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ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceptions of stakeholders on contents of Facebook pages of organisations in the food and beverage sector (Kasapreko Company Limited and Fan Milk Limited, Ghana). The followers’ underlying motivations for engaging with the organisations on Facebook, their expectations and perceptions about page contents and management were investigated.

The study employed a descriptive survey design, and a sample size of 200 respondents were selected using a systematic sampling technique. Underpinned by the uses and gratifications theory and the expectancy theory, an online survey was used for data collection. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyse data and findings were presented using frequency and percentage summary tables and figures.

The results revealed that reasons for stakeholders’ engagement with corporates organisations on Facebook were diverse, but receiving information on new or forthcoming products was the most desired. It was also found that followers had fairly positive perceptions of the contents or activities on the organisations’ Facebook pages. Followers noted that the pages were managed professionally and interactively. The findings further revealed that followers expected the organisations to post more advertisements, event promotion and product information on their Facebook pages in audio-visual formats.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This section introduces the study by looking at its background. It gives a general overview of who stakeholders are, as well as what social media and stakeholder engagement are. It provides a background of social media’s usefulness to organisations and stakeholders’ perceptions and expectations of contents and activities on corporate social media platforms. It states the research problem; the purpose of the study; objectives of the study; research questions; and significance of the study. It finally presents the organisation of the dissertation.

1.1 Background of the study

The view that organisations have stakeholders is recognised within the corporate and academic worlds (Freeman, 1984; Fassin, 2009 as cited in Sedereviciute and Valentini, 2011). These stakeholders generally range from customers, employees, local communities, suppliers and distributors, through to shareholders (Freeman, 2004). There are several definitions of who stakeholders of an organisation are. Eden and Ackermann (1998) defined stakeholders as “people or small groups with power to respond to, negotiate with, and change the strategic future of the organisation (p.117).” Bryson (1995) also defined stakeholders as “any person, group or organisation that can place a claim on the organisation’s attention, resources, or output, or is affected by that output (p.27).” Lastly, Freeman (2004) referred to stakeholders as “any group or individual who can affect or can be affected by the achievement of the organisation’s objectives.
Following Freeman’s (2004) definition, it could be inferred that individuals and groups may be considered as stakeholders of an organisation whether they directly or indirectly influence, or are influenced by the organisation’s activities. Since corporate brands work to create accounts on social media and engage with their followers on these platforms, these followers could be identified as their stakeholders. Also, since followers have the power to influence an organisation’s activities on social media, and are able to get the attention of the organisation, these followers of corporate brands could be identified as stakeholders.

1.1.1 Social media and stakeholder engagement

Stakeholder engagement is a powerful tool which enhances stakeholder participation. It also offers interactive mutual learning processes between organisations and their publics. It is further capable of causing social change in the organisation (Brown and Dillard, 2013).

In recent times, social media have become important vehicles for stakeholder engagement. Kaplan and Haenlein (2010, p. 61) defined social media as “internet-based applications built on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0.” Mangold and Faulds (2009) asserted that consumers were increasingly using social media sites like Facebook, Instagram, Twitter in their quest for information instead of just traditional media, such as television, radio, and magazines.

Corporate organisations in Ghana engage with their stakeholders on social media for different reasons. Social media are sometimes used to promote organisations’ products or services through advertisements. They also serve as tools to gather first-hand experience and insights from various
stakeholder groups. Organisations also use their social media platforms to manage their reputation by explaining issues their stakeholders need clarifications on.

The use of social media as a stakeholder engagement tool comes with some advantages to corporate communicators. Firstly, it helps address the needs of the 21st century stakeholders whose expectations and perceptions are driven by today’s global technology through the transition from organisations’ one-way communication into a multi-dimensional communication (Berthon, Pitt, and Campbell 2008; Diga and Kelleher, 2009). Social media are playing a pivotal role not just as a communication tool but increasingly, organisations are using the different dimensions to build lasting relationships with their publics. Also, social media use has become relevant not only for communication, but for improving relationships with organisations’ stakeholders (Verhoeven, Tench, Zerfass, Moreno and Vercic, 2012; Sallot, Porter and Acosta-Alzuru (2004). The use of social media ensures prompt feedback and response between organisations and their publics. This form of real time communication ensures that both parties respond to each other’s needs in a timely and cost-effective manner. Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) pointed out that social media allowed organisations to engage with their customers at relatively low cost. Lastly, organisations are also able to engage directly with different stakeholders (Heinonen, 2011) without being controlled by other stakeholder groups or gatekeepers.

1.1.2 Corporate Facebook usage

Facebook is the most popular social networking site, in terms of its reach and scope, with more than 2.3 billion global monthly active users (Statista, 2018). Shankland (2011) established that Facebook’s usage as a public relations tool for businesses has become a universal concept. Also, the Webtrends (2011) study found that stakeholders engaged with organisations’ Facebook pages
more frequently than their websites. Dornyo, (2014) alluded that Facebook was the best place to provide information about products and services, and helps with getting feedback from an organisation’s audience. Owyang (2007) also argued that Facebook has given stakeholders the opportunity to have power over messages they get from organisations. This, therefore, makes Facebook a relevant tool in communication and public relations, making its effective management an important aspect of stakeholder engagement.

In Ghana, some organisations have acquired Facebook pages which are used for advertising, public relations and marketing. Organisations, from all sectors in Ghana, have been present on Facebook over the years. According to Adzaho (2009, Facebook’s usage in Ghana has been growing over the years (as cited in Dornyo, 2014). A search on Facebook found organisations like MTN Ghana; Ghana Oil Company Limited (GOIL); Fan Milk Limited, Ghana; Ministry of Communications, Ghana; Tullow Oil plc; AngloGold Ashanti; Zoomlion Ghana Limited; and Tobinco Pharmaceuticals Limited; among other organisations had acquired Facebook pages and each of them had not less than 2,000 followers.

Fan Milk Limited, Ghana and Kasapreko Company Limited, both in the food and beverage industry in Ghana, were identified as the subjects of interest to the study. These are organisations well known as manufacturers of only food and beverage products in Ghana. In addition, their presence on Facebook and huge fan(follower) bases, influenced their selection for the study.

1.1.3 Perceptions and expectations of stakeholders

Panagiotopoulos, Shan, Barnett, Regan and McConnon, (2015) argued that when organisations communicate on social media, the expectations of their publics become more demanding. The perceptions and expectations of the various stakeholders become very useful to the communicators
for the strategic management of the social media platforms. Organisations should, therefore, take into consideration their stakeholder behaviours and expectations and them with theirs (Navarro, Moreno and Al-Sumait, 2017). Besides, in order to reach the level where an organisation’s behaviour becomes aligned with that of the stakeholders, it is important to know their expectations with regard to the organisation’s activities.

Wang and Fesenmaier (2003) also emphasised that “expectancy”, that is the “possibility of future reciprocation” is a major motivation for the contribution of members of online corporate communities. Members of a corporate social media platforms, whose expectations are met, may be motivated to contribute to the online discussions. These contributions may be done in several ways: a follower may like a post, ‘tag’ people, comment on a post, or share a post or activity they find on a corporate social media platform.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Adopting and strategically managing social media pages as part of corporate communication is an important aspect of organisations’ public relations work. The nature of social media suggests that individuals from online platforms can impact an organisation’s reputational and relational assets, and how these assets are viewed by different stakeholders. (Sedereviciute and Valentini, 2011). Globally, the use of various social media platforms by corporate organisations has been on the rise and academics have sought to conduct investigations into the various facets. Most of these studies revolve around the numerous advantages of social media use by corporate organisations and their effective management. Some studies by Diga and Kelleher (2009); Verhoevena Tench, Zerfass, Moreno and Verčić (2012); Dornyo (2014); Kwafo (2015); Adjei, Annor-Frempong and Bosompem (2016) have sought the views of public relations professionals, either through
interviews or surveys, concerning their use and management of their various organisations’ social media sites.

This study focused primarily on the stakeholders who visited and used corporate social media sites. It sought to investigate the perceptions and expectations of stakeholders on contents of corporate Facebook pages. This became necessary because it provided a form of evaluation of what corporate organisations had been posting on their social media pages. It also offered an opportunity to bridge the gap, if any, between what consumers wanted and what the organisations were doing on their social media platforms. This, essentially, could inform the formulation of policies regarding stakeholder engagement on social media.

The available studies that have investigated the perceptions and expectations of stakeholders on contents and activities corporate Facebook pages were limited, especially in the Ghanaian context. Thus, it became necessary for the researcher to investigate how stakeholders of Ghanaian companies perceived contents and activities on the Facebook pages of Ghanaian companies. The study also found out the motivations for users’ engagement with selected corporate brands on Facebook as well as their expectations.

1.3 Objectives of the study

The study seeks to:

- understand the reasons for stakeholders’ engagement with corporate organisations on Facebook
- identify how the followers perceive contents or activities on corporate Facebook pages
- find out the expectations of corporate Facebook pages’ followers
1.4 Research questions

- What are the followers’ underlying motivations for engaging with corporate organisations on Facebook?
- How do followers perceive contents or activities on corporate Facebook pages?
- What expectations do corporate organisations’ Facebook followers have with relation to their activities and contents?

1.5 Significance of the study

The findings of the research will give profitable and pertinent insights to social media communication and public relations activities. This will inform organisations on what their stakeholders expect from their corporate social media pages, to be able to strategise effectively. For instance, informing them on constantly updating their social media pages and adopting ways to enhance their publics’ association with their brands on Facebook. The findings will also help corporate communicators understand the reasons for their followers’ association with their brands online. The study will, finally, serve as a contribution to existing works of other researchers who have discussed issues on stakeholder engagement social media as. It will also serve as research evidence for further studies.

1.6 Operational Definitions

Below is a list of operational definitions of some terms and concepts used in the study. Though these terms may have different meanings in other contexts, within the scope of this current study, this is how the following are conceptualised.
- **Stakeholders**: They are people who have an interest in an organisation and are affected by its operations.

- **Stakeholder Perception**: How people with an interest in an organisation understand and interprete its activities.

- **Stakeholder Engagement**: The process by which an organisation involves people who may be affected by or can influence the implementation of the decisions it makes.

- **Contents**: Subjects or ideas contained in something written, said, created or represented on social media.

- **Activities**: The various actions taken by organisations on their social media platforms for their viewership.

