aspect of attention, native content advertising and native content were no significant difference, but two groups were better than the native sharing advertising and native suggested advertising. Native sharing advertising and native suggested advertising were no significant differences, but both of them were better than the non-native advertising. In terms of sharing, native content and native content advertising had no significant difference, but both were better than native sharing advertising and native suggested advertising. Native sharing advertising and native suggested advertising showed no differences, and but both were better than non-native advertising.
Table 3. ANOVA results (search product)

| Social media Ads Effectiveness | Native content advertising N=170 (1) | Native sharing advertising N=170 (2) | Native suggested advertising N=170 (3) | Native content N=170 (4) | Non-native advertising N=170 (5) | F     | p       | Tukey     |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|---------|-----------|
| Attention                     | 4.40 (0.82)                         | 3.72 (1.00)                          | 3.53 (1.02)                            | 4.31 (0.84)            | 3.04 (1.04)                     | 60.28 | 0.00**  | 1,4>2,3>5 |
| Share                         | 4.09 (0.94)                         | 3.28 (1.10)                          | 3.10 (1.15)                            | 4.13 (1.05)            | 2.75 (1.08)                     | 56.93 | 0.00**  | 4,1>2,3>5 |
| Action                        | 4.29 (0.86)                         | 3.52 (1.06)                          | 3.32 (1.08)                            | 4.25 (0.87)            | 2.83 (1.10)                     | 66.86 | 0.00**  | 1,4>2,3>5 |

Note: *: p<0.05 , **: p<0.01.

4.1.2 ANOVA results (experience product)

We chose clothing (Uniqlo) as the experience product. We analyzed experience product on five groups of social media advertising that evoked different social media advertising effectiveness. The results are shown in Table 4. We found that social media effectiveness include focus (F = 35.79, p < 0.01) share (F = 32.82, p < 0.01), action (F = 45.17, p < 0.01) all exist in different advertising. Furthermore, in order to discuss the effectiveness of social media advertising in five groups, we also conducted post-hoc test by Tukey’s HSD. In terms of attention, native content advertising and native content showed no significant difference, but both of them were better than the native sharing advertising, native suggested advertising and non-native advertising. Native sharing advertising, native suggested advertising and non-native advertising showed no significant differences. In aspect of sharing, native content advertising and native content were no significant difference, but two groups were better than the native sharing advertising, native suggested advertising and non-native advertising. There were no significant differences.
Table 4. ANOVA results (experience product)

| Social media Ads Effectiveness | Native content advertising N=170 (1) | Native sharing advertising N=170 (2) | Native suggest advertising N=170 (3) | Native content N=170 (4) | Non-native advertising N=170 (5) | F    | p      | Tukey |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--------|-------|
| **Attention**                 | 4.22 (0.87)                          | 3.72 (1.00)                          | 3.44 (1.03)                          | 4.32 (0.81)             | 3.30 (1.18)                   | 35.79 | 0.00** | 4,1>2,3,5 |
| **Share**                    | 3.80 (1.15)                          | 3.28 (1.09)                          | 3.05 (1.15)                          | 4.06 (0.90)             | 2.90 (1.24)                   | 32.82 | 0.00** | 4,1>2,3,5 |
| **Action**                   | 4.16 (0.95)                          | 3.52 (1.05)                          | 3.28 (1.10)                          | 4.34 (0.78)             | 3.15 (1.23)                   | 45.17 | 0.00** | 4,1>2,3,5 |

Note: *: p<0.05 , **: p<0.01.

5. IMPLICATIONS

On the framework of social media advertising effectiveness measurement, we base on AIDMA and AISAS model, choosing effectiveness, attention, action, sharing to measure the different type of advertising. There are still some limitations in this study. First, there are many effectiveness based on AIDMA and AISAS models. For example, stage of interest, desire, memory and search. Future studies can measure advertising effectiveness in other ways. We did not discuss the relationship among stages of effectiveness, such as buying (stage of action) a product after seeing a social media ad or sharing the experience of buying or using (stage of share). Future studies can compare the relationships between stages of effectiveness.

Second, this study only surveyed Taiwanese users. Cross-country studies would have more implications for marketers and researchers. We used clothing brand as experience product and smart phone as search product but other products or brands might lead to other results. In addition, Facebook users might be different from users of Twitter or Pinterest. Different advertising contents might generate different effects such as text, photo and video. We believe that social media advertising still has room for improvement.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Companies are now using social networking sites for native marketing. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to measure effectiveness of native
concept in social media advertising. First, we classified social media advertising to native and non-native advertising. We develop online questionnaire comprising 19 questions to measure the effectiveness according to the literature review. Second, Hall\(^7\) and Dentsu Incorporated\(^8\) proposed traditional advertising and online advertising models (AIDMA and AISAS). In this study stage of attention, action and sharing were used to measure social media advertising. We found that all effectiveness was significant in five groups of social media advertising. This study was consistent with previous research; Xu and Du\(^38\), Wei and Lu\(^39\) and Luor et al.\(^40\) to test effectiveness of advertising by AIDMA and AISAS models. We found that action and share were significant and this is consistent with work by Ha\(^41\) and Lee et al.\(^27\).

We classified current social media advertising to native advertising, and measured types of product difference by effectiveness of social media advertising (attention, action and share). The results show that native content and native content advertising are most effective, and non-native advertising is least effective. When enterprise broadcasts the advertising of search products, native content advertising and native content is high priority to use. And native sharing advertising and native suggested advertising are second order. For experience products, native content and native content advertising are the best way to advertise. We didn’t suggest native sharing advertising, native suggested advertising or non-native advertising.

Native advertising is better than non-native advertising. Native content is more effective. But native content is limited to exposure to consumers sometimes, it still need to convey information through other native forms to expose to more customer. On the other hand, although native sharing advertising and native suggested advertising are worse than both of native content and native content advertising, enterprise can also utilize these advertising’s characteristics. Native sharing advertising has mention with friends, such who click like or who share this message, it can generate social influence to attract user’s friends to be your fan page’s follower or customers. In native suggested advertising, enterprise can select gender, age, user’s interest and browsing history to target a customer. Finally, our study provides references of social media advertising effectiveness for further research or practical suggestion.
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