BRITISH ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT

BAM CONFERENCE

3RD-5TH SEPTEMBER
ASTON UNIVERSITY BIRMINGHAM UNITED KINGDOM

This paper is from the BAM2019 Conference Proceedings

A Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale for Organisations

Annmarie Hanlon[1], Karen Jones[2], Alison Lawson[3]

Abstract

This paper extends current understanding of social media affordances within an organisational context. Seven affordances were confirmed as being present within the organisational management of social media. Subsequent exploration of the affordances led to the construction of a framework to categorise the variations of application, into different stages, which focused on the levels of maturity demonstrated by interview participants. This framework is introduced as a social media affordances maturity scale. The implication for management is the ability to classify current levels of social media affordances maturity and understand the critical steps needed to move towards greater maturity, thus adopting enlightened management practices in the challenging and changing environment of social media.

---

[1] Corresponding author, University of Derby, personal email: AnnmarieH@evonomie.net

[2] Aston University

[3] University of Derby

Introduction

The growth of social media networks has created challenges and opportunities for organisations and considering the range and scale of social media, it is understandably attractive for organisations, which are keen to use social media to engage with their customers (Powers *et al.*, 2012; Sashittal, Sriramachandramurthy and Hodis, 2012; Argyris and Monu, 2015). However, many organisations have become spectators (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010), as control in corporate communications has transferred to the customers (Kietzmann *et al.*, 2011) as they fail to manage their social media application.

Whilst some organisations have succeeded in this quest to capture customer attention, others, including major brands, have failed publicly (Gallaugher and Ransbotham, 2010; Labrecque, 2014). Whilst extant research into social media has considered different areas such as online communities (Kozinets, 1999; Muñiz, Jr. and Schau, 2007; Adjei, Noble and Noble, 2009; Wilcox and Stephen, 2013), user types in varied settings (Muntinga, Moorman and Smit, 2011; Tsai and Men, 2013; Whiting and Williams, 2013; Bulut and Dogan, 2017) and the consumer experience (Pham, 2013; Lemon and Verhoef, 2016), the gaps in knowledge concerning the application of social media by organisations is acknowledged by Lamberton and Stephen (2016), who stated that there is still concern 'in understanding how digital (and particularly social and mobile) activity generates quantifiable marketing outcomes of value' (p. 163).

Furthermore, Lamberton and Stephen (2016) observed that although in practice, digital marketing had become crucial, there was a paucity in methods of management. Thus, the call for more research into the domain of social media and its application to organisations continues and the lack of empirical evidence within an organisational setting remains. There is a gap concerning the benefits of social media marketing by organisations.

Additionally, there is a lack of instruments to manage the application of social media for organisations and thus this paper presents a new construct. Firstly, considering benefits through the lens of affordances theory, with evidence derived from on an online survey and secondly, assembling the affordances within a maturity model, based on subsequent interviews.

Literature review

The everyday application of social media by organisations has been less considered than the practice of social media by individuals, which has been explored by several scholars through, for example, the uses and gratifications framework (Shao, 2009; Muntinga, Moorman and Smit, 2011; Whiting and Williams, 2013; Luchman, Bergstrom and Krulikowski, 2014).

As Fournier and Avery (2011, p. 193) presciently identified 'Brands rushed into social media, viewing social networks, video sharing sites, online communities, and microblogging sites as the panacea to diminishing returns in traditional mass media.' Whilst the opportunities were identified, it was recognised that social media are both changing and challenging the traditional business dynamic (Hanna, Rohm and Crittenden, 2011; Korschun and Du, 2013; Rapp *et al.*, 2013), whilst creating marketing contributions for organisations at many asynchronous levels and further transforming organisational processes (Fulgoni and Lipsman, 2014; McTaggart and Benina, 2014). As a consequence, social media presents marketing opportunities for organisations (Dollinger, 2015; Mills and Plangger, 2015). Consequently, researchers have explored positive aspects of social media application for organisations including: creating awareness and generating sales with existing customers (Järvinen *et al.*,