- **News Feed**: it is a feature on Facebook through which users are exposed to contents posted on the network

- **Corporate Facebook Followers**: People who have subscribed to the Facebook pages of corporate organisations.

- **Extent of professionalism**: The degree of competence or skill in the practice of an activity.

**1.7 Organisation of the study**

The structure of the study is in five chapters. Chapter one introduces the study by looking at the background to the study. It gives a general overview of social media and stakeholder engagement, social media’s usefulness to organisations and corporate Facebook usage. It states the problem under study; the purpose of the study; objectives of the study; research questions; and significance of the study. It ends with how the study will be organised.
Chapter two addresses the theories that support the study. It also presents a comprehensive review of literature that bears on the subject matter of stakeholder perceptions and expectations of corporate organisations’ social media platforms.

The third chapter is dedicated to the methodology and the processes used to address the research questions. It begins by stating the research design adopted for the study. The population of the study; the sample and sampling technique; the data collection procedure and instrumentation; and ethical consideration are also discussed. It finally looks at how data gathered will be analysed.

Chapter four presents the findings and interpretations of the study. It gives detailed discussions on the findings.

Finally, chapter five summarises the entire study and will identify key findings from the study. It will draw inferences from findings to arrive at a conclusion. It makes recommendations for future studies into the area of corporate social media communication.

1.8 Chapter summary

The chapter discussed the background of the study. It focused on some scholarly definitions of who stakeholders are; how useful social media is to organisations; some issues on social media and stakeholder engagement. Stakeholders were identified as customers, employees, local communities, suppliers and distributors, through to shareholders. It was established that social media and its strategic management is an important aspect of an organisation’s success. Also, the research problem, which is to provide empirical research into the limited studies on user perception and expectations on corporate social media platforms was identified. The research objectives,
questions, purpose, and the significance of this study were discussed. The chapter finally stated how the study was organised.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The objective of this study was to examine the perceptions and expectations of organisations’ stakeholders on the contents and activities on corporate Facebook pages. This chapter provides a comprehensive review of literature that bears on the subject matter in terms of the theoretical framework and empirical findings from similar studies. The theoretical review sets the base on which the research is founded and the empirical review considers similar studies undertaken by other researchers on the subject matter under study. The relevance of this to generate a pool of knowledge on the topic under study to create ample opportunity for analysing the data. Owing to this, certain facts and theories can be refuted and others confirmed and built upon.

2.1 Theoretical framework

The study was supported by two theories: Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch’s (1974) Uses and Gratification theory and the Expectancy theory by Vroom (1964). The use of the theories was informed by previous studies on stakeholders’ motivations, expectations and perceptions of media contents. These theories also helped address the objectives of this study.

2.1.1 Uses and Gratification theory

Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch (1974) propounded the Uses and Gratification theory in the article “the Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratification Research”. The Uses and Gratification theory is based on the assumption that audiences are not inactive consumers of
media, rather, they have power to choose the media they want to consume. The Uses and Gratification theory is primarily based on what individuals do with the media (Katz, Blumler and Gurevitch (1974). Early mass communication theories, such as the Hypodermic Needle theory, identified that mass media had a steady and instant effect on individuals whom they regarded as unable to form their own opinions on particular issues (McQuail and Windahl, 1993). Audiences were viewed as homogenous, passive, uncritical and were also not motivated to repel the attraction and effect of the mass media (Quan-Hasse and Young, 2011). According to Leung & Wei (2000), the Uses and Gratification approach focuses on people to identify the social and psychological factors that influence individuals’ choice and use of a particular media.

Some studies on the Uses and Gratification theory have focused on television (Zillmann and Bryant, 1984; Dobos, 1998; Mcilwraith, 1998) and other traditional media (Armstrong and Rubin, 1989; Patterson, 1994). With the emergence of social media, other studies on the Uses and Gratification theory have been carried out by Quan-Hasse and Young (2011), Whiting and Williams (2013), and Park, Kee and Valenzuela (2009).

In the context of this study, stakeholders derive a certain level of satisfaction from following, visiting or engaging with corporate organisations’ social media platforms. They could be engaging with these brands for specific gratifications, which may be informed by personal or social factors. Cheung, Chui and Lee, (2011) identified some key factors that influence the use of online communities. They are: purposeful value, self-discovery, entertainment value, social enhancement, and maintaining interpersonal connectivity.

- Purposeful value is “accomplishing some pre-determined informational and instrumental purpose”.
- Self-discovery is understanding one’s self through interacting with other people.
• Maintaining interpersonal interconnectivity is the social benefits an individual derives from getting to know people.

• Social enhancement is the value one gets from being accepted and approved by others.

• Entertainment is the amusement and enjoyment one gets while interacting with others.

(Cheung, Chui and Lee, 2011, p. 1337)

Social media provide platforms for users to seek information on subjects that are of interest to them. The emergence of new technologies in media has not only changed the way users gather and distribute information but also altered the relationship that existed between mass media and their audiences. In a study by Whiting and Williams (2013), that employed the Uses and Gratification theory, 88% of the respondents agreed to using social media to interact with their families and friends.

The Uses and Gratification theory has received a number of criticisms. Stanford (1983) opined that the Uses and Gratification theory had a challenge with confusing definitions and analytical model, lack of internal consistency and lack of justification for the theory. Ruggiero (2000) also argued that the central concepts such as needs, motivations, uses, social and psychological backgrounds were not clear. The lack of clarity on these concepts contributes to distorted thinking and enquiry (Ruggiero, 2000). Another criticism of the Uses and Gratification theory challenged the assumptions that individuals’ media selection and their expectations for media use are produced from individual tendencies, social interactions, environmental factors; and active audiences are with goal-directed media behaviour (Wimmer and Dominick, 1994). Also, according to Elliot (1974), the Uses and Gratification theory is primarily based on individual behaviours, thus, makes it difficult to explain or predict beyond the people studied and generalise the implications of media use. Being criticised as individualistic, the application of the Uses and
Gratification theory in this study may limit the ability of the result to be generalised to influence decision making in the Food and Beverage Manufacturing sector.

This study employed the Uses and Gratification theory to explain why Facebook followers of corporate organisations in Ghana engaged with corporate brands online since the followers’ motivations and expectations were of interest to the current study. This study also used the Uses and Gratification theory to explain the underlying motivations that influenced stakeholders to engage with corporate Facebook pages. The theory further helped to explain the expectations the followers had, which made them actively seek certain contents. Finally, the theory explained how the followers perceived the contents and activities on the pages, and whether these perceptions affected their levels of engagement.

2.1.2 Expectancy theory

Vroom (1964) developed the Expectancy theory through his study of the motivation behind decision making. Expectancy in terms of communication is “an enduring pattern of anticipated behavior” (Burgoon, 1993, p. 31). Expectancy theory explains a motivated behaviour as goal oriented. Vroom (1964) opined that people tend to act on the belief that pleasure or happiness is the highest good in life. The theory further contends that “the strength of a tendency to act in a certain way depends on the strength of an expectation that the act will be followed by a given outcome, and on the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual” (Robbins, 1993 as cited in Suciu, Mortan and Lazar, 2013, p. 183). These actions can be applied to communication in different forms, whether verbal or online.
According to Tedjamulia, Olsen, Dean and Albrecht (2005), the Expectancy theory views communication as a balance of rewards and costs. Thus, if an individual expects communication to have a reward or desired outcome, the individual is more likely to react positively towards that communication. The theory argues that expectancies from communication are derived from three factors: communicator, relationship, and context characteristics (Burgoon, 1993). The communicator is those of “salient features of individual actors, such as demographics, personality, style of communication” among others; relationship factors such as “degree of familiarity, attraction, and status equality” among those communicating; and context factors include “privacy, formality or task orientation” (Burgoon, 1993, p. 32). Lindner (1998) used the Expectancy theory in his study of employee motivation. The study identified a ranked order of motivation factors for employees: good wages, job security, good working conditions, among others. In the current study, the communication expectancies of Facebook followers of selected corporate organisations, what influenced their decision making to engage with them, as well as the actions they took when they were confronted with the contents and activities on the pages were investigated.

2.2 Related studies

A number of scholarly works have been conducted on corporate organisations engagement with their stakeholders on social media. Although most of these works have focused on what organisations have done to take advantage of the growing usage of social media, few have focused on the stakeholder’s end of the bargain. In discussing related literature, articles bordering on motivations of stakeholders for visiting organisations’ social media pages; the correlations between social media interaction and corporate reputation; and expectations of stakeholders on contents of corporate social media pages were reviewed.
Dijkmans, Kerkhof and Beukeboom (2015) carried out a study to examine whether and when a company’s social media activities were important to corporate reputation. The study involved customers and non-customers of an international airline to measure how consumers participated in the airline’s social media activities and their perception of the airline’s corporate reputation. Their results showed that consumers who frequently used social media actively engaged in the airline’s social media activities.

The findings of the study by Dijkmans, Kerkhof and Beukeboom (2015) also showed a positive correspondence between an organisation’s social media engagement and the perceptions consumers held on the organisation’s reputation. The current study also sought to identify the views of the respondents on the contents and activities on corporate social media pages. It also identified their perceptions of how the organisations managed their corporate Facebook pages. The findings of the current study were compared to that of Dijkmans, Kerkhof and Beukeboom (2015) to confirm or refute the claim on correlation between stakeholder social media engagement and organisations’ reputation.

With regard to the type of contents and the formats of presentation, De Vries, Gensler, and Leeflang (2012), in their study of brand posts on brand fan pages, examined which firm-generated content on social networking sites influenced consumers to react. The researchers found out that posts that were more meaningful and posts that the followers could relate to were more popular on successful companies’ social media platforms. Companies’ posts on their social media platforms were considered as informative, entertaining, or neutral. Informative posts were identified as the posts that provided information about the company, its brand, products and services. Entertaining posts on the social media platform were also defined as posts whose contents did not relate to the organisation but provided some form of entertainment for the followers (e.g. humor). Neutral posts
were identified as post that neither provided information nor entertainment, for instance a post which asked followers the colour they preferred. According to De Vries et al. (2012), entertainment and information were the main reasons why individuals visited corporate Facebook pages. Similarly, the current study identified the contents of corporate Facebook pages. However, it further investigated the perceptions and expectations followers had on the contents of corporate Facebook platforms.

A research conducted by Navarro, Moreno and Al-Sumait (2017) sought to compare the perspectives of Public Relations professionals against those of the general public in Spain with regard to what organisations offered on their social media platforms. The results of the study showed a difference in the perceptions and expectations of the Public Relations professionals and the general public. The researchers identified that stakeholders wanted to be offered a direct channel of communication with organisations’ management. Stakeholders also wanted to be given the opportunity to share their experiences with the company or with their products and services through comments; be informed about the forthcoming products; product safety and crises that may affected customers.

The relevance of the study by Navarro, Moreno and Al-Sumait (2017) to the current one is that it offered an insight into some of the possible expectations of European citizens on contents of corporate social media platforms. The current study further gave an insight into the expectations, as well as perceptions of stakeholders in the Food and Beverage Industry in Ghana.

Another study by Zaglia (2013) on the embedding of brand communities in social networks explored consumer motivations for subscribing to a company’s social media platform. According to the findings of the study, reasons for engaging with a company on the internet include: passion for the brand; eagerness to learn and improve skills; social relation to others; getting information
tailored to specific members’ needs; entertainment; and enhancement of one's social position. In addition, consumers agreed that social network communities influenced them to adapt to new things and they could basically provide or receive feedback from other proficient and experienced users. Another reason for consumers’ engagement with organisations on social media was the sharing of their passion for the brand. Consumers looked for customised content from the social media platforms of companies they care about (Zaglia, 2013). In discussing stakeholder engagement on corporate Facebook pages, the identification of motivations of stakeholders was relevant to the current study.

Similarly, Azar, Machado, Vacas-de-Carvalho and Mendes (2016) studied consumers’ motivations for interacting with brands on Facebook. The findings of the study established five general motivations that impacted consumers' engagement with a brand on Facebook. These were: social influence, search for information, entertainment, trust and reward (Azar et al., 2016). Stakeholders interacted with corporate brands on Facebook when the organisation’s page was seen as a reliable information resource, when there were entertaining contents and activities on the organisation’s Facebook pages, when users trusted information posted on the pages and found what was posted on the pages relevant (Azar et al., 2016).

Also, in an exploratory study, Enginkaya and Yılmaz (2014) sought to investigate what motivated consumers to use social media as a means of interacting with brands. An online survey was conducted on post-graduate students to understand the reasons for their engagement and consumption of contents and related activities of corporate social media pages. Five distinct and reliable motivation factors: “Brand Affiliation,” “Investigation,” “Opportunity Seeking,” “Conversation,” and “Entertainment” were revealed. Enginkaya and Yılmaz’s (2014) found that some users would engage with brands they consumed only, or those that were congruent with their
lifestyles. Others users also associated with a brand with influential, creative and entertaining contents. Also, some users preferred to engage with brands online because they believed social media provided a reliable information resource. The current study, aside identifying the motivating factors of followers, examined their perceptions and expectations of what organisations posted on their Facebook pages.

In addition, Sukoco and Wu (2010) studied personal and social motivations of customers’ participation in brand community. Some hypotheses: “stronger self-related motives lead members to have stronger identification and integration toward brand community; stronger social-related motives lead members to have stronger identification and integration toward brand community” were developed by Sukoco and Wu (2010, p. 616). The study established that both self- and social-related motivations played significant roles in driving members to identify and integrate themselves into brand communities. Self-related motivations were explained as individuals' interests in entertainment, gaining knowledge about the brand, and enhancing their self-esteem. Members’ interest to associate with the brands and other members, and to obtain social relevance were the social-related motivations (Sukoco and Wu, 2010).

A study by Kwafo (2015) investigated Facebook’s usage by organisations for Public Relations. Public Relations practitioners of sampled organisations were interviewed to find out how interactive the various organisations’ Facebook pages were. It was found that the organisations’ Facebook pages studied were interactive. Thus, instant feedback from both sides of the communication channel was a key feature of their pages (Kwafo, 2015). This, therefore, was one of the reasons that informed this study. The current study sought followers’ perceptions of the level of interactivity on some corporate Facebook pages.
Tedjamulia, Olsen, Dean and Albrecht (2005) carried out a research on what motivated content contributors to online communities. The study was aimed at proposing a model that could help disclose approaches to rouse part commitments to online. The findings of the research revealed that extrinsic rewards could increase a person’s intrinsic motivation to contribute to conversations online. The findings and literature used in this research enabled the researcher understand better the motivations of stakeholders who followed, visited and interacted with others on corporate social media pages. it further probed into what their perceptions and expectations of organisations’ social media contents were.

Another research, conducted by Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, and Gremler (2004), was aimed at exploring the motivations consumers had for presenting their views on online opinion platforms. The results revealed that consumers’ desire for social interaction; desire for economic incentives (e.g. giveaways, deals); their concern for other consumer; and the potential to enhance their own self-worth were the primary factors that motivated them to engage with brands online. These results mirrored that companies needed to channel their communication to specific groups of their stakeholders and provide valuable contents. Companies needed to also have transparent discussions among all consumers on their social media platforms to enhance social interaction. Also, measures needed to be taken to ensure their followers organisation related to their followers in a respected and professional way to enhance their self-worth. The findings of this research identified the expectations of consumers and how they preferred corporate organisations to manage their social media pages. These expectations are most likely to be influenced by the followers’ perceptions of how the organisations had to manage their social media pages.

In addition, Laroche, Habibi and Richard (2013) carried out a study on how social media affected corporate brand loyalty. The research sought to analyse the unique opportunity social media
provided for brands to develop their relationship with customers. The research revealed that brands’ presence on social media influenced customer-product/brand/company/others customers’ relationship. Laroche, Habibi and Richard (2013) found out the role social media played in the relationship between organisations and their customers. However, it was limited to establishing how positive or negative this relationship was. The current study, while considering a broader group of stakeholders, that is followers of organisations’ Facebook pages, further investigated the contents and activities on the pages, as well as their influence on followers’ perceptions about the organisation.

Finally, on actions taken by stakeholders on social media, Berger and Milkman (2012) conducted a research on what made online content viral. Their study aimed at identifying reasons for people’s reactions to posts on social media, specifically why online contents were shared. The researchers found that positive content is more was more viral than contents that evoked negativity. They also determined the relationship between emotion and virality as more complex than explaining with valence alone. They also found that arousal drove social transmission. Online content that “evoked high-arousal emotions was more viral, regardless of whether those emotions were positive (e.g. awe) or negative (e.g. anxiety) while that evoked more of a deactivating emotion (e.g. sadness) was less frequently shared” (Berger and Milkman, 2012, p. 10). In the context of the current study, specific reactions (like, comment, follow) of followers to posts made by the selected brands on Facebook were investigated. In addition, the types of posts they reacted to, as well as their reasons for taking such actions were examined.
2.3 Chapter summary

The chapter explained the theoretical framework within which the study was situated. It discussed selected studies related to motivations, perceptions and expectations of social media followers of corporate organisations in Ghana. The assumptions of the Uses and Gratification theory, that people actively seek specific media to satisfy specific needs, and the Expectancy theory, which posits that a person’s tendency to act in a way depends on the expected outcome, were appropriate for the present study. Also, studies on motivations, perceptions and expectations of social media followers of corporate brands were reviewed to guide the present study. The studies reviewed identified various motivations and expectations of stakeholders with relation to contents and activities of organisations’ social media platforms. The gaps identified provided a basis for the current study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter describes the research execution process. It identifies the research approach and the method, as well as justifications for these choices. It also details the population of the study, the sample and sampling technique, the data collection procedure, instrumentation and ethical consideration. The chapter finally looks at how data gathered was analysed to make meaning.

3.1 Research design

According to Leedy and Ormrod (2001), a research methodology is “the general approach the researcher takes in carrying out the research project” (p.14). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) posited that a research methodology is determined by the nature of the research questions and the subject being studies.

To investigate what the interests, perceptions and expectations of followers of Fan Milk Limited, Ghana and Kasapreko Company Limited were, with relation to the contents and activities on their corporate Facebook pages, the quantitative approach was employed. Quantitative research “involves the collection of data so that information can be quantified and subjected to statistical treatment in order to support or refute alternative knowledge claims” (Creswell, 2003, p. 153 as cited in Williams, 2007, p. 66). Quantitative research is concerned with how frequently a variable
is present, and for the most part, uses numbers to convey this amount. It requires that the variables under consideration be measured (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011).

The quantitative approach was adopted because the nature of this study implied that a relatively bigger sample had to be selected to know how often a variable was present. A quantitative study made it possible for the researcher to achieve this by getting varied responses, unlike a qualitative study which would have meant that the researcher spoke to each respondent of this relatively large sample or organised focus group discussions. Also, survey has been used in a number of studies on stakeholder perceptions of contents and activities on corporate social media platforms (Sukoco and Wu, 2010; Enginkaya and Yılmaz, 2014; Navarro, Moreno and Al- Sumait, 2017).

3.2 Data collection and instrumentation

Among the quantitative methods, survey was adopted for data collection for the current study. A survey method “provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (Creswell, 2009, p13). Survey research involves the gathering of data from a sample of a well-defined population with questionnaires (Babbie, 1990, Fowler 1988). In addition, Nesbary (2000) and Sue and Ritter (2007) opined that a Web-based or internet survey can be done by collecting data online. An online survey is the type where questionnaires are administered via email, or a respondent is sent a given link to access the questionnaire online (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011). Facebook being an online platform with virtual users, the best way to have reached respondents was to conduct an online survey to investigate what their interests, expectations and perceptions of the organisations’ Facebook pages were.
A questionnaire was developed with Google Forms to be able to administer it successfully online. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher with factors like the purpose of the study, objectives, research questions, as well as the literature reviewed taken into consideration. The questionnaire was made up of both open-ended and closed-ended questions. A list of possible reasons or motivations for following and contributing to corporate Facebook pages, perceptions of followers on what existed on these pages, their interests and expectations were identified through the extensive literature reviewed and the theories adopted for the study. Respondents were contacted via Facebook’s private messaging system. The purpose of the research was communicated to the sampled respondents and their consent was sought before the links to access the questionnaire were sent to their individual e-mail addresses. Data was gathered by sending each person sampled the link to access the questionnaire.

### 3.3 Population, sampling procedure and sample size

Polit and Hungler (1999:37) defined a population as an “aggregate or totality of all objects, subjects or members that conform to a set of specifications.” The population for the study was social media followers of companies associated with the manufacturing of food and beverages only, listed on the 2017 Ghana Club 100. Sampling frame.