2012; Qu *et al.*, 2013; Tsimonis and Dimitriadis, 2014b); influencing purchase decisions (Zhang, Craciun and Shin, 2010); launching new products and product placement (Dobele, Steel and Cooper, 2015; Liu, Chou and Liao, 2015; Candi *et al.*, 2018); brand promotion (Jansen *et al.*, 2009; Aladwani, 2015); customer relationship management (Hennig-Thurau *et al.*, 2010; Harrigan *et al.*, 2015; Verma, Sharma and Sheth, 2015; Kumar *et al.*, 2016); customer services (Canhoto and Clark, 2013); and brand engagement (de Vries, Gensler and Leeflang, 2012; Hollebeek, Glynn and Brodie, 2014). Yet how these benefits for organisations are applied, remains unclear.

Affordances, a neologism divined by Gibson (1979) in the domain of ecological psychology, although often attributed to Norman (1988), represent opportunities for action (Gibson, 1979) and positive affordances provide benefits for business (Argyris and Monu, 2015).

Considered as a multivalent theory, the construct of affordances has been used in fields including psychology (Gibson, 1979, 1986; Chemero, 2003), product design (Norman, 1988), sociology (Hutchby, 2001), communication theory (Argyris and Monu, 2015; Nagy and Neff, 2015; Evans *et al.*, 2017), tourism (Cabiddu, de Carlo and Piccoli, 2014), local and national government practice (Klang and Nolin, 2011; Malsbender, Hofmann and Becker, 2014; Chen *et al.*, 2016), human computer interaction design (Pols, 2012; Zhao *et al.*, 2013), and technology (Gaver, 1991; McGrenere and Ho, 2000; Markus and Silver, 2008).

Furthermore, affordances as a lens has been used in aspects of social media, although largely applied to individuals, concerning societal issues such as: digital activism (Earl and Kimport, 2013); micro-volunteering (Ilten, 2015); changing online behaviour (Wellman *et al.*, 2006; boyd, 2010; Rathnayake and Suthers, 2018); digital labour (Postigo, 2016); privacy (Trepte, 2015); and identity (Khazraee and Novak, 2018). Whilst affordances have been used in many domains, led by ecological psychology, which witnessed the nominalisation, there are differing perspectives concerning its construct. Those espousing the original work of Gibson (1979, 1986), considered affordances as properties of the environment which provide potential for action, and recognised the relational and contextual aspects of affordances. A different, less complex and functional perspective of the features of the technology, was originally proposed by Gaver (1991), which heralded the application of affordances as the features of the technology. According to Treem and Leonardi (2013), this may be as the utility of affordances explained 'why people using the same technology may engage in similar or disparate communication and work practices' (p. 146).

Extracting the functional aspects of social media platforms to explicate affordances as features of a technology that facilitated action, is a notion followed by several scholars exploring social media (Treem and Leonardi, 2013; Ilten, 2015; Postigo, 2016; Karahanna *et al.*, 2018; Rathnayake and Suthers, 2018), as well as in other domains, where the materiality and functionality of the features, without the connection to social impact, was investigated (Ellison and Vitak, 2014).

A further categorisation of affordances was provided by Bucher and Helmond (2018, p. 12), who considered 'high-level and low-level affordances', where the high-level represented Gibson's abstract definition, and the low-level comprised the functional features of technology. Whilst this classified the two positions, the low-level emanated from the realms of design and technology (Norman, 1988; Smets, Overbeeke and Gaver, 1994), where practical action was sought. However, some scholars merged the two levels (Majchrzak *et al.*, 2013; McVeigh-Schultz and Baym, 2015; Khazraee and Novak, 2018; Rathnayake and

Suthers, 2018), deeming affordances to comprise both the high-level properties of the environment and its action potential, as well as the low-level functional features of a technology that facilitated action.

Whilst affordances have been applied within several domains, including marketing, the ontological debate concerning the nature of affordances remains, thus this paper seeks to harness affordances theory, as applied to social media, within an organisational setting, based on the high-level concept of the benefits found, rather than embedded functionality.