Food and beverage manufacturing companies were selected for this study because most studies that have been conducted on Public Relations and social media in Ghana have focused on some particular sectors, which are telecommunication (Boateng, 2014); tourism (Osei and Abenyin, 2016); and education sector (Apeanti and Danso, 2014). Despite the existence of all these studies
on social media use in Ghana, there is little known works on the Food and Beverage Manufacturing sector in Ghana, thus, the researcher’s decision to focus on this sector.

Kasapreko Company Limited and Fan Milk Limited- Ghana were purposively selected for the current study because they were well known in the food and beverage manufacturing industry in Ghana. The researcher searched for the two organisations on Facebook with the key word; Fan Milk, Ghana for Fan Milk Limited -Ghana, later changed to Fanyogo Ghana, and Kasapreko for Kasapreko Company Limited. Both organisations were found with each of them having at least 20,000 followers. There were some forms of activities on the pages. For instance, they had also posted some of their products and other contents. This makes it necessary to study how their stakeholders perceive the content of the social media platforms, as well as analysing their expectations of their Facebook content.

Fan Milk Limited -Ghana, as stated on Facebook, is a “Foodservice Distributor.” The organisation is the “producer of Fan Yogo (yoghurt), Fanchoco (chocolate milk), Fanice (ice cream), FanDango (fruit drink), FanPop (iced jolly), Funky Banana, among other products.” Fan Milk Limited -Ghana had 71, 626 followers on Facebook as at 09:20am on July 10, 2018, and 71, 595 people had liked the same page as at the same time (Fan Milk- Ghana’s Facebook page). Fan Milk Limited -Ghana has the mission of being one of the leading food companies in West Africa. Fan Milk- Ghana took the 15th position on the Ghana Club 100 list in 2017.

Kasapreko Company Limited is “an alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverage producer in Ghana.” The organisation is the producer of “Kasapreko Alomo Bitters, Kasapreko Tonic Wine, Kasapreko Carnival Strawberry, Royal Drinks, 10/10 Drink, Awake Purified Drinking Water, among other products. Kasapreko Company Limited had 21,993 followers on Facebook as at 06:30 am on September 27th, 2018, and 21, 002 people had liked the same page as at the same time (Kasapreko’s
Facebook page). Kasapreko Company Limited has the mission is “to be a multinational company creating lasting value for its stakeholders by producing diversified alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages from herbal and other traditional blends using first class technology.” Kasapreko Company Limited placed 53rd on the 2017 Ghana Club 100 list.

The Ghana Club 100 (GC 100) is “an annual compilation of top 100 companies in Ghana. It was launched by the Ghana Investment Promotion Centre (GIPC) in 1998 to give due recognition to successful enterprise building. For an organisation to be eligible, it must be a limited liability company”. Also, for companies with government interest, government ownership should be less than 50% unless the company is listed on the Ghana Stock Exchange (gipcghana.com).

The respondents of the study were 200 (100 for each organisation) systematically sampled Facebook followers of the companies listed on the 2017 Ghana Club 100 who manufacture only food and beverage products. These companies are Fan Milk Limited, Ghana and Kasapreko Company Limited. Unilever, Ghana was excluded from the study because the organisation is not into food and beverage manufacturing only. They produce other things which do not fall into the category that informed the decision for the organisations sampled. Also, both organisations selected had at least 20,000 followers on Facebook as at 09:20am on 10th July, 2018, which means they have a relatively large fan base on Facebook. Thus, it makes the researcher interested on why this number of people are following and liking the pages.

Sampling is the method of taking any portion of the population or universe as representative of that population Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007). In this research, Systematic sampling method was adopted for the study. This procedure allows for the selection of every ‘nth’ subject, unit or element from the population (Wimmer & Dominick, 2011). Levin and Rubin (1991) also posited that in systematic sampling, elements are selected from the population at a fixed interval measured
in time, order, or space. In adopting this method, the researcher ensured that every follower of the sampled organisations would stand a chance of being selected. Fan Milk Limited -Ghana had 71,626 followers on Facebook as at 09:20am on July 10, 2018 while Kasapreko Company Limited had 21,993 followers on Facebook as at 06:30 am on September 27th, 2018. To achieve random selection, an integer (5) was selected to serve as the constant difference between any two consecutive numbers in progression. Every 5th person on the list of Facebook followers was chosen as a participant for the study until 100 respondents were sampled. This process was repeated for the second organisation. The total sample for the survey was two hundred respondents. The individual followers of the selected organisations therefore make up the units of analysis.

Facebook was selected for the study because its usage as a Public Relations tool for businesses had become pervasive over the years. Also, most corporate organisations had been present on Facebook for some time. Dorny (2014) also identifies Facebook to be the best place for the placement of information about products and services and the best avenue for organisations to get feedback from their publics.

3.4 Pretesting

As established by Wimmer & Dominick (2011), the best way to find out whether a research instrument is well designed is to conduct a study with a small sample to assist with refining the questions. To achieve this, the research instruments were administered to an initial random sample of 10(5 each) Facebook followers of FANMILK and KASAPREKO. The test helped the researcher know how responses were presented on the Google form. It also helped to determine whether the questions and their arrangement needed modification.
3.5 Data analysis procedure

Analysis of data allowed the study to assess the findings to attain lawful, significant and important conclusion. Data was coded and entered using the Statistical package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 22. Frequency and percentage summary tables were used to analyse for answers to all three research questions.

3.6 Ethical consideration

Ethical issues were taken into consideration in all stages of the research. Participants were informed on the purpose and nature of the study. They were advised about the nature of their participation. Respondents were also assured of their right to privacy on connection with responses provided.

3.7 Chapter summary

This chapter discussed the steps that were taken in data collection and the rationale behind those steps. Survey, a quantitative method was used to gather data to answer the research questions set at the beginning of the study. This approach was chosen because, it provided a path for identifying the views of the various online stakeholders of corporate organisations concerning their motivations, expectations and perceptions. The systematic sampling procedure was employed to select the followers of the organisations’ Facebook pages. Questionnaires were used for data collection. Data was analysed using statistical tools such as frequency and percentages. The chapter also identified some ethical issues that were considered during the collection of data.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents data collected, analysis of the data, interpretations and discussions of the findings of the study. The first section presents respondents’ background information, which include sex, age range, level of education, among others. The respondents’ years of experience with the corporate entities’ Facebook pages is also presented. The next section presents their responses pertaining to the research questions developed at the beginning of the study.

4.1 Background information of the respondents

This section of the chapter provides the background information of respondents for both KASAPREKO and FANMILK. These include; age, sex and their educational levels, as presented in Tables 1a and 1b for KASAPREKO and FANMILK respectively.

Table 1a: Background Information of the Respondents (KASAPREKO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18-25yrs</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26-35yrs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36-45yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-55yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56-65yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, Owusu (2019)
From Table 1a, there were more males (63%) than females (37%) in the study sample for KASAPREKO. What this means is that most of the responses tend to reflect views of the males, since they dominated the study. This implies that more males were interested in KASAPREKO’s Facebook contents and activities than females.

For age groups, majority of the respondents were between 26-35 years (52%), followed by 18-25 years (23%), with those between 46-55 years forming the minority (5%) in the study sample. Also, age ranges 56-65 years and 66+ years recorded zero. This implies that KASAPREKO had youthful followers on Facebook. This may mean that the contents on their Facebook page appealed to the youth. It may also imply that older persons were not interested in following KASAPREKO on Facebook or may not have been sampled.

Table 1b: Background Information of the Respondents (FANMILK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18-25yrs</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26-35yrs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36-45yrs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46-55yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56-65yrs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, Owusu (2019)

From Table 2, males were not as dominant as they were in the KASAPREKO study sample, although their number (52%) was slightly higher than that of the females (48%). This implies that a relatively higher number of females could be identified as Facebook followers of FANMILK, although the males represented a larger sample.
For age groups, majority of the respondents were within 18-25 years (47%), followed by 26-35 years (25%), with those within 46-55 years forming the minority (19%) in the study sample. Age 56 years and above also recorded zero in this study sample. Similar to that of KASAPREKO, the stakeholders of FANMILK who followed its Facebook page were largely youthful. As defined by the African Youth Charter, ‘youth’ means every person between the ages of 15 and 35 years” (unesco.org). This result is in agreement with the findings of Kwafo (2015), that majority of the sampled organisations’ target audience on Facebook were the youth. Besides, this finding could mean that people above age 56 years were not engaging with the selected corporate brands on Facebook. As expected, the products of FANMILK are mostly targeted at young people and children. It is therefore a true representation of the nature of Facebook followers it had.

Also, majority (96%) of the respondents in the KASAPREKO study sample and 98% for FANMILK had at least secondary education. This indicated a fairly educated group of respondents who were likely to have a level of motivation or reason for following the Facebook pages of FANMILK and KASAPREKO, which is part of what the study investigates. In addition, the literacy level of the respondents indicated their ability to understand what the organisations posted and how it influenced them. The high percentage of educated respondents also assisted the researcher in obtaining desired responses.
Regarding the number of years respondents had been engaging with the corporate entities, table 2 indicates that majority (65%) of the study sample for KASAPREKO had followed its Facebook page for a minimum of six months as at the time of the survey. The period within ‘1 to 5 years’ recorded the highest (38%) while only 2% had followed the page for more than 10 years. Also, from table 3, majority (67%) had followed FANMILK on Facebook for a maximum of 5 years. This indicated that most of the respondents had significant experience and knowledge of what KASAPREKO and FANMILK posted on their Facebook pages.

4.2 RQ1: What are the followers’ underlying motivations for engaging with corporate organisations on Facebook?

This research question sought to find the reasons (motivations) for respondents’ decisions to follow and engage with corporate brands on Facebook. To determine the followers’ underlying motivations for engaging with corporate Facebook pages, ten closed-ended items were generated on a five Likert scale for them to indicate whether they ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘neutral’,
‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree,’ Their responses are analysed and presented in Tables 3a and 3b for KASAPREKO and FANMILK respectively.

**Table 3a: Followers’ underlying motivations for engaging with KASAPREKO on Facebook**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I follow KASAPREKO on Facebook for/because…</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>information on new or forthcoming products</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want quick response to product or service complaints</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need information on product use</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need information on events</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need Information about the organisation’s locations/ branches of reward or promotion for followers</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the page has exciting content</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my interest in their products</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my interest in the organization</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found most of my friends following</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Out of the 100 respondents, majority (61%) agreed that they followed KASAPREKO on Facebook “for information on new or forthcoming products” while only 13% of the respondents disagreed with the same item. This implies that most people followed KASAPREKO with the motivation for information on new or forthcoming products, as majority of the respondents confirmed. Regarding the statement “I follow KASAPREKO on Facebook because I want quick response to product or service complaints,” 71% of the respondents, representing the majority, agreed while 6% of them disagreed. It is possible that KASAPREKO responded to product or service complaints from their followers quickly, as majority of the respondents alluded. Followers could have also realised that posting complaints on products and services of the organisation on Facebook helped them get quick responses as they wanted. This is consistent with the findings of Enginkaya and Yılmaz
(2014) which revealed that some users preferred to engage with brands online because they believed social media provided a reliable information resource.

In addition, majority (53%) of the respondents indicated that their interest in KASAPREKO’s products was their main motivation for following the organisation on Facebook while a few (13%) disagreed with the same statement. This could mean that a larger number of the followers were those who are involved, in one way or other, with KASAPREKO’s products.

Table 3b: Followers’ underlying motivations for engaging with FANMILK on Facebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I follow FANMILK on Facebook for/because…</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>information on new or forthcoming products</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want quick response to product or service complaints</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need information on product use</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need information on events</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need Information about the organisation’s location and branches of reward or promotion for followers</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the page has exciting content</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my interest in their products</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my interest in the organization</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found most of my friends following</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source, Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

From table 3b, out of 100 respondents in the FANMILK study sample, majority (77%) agreed that they were motivated to follow the Facebook page because of their interest in the organisation while a few (3%) disagreed. Also, majority (73%) were motivated to follow the organisation’s Facebook page because of their interest in its products. Another significant number (69%) represents those who followed FANMILK on Facebook for quick response to their product or service complaints. Concerning the statement, “because the page has exciting contents,” 58%, representing the majority, agreed while only 4% disagreed. This could mean that FANMILK’s post on Facebook
were entertaining. The finding supports Enginkaya and Yılmaz’s (2014) assertion that users also associated with a brand with creative and entertaining contents on social media. Also, 61% of the respondents confirmed that they engaged FANMILK because they found most of their Facebook friends already following the organisation while a few (6%) disagreed.

Respondents were further asked if they had come across news feed about KASAPREKO and FANMILK on their personal timelines. Majority (89.53%) of the respondents confirmed they had seen posts from the Facebook pages of KASAPREKO and FANMILK. However, 10.47% of the respondents indicated that they had not come across such news feed on their Facebook timelines. Additionally, majority (89% and 95%) of the respondents for KASAPREKO and FANMILK, respectively, affirmed ‘Yes’ to following the organisations on other social media platforms apart from Facebook.

Respondents’ reasons for following KASAPREKO on other social media platforms were also investigated. Some of the responses were that the Instagram pages of the corporate organisations were more interesting while their Facebook pages were boring. Others also followed them on Instagram and Twitter because they were not active on Facebook. Some respondents for FANMILK’s study sample decided to follow the organisation on other social media platforms (Instagram and Twitter) because they found those pages contained exciting contents. Some of the respondents also did not want to rely on getting information from FANMILK on one social media platform while some followed FANMILK on Instagram because they spent more time on this page more than they did on Facebook.

However, some respondents were not following the corporate entities on other social media platforms because they did not own Instagram accounts; they got sufficient information from
Facebook; and they had observed that they organisation posted the same contents on other social media platforms.

### Table 4: What prompts Followers to visit the companies’ Facebook pages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>KASAPREKO</th>
<th>FANMILK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When they come out with new products</td>
<td>67 (67%)</td>
<td>68 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they are organizing an event</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they are in a crisis</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they are in the news</td>
<td>15 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When they are rewarding customers or organizing promotion</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>11 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Analysis of the followers’ responses, as shown in Table 4, indicates that information on new products was the major reason why followers visited KASAPREKO’s Facebook page, as was indicated by most (67%) of the respondents. Also, with FANMILK, most (68%) respondents visited its Facebook page when they came out with new products. This is followed by “when they are in the news”. For instance, 15% of the respondents visited KASAPREKO’s Facebook page when the organisation was in the news while 7% of them were prompted to visit FANMILK’s page for the same reason. Also, 9% and 11% of the respondents visited KASAPREKO and FANMILK’s Facebook pages respectively when the organisations were organising events. Surprisingly, only 5% of the respondents visited KASAPREKO’s page when it was in crisis, with 3% of the FANMILK study sample doing so for the same reason. In addition, 11% of the respondents visited FANMILK’s page when they were rewarding customers or organising promotions, with a few (4%) doing same with KASAPREKO. What this means is that more followers were motivated to visit these corporate Facebook pages when the organisations
introduced new products to the market. Followers might have an interest in the organisations’ products or wanted to be informed on what new the organisations had manufactured.

These findings are in agreement with the assertion of Navarro, Moreno and Al- Sumait (2017) that stakeholders online had the expectation of being informed about the organisation’s new and forthcoming products. Also, de Vries, Gensler, and Leeflang (2012) found that consumers engaged with companies’ fan pages online for informative posts. De Vries et al. (2012) posited that posts were considered informative when they contained information about the company, its brand, and products. In addition, the finding that some followers visited the companies’ Facebook pages when customers were being rewarded through promotions is consistent with the assertion of Azar, Machado, Vacas-de-Carvalho and Mendes (2016) that consumers engaged with corporate brands on Facebook because of monetary or other tangible rewards. 11% of the respondents, with a few (4%), agreed that they were prompted to visit the Facebook pages of FANMILK and KASAPREKO, respectively, with hope of getting rewarded.

All 200 respondents were further asked the question, “How often do you visit the Facebook pages of FANMILK or KASAPREKO?” Analysis of their responses indicates that 110 (55%) of them, representing the majority, visited the companies’ Facebook pages once in a while. Out of the 110 respondents, 68 and 42 respondents visited KASAPREKO and FANMILK’s Facebook pages respectively. This was followed by 41 respondents who rarely visited KASAPREKO’s page, and 33 respondents who also did same with FANMILK. The remaining 8% and 9% visited KASAPREKO and FANMILK pages everyday respectively. This means that majority of the respondents were not dedicated to engaging with the corporate organisations on Facebook or had other reasons for not doing so. The followers were either not self- motivated or socially- motivated to engage with the corporate organisations on Facebook.
In conclusion, analysis of the findings for research question one indicates that respondents had different motivations for engaging with KASAPREKO and FANMILK on Facebook. For instance, some followed with the motivation of getting information on new or forthcoming products; for information on product use; for information on events; and for information about the organisation’s location and branches. Other respondents also followed KASAPREKO on Facebook for quick response to product or service complaints; for reward or promotion for followers; because of their interest in KASAPREKO’s products, as well as their interest in the organisation. Concerning what prompted followers to visit the Facebook pages of KASAPREKO and FANMILK, most respondents did so when these organisations introduced new products onto the market since they had an interest in them.

The findings of research question one confirmed the assumptions of the Uses and Gratification theory that audiences are not passive consumers of media, rather, they engage with brands online for specific gratifications. Also, these findings are consistent with Zaglia (2013), whose findings revealed that consumers’ motivations for engaging with a company’s social media platform include getting information tailored to specific members’ needs. The findings are also in agreement with Navarro, Moreno and Al- Sumait’s (2017) study which identified the need to be informed about organisations’ new, future or current products as a motivation for stakeholders’ engagement with corporate social media pages.

4.3 RQ2: How do followers perceive contents or activities on corporate Facebook pages?

This research question sought to investigate how followers perceived of the management of the corporate Facebook pages of KASAPREKO and FANMILK. In this regard, six items, all geared towards answering this major research question, were presented to 200 respondents to ‘strongly
agree,’ ‘agree,’ ‘neutral,’ disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree.’ Firstly, the study attempted to look at what respondents perceived of the level of interactivity on the corporate Facebook pages. The responses of these followers are analysed and presented in Tables 5a and 5b.

Table 5a: Extent of interactivity on KASAPREKO’s Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KASAPREKO........</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>solicits feedback from consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows consumers and others to comment on an experience with the organisation or its products and services</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers a direct line of communication with the organisation’s management</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works interactively/directly with consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodates all views and suggestions from their publics</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds immediately to customer complaints</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Out of the 100 respondents, 64%, forming the majority, strongly agreed that KASAPREKO had given consumers and others the opportunity to comment on an experience with the organisations or their products and services on its Facebook page. However, some (7%) did not think so, as they strongly disagreed that they could share their views by commenting on an experience they had KASAPREKO’s products and services on its Facebook page. While 49% of the respondents agreed with the statement ‘KASAPREKO solicits feedback from consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations,’ 24% of them disagreed. Based on the views of the majority, it could be inferred that KASAPREKO was concerned with consumers’ and others’ feedback on product and service improvements and innovations. This is because, the majority
(49%) also agreed that KASAPREKO worked with them directly for its products and service improvement. The implication is that these followers were likely to continue following such corporate entities on their Facebook pages since they had a positive perception of how useful the organisations found their feedback on improving its products and services.

Along the same line, majority (49%) of the followers agreed that KASAPREKO accommodated all views and suggestions from their publics even though about 38% of the respondents disagreed.

It is likely that KASAPREKO allowed its followers to share their views and suggestions, no matter how negative or positive they were, as majority of the respondents alluded. Besides, 54% of the respondents agreed that KASAPREKO responded immediately to customer complaints”.

However, 28% of them disagreed. It is likely that KASAPREKO responded immediately to their customers’ comments and also put up with complaints on their Facebook pages.

Table 5b: Extent of interactivity on FANMILK’s Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FANMILK ........</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>solicits feedback from consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows consumers and others to comment on an experience with the organisation or its products and services</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offers a direct line of communication with the organisation’s management</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works interactively/directly with consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodates all views and suggestions from their publics</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds immediately to customer complaints</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)
From table 5b, respondents, generally, had the perception that FANMILK allowed consumers and others to share an experience they had with the company, its products or service, as majority (69%) indicated. Out of the 100 respondents, 57% also agreed that FANMILK worked directly with its customers for product and service improvements while a few 7% disagreed. In addition, most respondents (54%) perceived that FANMILK offered a direct line of communication with the organisation’s management by giving them the opportunity to share their suggestions and complaints with others on the Facebook page. However, 14% of the respondents disagreed that they were given such an opportunity just because they had access to FANMILK’s Facebook page.

Concerning the rate at which FANMILK responded to customers’ complaints on its Facebook page, 66% of the respondents, representing the majority, agreed while only 12% disagreed. This finding is in agreement with Kwafo’s (2015) study, from which Public Relations practitioners affirmed that their various organisations’ Facebook pages were interactive. The Public Relations practitioners mentioned that they accommodated all views and suggestions of their followers on Facebook. They added that instant feedback from both sides of the communication channel was a key feature of their pages (Kwafo, 2015). This result of the current study is also consistent with the finding of Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, and Gremler (2004), that consumers’ desire for social interaction and the potential to enhance their self-worth were factors that motivated their engagement with corporate brands online.

Further, 200 respondents were presented with a question to indicate “Yes” or “No” to the item “Has following FANMILK or KASAPREKO’s page on Facebook influenced your perception of the organisation in any way?” Out of this number, 86.5 % of them indicated ‘Yes’ while the remaining 13.5 % indicated ‘No.’ In a follow-up with those who indicated ‘Yes,’ a question was
posed for them to indicate as to why their perception had been influenced and Figures 1a and 1b indicate their responses.

Figure 1a: Influencers of followers KASAPREKO’s perception

From Figure 1, majority (66%) of the followers’ indicated that their perception of KASAPREKO had been influenced because the organisation provided adequate information for its followers. Most respondents indicated that KASAPREKO was interested in providing them with information they thought was acceptable. Others (16%) also perceived that the organisation sought customers’ opinion on its products and services. This explains that majority of the followers were interested in the provision of adequate information on the organisations’ products.
Figure 1b: Influencers of followers of FANMILK’s perception

Similar to KASAPREKO, figure 1b indicates that majority (60%) of the respondents had the perception that FANMILK provided adequate information on its products. Some (16%) respondents perceived that communicators on FANMILK’s Facebook page were interested in their views and suggestion, thus, sought customers’ opinions on its products and services. This group was followed by those who perceived that FANMILK responded to their complaints on its Facebook page (14%). Lastly, respondents who represented 10% of the sample thought that communicators considered their comments useful to their organisation, thus, responded to them. These findings established that FANMILK used its Facebook page to gather first-hand information from their stakeholders through seeking their customers’ opinions. Also, FANMILK capitalised on the advantages of using social media for corporate communication by providing them with adequate information, as well as responding to comments and complaints instantly. As Dornyo (2014) posited, Facebook helped with getting feedback from an organisation’s audience.

To fully ascertain the perceptions of followers on the contents or activities on corporate Facebook pages, all the 200 respondents were given the opportunity to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 = strongly
disagree…strongly agree, the extent of professionalism on the platforms. Tables 6a and 6b indicate their responses regarding how professionally corporate communicators related to followers on their corporate Facebook pages.

Table 6a: Extent of Professionalism on KASAPREKO Facebook pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posts are sensitive to cultural or religious issues</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know when to post what</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses language I easily understand</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything posted on Facebook is true</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly updates the contents</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relates politely with followers</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

As illustrated in Table 6a, out of the 100 respondents, majority (57%) agreed that they understood the contents posted by KASAPREKO, since the language used was easy while 11% disagreed. Concerning how the organisation related with their followers on Facebook, majority (55%) of the respondents agreed that the communicators engaged with them politely while a few (5%) disagreed. In addition, while 51% of the respondents agreed that the organisation knew what and when post, some (15%) indicated otherwise. What this might mean is that, KASAPREKO knew the kind of contents to post at the right time on its Facebook page. It was therefore not surprising when 47% of the respondents agreed that KASAPREKO regularly updated the contents and activities on its Facebook page, even though 20% of them disagreed.
Table 6b: Extent of Professionalism on FANMILK Facebook pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posts are sensitive to cultural or religious issues</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knows when to post what</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses language I easily understand</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything posted on Facebook is true</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regularly update the contents</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relates politely with followers</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Table 6b indicates that, out of the 100 respondents, majority 60% neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, ‘posts on Facebook are sensitive to cultural or religious issues,’ while a few 3% of them strongly disagreed. Also, respondents had the perception that FANMILK politely engaged with its followers on Facebook, since majority (60%) of them agreed to the statement that sought to investigate the organisation’s relation with them. Only a few (5%) indicated that FANMILK did not relate politely with them.

In addition, most (56%) agreed to the statement, “FANMILK knows when to post what” on its Facebook page while 11% disagreed. FANMILK’s posts on Facebook were perceived to be true by their followers, as majority (53%) of the respondents indicated, though only 8% of them disagreed. Out of the 100 respondents, majority (51%) agreed that FANMILK regularly updated contents on its Facebook page while 4% strongly disagreed.

Also, concerning followers’ comprehension of what was posted by FANMILK on its Facebook page, most (52%) of them alluded that they understood the contents and activities because the language used was easy. However, some (16%) of the respondents had the perception that FANMILK did not use language they easily understood.
In conclusion, majority of the followers had fairly positive perceptions of the contents or activities on the corporate Facebook pages of FANMILK and KASAPREKO. From the findings, respondents affirmed that the organisations’ Facebook pages were interactive. Corporate communicators allowed them to share their views and responded to them. Respondents also perceived that the communicators related with them and managed the pages professionally. This finding supports the assertion of (Weinberg & Pehlivan, 2011; Fournier & Avery, 2011; Habibi, Richard, & Laroche, 2013; Yan, 2011) that marketers often interacted with consumers on Facebook pages to provide information about their brands, which can influence their perceptions.

4.4 RQ3: What expectations do corporate organisations’ Facebook followers have with relation to their activities and contents?

The purpose of this research question was to determine what followers of corporate organisations (FANMILK and KASAPREKO) expected from them. It went further to find out: whether the contents and activities met their expectation; their reactions towards the contents they came across; and their reasons for taking these actions.

All the 200 followers sampled were asked to respond to the item, “Have you come across news feed from FANMILK or KASAPREKO on your timeline?” This question was to determine if followers had been seeing posts of FANMILK and KASAPREKO on their personal Facebook pages.

Analysis of their responses indicates that a majority 88% and 96% representing KASAPREKO and FANMILK respectively, indicated “Yes” while the remaining minority (12% and 4%) indicated “No.” This means that most respondents did see FANMILK and KASAPREKO’s Facebook posts, thus, they reached a substantial number of their followers. Since majority of the
respondents had come across such posts, it was possible to determine whether the contents met the expectations of the followers. More than half of the respondents (69% and 76%), representing KASAPREKO and FANMILK, indicated that they often paid attention to the organisations’ contents on their news feed. It was also indicated by 19% and 16% of the respondents that they sometimes paid attention to KASAPREKO and FANMILK’s Facebook’s posts respectively. Also, 12% said they did not pay attention to KASAPREKO’s news feed, and 8% of the study sample for FANMILK indicated same.

All the 180 respondents, representing 90% of the total, who indicated either they often or sometimes paid attention to the contents, were further asked to specify the kind of posts that got their attention on their news feed. Figures 2a and 2b illustrate the kind of contents that followers of KASAPREKO and FANMILK paid attention to, thus what was of interest to them.

![Figure 2a: Kind of KASAPREKO Contents Followers Pay Attention to on their news feed.](image)

From figure 2a, among the various types of contents posted on the Kasapreko’s Facebook page, advertisements were the most intrusive. Majority (55%) of the respondents indicated that they were likely to pay attention to posts that advertised KASAPREKO’s products. However, posts that
requested customer appraisal were less likely to be noticed, since a few (3%) of them paid attention to them. Based on these responses, it could be inferred that when information or issues were addressed through advertisements, there was a high possibility of reaching more followers than posts in other formats.

![Figure 2b](image_url) Kind of Contents Facebook Followers of FANMILK Pay Attention to on their news feed.

As shown in figure 2b, majority of the respondents (57%) paid attention to advertisements. Only a few (5%) of the followers paid attention to posts that requested customer appraisal. This could mean that most flowers have in interest in the products of FANMILK. Similar to KASAPREKO’s finding, information that are channeled through advertisements had a high possibility of being noticed by the followers.

Respondents were asked to give reasons for paying attention to a particular content. They paid attention to advertisements because they got additional information on new products introduced by the organisations. In addition, respondents found information in advertisements important, informative and interesting, and some paid attention because they had an interest in new content.
Concerning respondents’ reasons for paying attention to posts that requested customers’ appraisal, some found these contents essential to the companies’ growth. Respondents had keen interest in event, thus they paid attention to event promotion contents. Another reason that made respondents pay attention to posts on ‘product information’ was because they used the organisations’ products. Finally, some reasons identified by those who paid attention to posts that provided general information were: their love for interesting posts on Facebook and the likelihood of the posts communicating information that might be relevant to them.

Further, all the respondents were asked to indicate their preferred formats of posts. Tables 7a and 7b give the preferred formats of posts by followers of KASAPREKO and FANMILK respectively, thus, how they expected the corporate entities to post on their Facebook pages.

### Table 7a: Preferred Formats of post (KASAPREKO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Format</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Audio-visual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Audio, Audio-visual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text, Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text, Audio-visual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text, Audio, Audio-visual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text, Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text, Audio, Audio-visual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Among the formats of posts followers wanted, table 7a indicates that contents presented in audio-visuals were preferred by most of the respondents for the KASAPREKO study sample. This is because 34% of them expected posts to be in audio-visual formats only. In addition, some
respondents preferred either audio-visuals or other posts (picture, text, audio). Also, some (29%) preferred posts in picture formats while 2% preferred picture, text, audio or audio-visual. Only 1% of the respondents preferred pictures, audio, as well as audio-visual formats. While most of the followers wanted KASAPREKO to post only in audio-visual or only picture formats, there were few respondents who preferred either picture, text, audio or audio-visual. The implication of this finding is that most of KASAPREKO’s posts that were in forms of audio-visuals and pictures were likely to draw the attention of followers, and influence their consumption of the message, as compared to other formats.

Table 7b: Preferred Formats of post (FANMILK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Format</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Audio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Audio-visual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Audio, Audio-visual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text, Audio</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text, Audio-visual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture, Text, Audio, Audio-visual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text, Audio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text, Audio, Audio-visual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Table 7b indicates that respondents for the FANMILK study sample preferred Facebook posts that came in audio-visual formats, as majority alluded. Preference for posts in only pictures came after audio-visual as 21% of the respondents indicated. Respondents who preferred posts in either picture or audio-visual formats represented 12% of the total while only 1% preferred posts in either
picture, text, audio or audio-visual formats. From these findings, Facebook posts in audio-visual forms were ideal for respondents of the FANMILK study.

Respondents were further asked to identify actions they took when they came across posts made by KASAPREKO and FANMILK on their Facebook pages. Their responses are depicted in Figure 3. From the illustration below, it is evident that 36.5% of the respondents only read or watched Facebook posts of KASAPREKO and FANMILK, with only 4% of them discussing them with their Facebook friends. About 6% of them discussed those posts with friends outside Facebook. Those that ‘liked’ the posts and commented on them were 25% and 10% respectively. What this means is that followers reacted differently to posts on KASAPREKO and FANMILK’s Facebook pages.

Figure 3: Actions taken by Respondents

All the 100 respondents were equally asked to point out the type(s) of post(s) on KASAPREKO’s Facebook page they would ‘LIKE’. Their responses are analysed and presented in Tables 8a and 8b.
Table 8a: Types of posts Respondents would ‘LIKE’ (KASAPREKO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of post</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General information</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion, General information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion, Product information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Product information</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, General information</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, Product</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, Request</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, General information, Prod Info</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, General information, Request</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion, Product information, Request</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Table 8a shows that 25% of the respondents were most likely to click on the ‘LIKE’ button if they came across advertisements on the Facebook page of KASAPREKO. This was followed by posts on either Advertisements, Event promotion or General information, as 15% of the respondents indicated. Quite a significant number (10%) indicated that they would ‘like’ posts that either advertised KASAPREKO’s products or provided them with information about what the organisation manufactures. To ‘LIKE’ a post implies that the content appealed to the followers in terms of concept and information and this causes them to show approval by ‘LIKING.’ This implies that most respondents were interested in KASAPREKO’s advertisements as compared to other posts, thus, their decision to ‘like’ such contents.
Table 8b: Types of posts Respondents would ‘LIKE’ (FANMILK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of post</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion, General information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion, Product information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Product information</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, General information</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, Product</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, Request</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, General information, Prod Info</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, General information, Request</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion, Product information, Request</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

Table 8b indicates that 22% of the respondents would ‘like’ either advertisement, posts that promoted events or those that gave them general information. This was followed by respondents (15%) who would ‘like’ only FANMILK’s advertisements posted on its Facebook page. Also, 12% of the respondents were most likely to ‘like’ posts on event promotion. This meant that followers of FANMILK’s page had multiple needs that posts fulfilled. It could also imply that FANMILK posts different forms of contents which interests their followers therefore they tend to show their approval with the ‘LIKE’ button.
Table 9a: Type(s) of post followers like to share (KASAPREKO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of post</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product information</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion, Product information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Product information</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, General</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, Product</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, Event promotion, Request</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements, General information, Product</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Owusu (2019)

From table 9a, 25% of the respondents were likely to share only posts that advertised KASAPREKO’s products. This was followed by 16% who would share only posts on event promotion. Also, 12% were likely to share posts that provided information KASAPREKO’s products while 11 % would have done same for either those that advertised or provided product information. A few (3%) were likely to share posts that provided general information. This implies that KASAPREKO may be designing their advertisements in a way that appeals to their followers. As a result, their followers ‘share’ these advertisements with others who might not be on the page. This has the ability of generating a larger Facebook followership for KASAPREKO.

The implication of this finding is that posts made by KASAPREKO in the form of advertisements and events promotions were likely to reach a much larger audience since most followers were likely to share such posts.
From table 9b, majority (30%) of the respondents in the study sample for FANMILK preferred to share posts on only advertisements while a few (2%) preferred to share both posts that promoted events and those that provided information about FANMILK’s products. Equal number of respondents (15%) indicated that they were likely to share posts that promoted events and those that provided them with information on products manufactured by the organisation. Also, some respondents, representing 10% of the sample preferred to share either posts that informed them on what the organisation produces or advertisements. Also, a few (8%) would share contents that advertised FANMILK’s products, those that promoted events as well as those on general information that were not tailored specifically to promote their product. This implies that the followers of FANMILK were genuinely interested in making the organisation and its posts visible to others on Facebook. Whereas the sharing of adverts does not necessarily translate to a higher
patronage of their products, it is likely to provide extra exposure to others who might not have information about the company, its products and services.

Relating these findings to the assertion of Berger and Milkman (2012), positive content is more viral (get shared the most) than negative content, and followers would share contents they found pleasing. Since advertisements usually promote products or services, and majority of the followers were likely to share such posts, which are usually for a positive reason, the current study is in agreement with the finding of Berger and Milkman (2012).

In conclusion, advertisements, event promotion, and product information were the most contents expected by followers on corporate Facebook pages. Majority of the respondents preferred these posts to be in audio-visual formats. Also, followers were most likely to share posts on advertisements and event promotions since they were interested in such contents. These findings are supported by the assumptions of the Expectancy theory. The theory posits that the possibility of people to act in a way depends on the strength of their expectations that the act will be followed by an outcome that they find relevant.

From the findings, majority of the respondents expected organisations to post advertisements on their Facebook pages. Consequently, they were likely to react to (like, comment, share) more posts on advertisements. This means that stakeholders’ engagement with corporate Facebook pages is much frequent when their expectations are met. Researchers and commentators such as Habibi, Richard and Laroche (2013), de Vries, Gensler and Leeflang (2012), Gensler, Völckner, Liu-Thompkins and Wiertz (2013), Genseler et al. (2013) also reached similar findings and conclusions with the current study. In addition, de Vries, Gensler and Leeflang (2012), in their study, observed that organisations could share photos, videos, and product information with followers on Facebook, who further shared same with their friends.
4.5 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, there were presentations and analyses of data gathered on stakeholders’ perceptions of contents of corporate organisations Facebook pages. Data was coded using the Statistical package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 22. Statistical tools such as frequency and percentage were used to analyse the data. Discussions were then made to make meaning of the data collected. The interpretations of the figures were further used to either confirm or dispute finding of related literature on the subject matter. Finally, the results were used to answer the research questions developed by the researcher. The study found that most followers engaged with FANMILK and KASAPREKO with the motivation of getting information on new or forthcoming products, as majority of the respondents confirmed. The followers also expected organisations to post more advertisements, and have fairly positive perceptions of the contents or activities that FANMILK and KASAPREKO post on their corporate Facebook pages.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter summarises the findings of the study, draws conclusions, and makes recommendations for future studies. The study examined the expectations and perceptions of stakeholders on contents and activities of the corporate Facebook pages of Kasapreko Company Limited and Fan Milk Limited, Ghana. Specifically, the study sought reasons for stakeholders’ engagement with corporates organisations on Facebook, assessed what the followers perceived on the contents or activities of corporate Facebook pages, and finally examined the expectations of corporate Facebook pages’ followers.

5.1 Summary of key findings

The study found reasons for stakeholders’ engagement with corporates organisations on Facebook. For instance, some followed with the motivation of getting information on new or forthcoming products and for quick response to product or service complaints. Others followed the same corporate entities because they needed information on events, product use and the organisations’ location and branches. Reward or promotion for followers and interest in the organisations’ products were also motivations that influenced respondents to follow the pages. In addition, it was found that majority of the followers of FANMILK and KASAPREKO visited the organisations when they wanted quick responses to product or service complaints.

The study also discovered that followers had fairly positive perceptions of the contents and activities on the Facebook pages of FANMILK and KASAPREKO. The organisations’ Facebook
pages were considered by the followers as interactive, and they were perceived to be managed professionally. The followers established that corporate communicators solicited feedback on product and service improvements and innovations from them; they allowed consumers and others to comment on their experience with the organisations, their products or services, and most importantly, responded immediately to customer complaints. Owing to this, majority of the followers indicated that how the pages were managed, as well how corporate communicators related to them on the pages had influenced their perceptions positively about the organisations.

Concerning the expectations of followers, the study found that they wanted the organisations to post more advertisements on their pages. The followers indicated that they were likely to react to (like, comment or share) posts that advertised new products introduced by the organisations. Also, majority of the followers preferred KASAPREKO and FANMILK’s Facebook posts to be in audio-visual formats.

5.2 Limitations of the study

The first limitation of the study is that it focused on only two organisations in the food and beverage manufacturing sectors. That makes it impossible to generalise the findings to other corporate organisations, let alone sectors.

Another limitation of the study was the challenge with obtaining relevant literature related to perceptions of social media followers of corporate organisations in Ghana. Most studies found on stakeholder engagement on social media focused on motivations and expectations. It therefore made it difficult for the current study to draw on, and relate its findings to others.
5.3 Recommendations for further studies

The researcher conducted the study using Kasapreko Company Limited and Fan Milk Limited, Ghana. It is being suggested that a similar study be carried out on organisations in other sectors in the country for a comprehensive sector-wide research result. Again, further studies should focus on what influences organisation’ decision making concerning what to post on social media. Lastly, a study should be conducted to investigate the presence and viability of organisations on other social media platforms, apart from Facebook.

5.4 Conclusion

This study examined the perceptions of stakeholders on contents and activities on the corporate Facebook pages of Kasapreko Company Limited and Fan Milk Limited, Ghana. Specifically, it sought the reasons for stakeholders’ engagement with corporate organisations on Facebook, assessed what the followers perceived on the contents or activities on corporate Facebook pages. this was done by conducting a survey on the followers of the organisations’ Facebook pages. The present study clearly showed that followers had different motivations for engaging with the corporate entities (KASAPREKO and FANMILK) on Facebook. For instance, some people followed to get information on new or forthcoming products, and for quick response to product or service complaints. Another motivation for stakeholders’ engagement with corporate entities on Facebook are their need for information on products. Reward or promotion for followers’ and was also identified a reason for followers’ engagement with corporate Facebook pages.

It is concluded that followers had fairly positive perceptions of the contents or activities FANMILK and KASAPREKO posted on their corporate Facebook pages. The pages of the were seen to be interactive. Also, corporate communicators who managed the pages were perceived as
professional by the followers. The pages were described as interactive in the sense that feedback was solicited from consumers on product and services and followers received rapid response to their complaints. Managers of the pages were viewed by their followers as professional because they related politely with followers; they regularly updated their pages; and posted truthful information.

FANMILK and KASAPREKO were expected to post more advertisements on their Facebook pages. As a result of followers’ preference for advertisements, they reacted, by liking, sharing, or commenting on contents that advertised new and forthcoming products. Audio-visual posts were largely preferred by the followers since they seemed to get enough information from such contents.
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APPENDIX A

STAKEHOLDERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF CONTENTS AND ACTIVITIES ON CORPORATE FACEBOOK PAGES

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent,

I am conducting a study on stakeholders’ perceptions of contents of organisations’ Facebook pages and would appreciate if you could take a moment to respond to my questionnaire. You are selected because you are one of the followers of FANMILK Limited, Ghana. The research seeks to examine the expectations and perceptions you hold on the contents and activities on FANMILK’s Facebook page.

This is an academic exercise whose findings would inform decisions on what exists and what needs to be done for content generators and recipients to come to common grounds or platform. The questionnaire may take up to 30 minutes to complete. I hope you will be kind enough to answer the questions as best as you can. I wish to assure you that your responses would be treated with utmost respect and confidentiality.

Thank you.

Please tick [✓] where appropriate.

1. Please indicate your gender
   - Male [ ]
   - female [ ]

2. Please specify your age range
   - 18 – 25 [ ]
   - 26 – 30 [ ]
   - 31 – 39 [ ]
   - 40 – 49 [ ]
   - 50 -59 [ ]
   - 60 and above [ ]

3. Level of education
   - Basic [ ]
   - High school/ secondary education [ ]
   - Tertiary [ ]

Other (please specify) .................................................................
4. For how long have you been following FANMILK on Facebook?

Less than 6 months  
I to 5 years  
5 to ten years  
More than 10 years  
Other (please specify) ...........................................................................................................

5. How often do you visit the Facebook page of FANMILK?

Everyday  
Once in a while  
Rarely  
Other (please specify) ...........................................................................................................

6. What prompts you to visit the FANMILK’s Facebook page? (select as many as apply)

When they come out with new products  
When they are organising an event  
When they are in a crisis  
When they are in the news  
When they are rewarding customers or organising promotions  
Other (please specify) ...........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................
7. On a scale of 1 to 5 = strongly disagree… Agree, rate the reasons you may be following FANMILK on Facebook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for information on new or forthcoming products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I want quick response to product or service complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I need information on product use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I need information on events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I need information about the organisation’s location and branches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of reward or promotion for followers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because the page has exciting content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of my interest in their products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of my interest in the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I found most of my friends following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Have you come across news feed from FANMILK on your timeline?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

9. Do you often pay attention to their contents on your news feed?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]

10. Reason for response to question 9?
    ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. What kind of contents would you pay attention to? (select as many as apply)
    Advertisements [ ]  Event promotion [ ]  General information [ ]
    Product information [ ]  Request for customer appraisal [ ]
Other (please specify)
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

12. What is your reason for your choice(s) to question 11?
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

13. In what formats do you prefer FANMILK’s posts to be? (select as many as apply)
Picture  □    Text  □    Audio  □    Audio-visual  □
Other (please specify)
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

14. What is the reason for your choice to question 11?
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

15. What actions do you take when you come across a post from FANMILK on Facebook?
Like the post  □    Share the post  □    Comment  □
Just read or watch  □    Not pay attention  □    Discuss with friends on Facebook  □
Discuss with friends outside Facebook  □

16. What type(s) of post(s) from FANMILK are you likely to ‘LIKE’? (select as many as apply)
Advertisements  □    Event promotion  □    General information
Product information  □    Request for customer appraisal  □
Other (please specify)
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
17. What is your reason for your choice(s) to question 16?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

18. What type(s) of post(s) from FANMILK are you likely to ‘SHARE’? (select as many as apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisements</th>
<th>Event promotion</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product information</th>
<th>Request for customer appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

19. What is your reason for your choice(s) to question 18?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

20. What type(s) of post(s) from FANMILK are you likely to ‘COMMENT’ on? (select as many as apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisements</th>
<th>Event promotion</th>
<th>General information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product information</th>
<th>Request for customer appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

21. What is your reason for your choice(s) to question 20?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………
22. On a scale of 1 to 5 = strongly disagree… Agree, rate the extent of interactivity on FANMILK’S Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK Solicits feedback from consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK Allow consumers and others to comment on an experience with the company/organisation or its products and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK Offers a direct line of communication with the company/organisation’s management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK works interactively/directly with consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK accommodates all views and suggestions from their publics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK responds immediately to customer complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Has following FANMILK’s page on Facebook influenced your perception about the organisation in any way?
Yes ☐ No ☐

24. Perception has been influenced because …
they provide adequate product information ☐
they respond to complaints ☐
they react immediately to comments ☐
they seek customers’ opinion on products and services ☐
25. On a scale of 1 to 5 = strongly disagree… Agree, rate the extent of professionalism on FANMILK’s Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK’s posts on Facebook are sensitive to cultural or religious issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK knows when to post what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK uses language I easily understand on their Facebook wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything FANMILK posts on Facebook is true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK regularly updates the contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANMILK relates politely with followers on Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Apart from Facebook, do you follow FANMILK on other social media networks (Instagram, twitter etc.)?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure ☐

27. What is the reason for your response to question 25?

....................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................

28. What do you think FANMILK should do to improve the management of its Facebook page?

....................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................
Dear Respondent,

I am conducting a study on stakeholders’ perceptions of contents of organisations’ Facebook pages and would appreciate if you could take a moment to respond to my questionnaire. You are selected because you are one of the followers of **KASAPREKO Company Limited**. The research seeks to examine the expectations and perceptions you hold on the contents and activities on Kasapreko’s Facebook page.

This is an academic exercise whose findings would inform decisions on what exists and what needs to be done for content generators and recipients to come to common grounds or platform. The questionnaire may take up to 30 minutes to complete. I hope you will be kind enough to answer the questions as best as you can. I wish to assure you that your responses would be treated with utmost respect and confidentiality.

Thank you.

Please tick [✓] where appropriate.

1. Please indicate your gender
   
   Male  [ ]  female  [ ]

2. Please specify your age range
   
   19 – 25  [ ]  26 – 30  [ ]  31 – 39  [ ]  40 – 49  [ ]  50 – 59  [ ]  60 and above  [ ]

3. Level of education
   
   Basic  [ ]  High school/ secondary education  [ ]  Tertiary  [ ]

Other (please specify)  .................................................................
4. For how long have you been following KASAPREKO on Facebook?

- Less than 6 months
- 1 to 5 years
- 5 to ten years
- More than 10 years
- Other (please specify) …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5. How often do you visit the Facebook page of KASAPREKO?

- Everyday
- Once in a while
- Rarely
- Other (please specify) …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. What prompts you to visit the KASAPREKO’s Facebook page? (select as many as apply)

- When they come out with new products
- When they are organising an event
- When they are in a crisis
- When they are in the news
- When they are rewarding customers or organising promotions
- Other (please specify) …………………………………………………………………………………………………………
7. On a scale of 1 to 5 = strongly disagree… Agree, rate the reasons you may be following KASAPREKO on Facebook?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I follow KASAPREKO on Facebook…</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for information on new or forthcoming products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I want quick response to product or service complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I need information on product use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I need information on events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I need Information about the organisation’s location and branches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of reward or promotion for followers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because the page has exciting content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of my interest in their products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because of my interest in the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because I found most of my friends following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Have you come across news feed from KASAPREKO on your timeline?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

9. Do you often pay attention to their contents on your news feed?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ]

10. Reason for response to question 9?
    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. What kind of contents would you pay attention to? (select as many as apply)
    Advertisements [ ] Event promotion [ ] General information [ ]
    Product information [ ] Request for customer appraisal [ ]
12. Reason for response to question 9?

13. In what formats do you prefer KASAPREKO’s posts to be? (select as many as apply)
Picture ☐   Text ☐   Audio ☐   Audio-visual ☐
Other (please specify)

14. What is the reason for your choice to question 13?

15. What actions do you take when you come across a post from KASAPREKO on Facebook?
Like the post ☐   Share the post ☐   Comment ☐
Just read or watch ☐   Not pay attention ☐   Discuss with friends on Facebook ☐
Discuss with friends outside Facebook ☐

16. What type(s) of post(s) from KASAPREKO are you likely to ‘LIKE’? (select as many as apply)
Advertisements ☐   Event promotion ☐   General information ☐
Product information ☐   Request for customer appraisal ☐
Other (please specify)
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17. What is the reason for your choice(s) to question 16?


18. What type(s) of post(s) from KASAPREKO are you likely to ‘SHARE’? (select as many as apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product information</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for customer appraisal</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What is the reason for your choice(s) to question 18?


20. What type(s) of post(s) from KASAPREKO are you likely to ‘COMMENT’ on? (select as many as apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event promotion</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product information</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for customer appraisal</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. What is the reason for your choice(s) to question 20?


22. On a scale of 1 to 5 = strongly disagree… Agree, rate the extent of interactivity on KASAPREKO’S Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO solicits feedback from consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO allows consumers and others to comment on an experience with the company/organisation or its products and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO offers a direct line of communication with the company/organisation’s management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO works interactively/directly with consumers and others on product and service improvements and innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO accommodates all views and suggestions from their publics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO responds immediately to customer complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Has following KASAPREKO’s page on Facebook influenced your perception about the organisation in any way?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

24. Perception has been influenced because …
   - they provide adequate product information [ ]
   - they respond to complaints [ ]
   - they react immediately to comments [ ]
   - they seek customers’ opinion on products and services [ ]
25. On a scale of 1 to 5 = strongly disagree… Agree, rate the extent of professionalism on KASAPREKO’s Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO’s posts on Facebook are sensitive to cultural or religious issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO knows when to post what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO uses language I easily understand on their Facebook wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything KASAPREKO posts on Facebook is true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO regularly updates the contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASAPREKO relates politely with followers on Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Apart from Facebook, do you follow KASAPREKO on other social media networks (Instagram, twitter etc.)?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Not sure [ ]

27. What is the reason for your response to question 25?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

28. What do you think KASAPREKO should do to improve the management of its Facebook page?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………