To date, there has been less exploration of affordances of social media by organisations. Treem and Leonardi (2013), reviewed studies that considered the use of social media in organisations and identified four affordances of social media: visibility, persistence, editability, and association. Their notion of visibility concerned 'the amount of effort people must expend to locate information' (Treem and Leonardi, 2013, p. 150); this is part of Gibson's (1979), and Norman's (1999), original concept, that perceived affordances pertained to vision. Thus for an affordance to exist, it must be visible, or when Gaver (1991), developed the notion, be perceptible to auditory or tactile senses. Gibson and Norman asserted that an affordance had to be perceived to exist and the level of effort would depend upon the agency and the context. Thus attributing visibility as an affordance demonstrates a lack of comprehension of the original texts – without some form of visibility there could be no perceived affordance.

Another aspect to affordances is constancy, or remaining static, which was interpreted by boyd (2010), and Treem and Leonardi (2013), who propounded that online content remains available, once the user has left the platform and thus this second affordance of persistence resonated with the notion of variance from Gibson (1979), and McGrenere and Ho (2000), insomuch as the affordance was invariant and lacked the possibility to change. However, this concept of always available content, an affordance termed 'fixity' by Graves (2007, p. 341), fails to recognise the fluidity and malleability of online tools and thus affordances cannot be static (Heft, 2003). For example, online content can be deleted by users (Rheingold, 1993; Dean, 2010), which is a function made available through several platforms (Facebook Inc., 2012; Schmidt and O'Connor, 2015), or erased by the platform (Langvardt, 2018), or removed by request within a privacy framework (Verčič, Verčič and Sriramesh, 2015) and thus can change. Whilst there are exceptions, such as deleted tweets from politicians which can be immediately captured by online tools such as Politwoops (Meeks, 2018), there is nonetheless, the possibility that online content is subject to alteration. Furthermore, several social media platforms where content was present have been discontinued and access to the content is no longer available (for example; Google Buzz - closed 2011, Gowalla - closed 2012, Friends Reunited - closed 2016, YikYak - closed 2017), removing the notion of all online material being ever-present. Therefore identifying persistence within an online setting as an affordance lacks validity.

Nagy and Neff (2015), claimed to introduce their notion of imagined affordance as being dynamic and having the capacity to change, suggesting this had hitherto not been recognised within affordances. However, Turvey (1992, p. 175), had earlier acknowledged the notion of dynamism 'there are no changeless things and there are no thingless changes; there are only changing things', as did Heft (2003, p. 171), who appreciated the potential of a changed or altered state within affordances whereby 'features of the environment can possess alternative affordances at different times in the context of different encounters'. Comprehending affordances outside a static state, Heft (2003) suggested that these intended or unintended

changes could occur due to environmental, geographical, behavioural, or sociocultural contexts. Thus it appears that the article by Nagy and Neff (2015), failed to consider earlier pertinent work.

Editability was a further affordance proposed by Treem and Leonardi (2013), where users could edit content before, or after, sharing in an online setting. They argued that the ability to alter content enabled actors to manipulate shared information. Moreover, actors could focus specific messages to certain groups and ameliorate the original content. This element of publishing control is a long-recognised feature within several social media platforms that has been recognised by others (Walther, 2011; Crowston and Fagnot, 2018). Thus editability could be acknowledged as a functional affordance, although it is considered a key aspect of social media (Knobel and Lankshear, 2007; Palfrey and Gasser, 2008; Vuori and Jussila, 2016).

The final affordance promulgated by Treem and Leonardi (2013), was association between individuals. This element of connection or tie strength (Granovetter, 1973), was one of the core attributes surrounding the relationships between actors. However, the notion of connections is not an affordance, it is the *raison d'être* for many social media networks.

More recently Hauge (2018), addressed affordances within an organisational setting, linking the concept to 'situated valuation' (p. 245), and observed that affordances had utility as 'a lens for understanding the influence of technology' (p. 253), which validated earlier work from Fayard and Weeks (2014), who considered that affordances offered a context for exploring technology within different settings.

The construct of affordances lacks clarity, which has been acknowledged by several scholars (McGrenere and Ho, 2000; Markus and Silver, 2008; Parchoma, 2014; Nagy and Neff, 2015; Evans *et al.*, 2017) and is perceived as having many meanings (Bucher and Helmond, 2018). However, the obscurity is not surprising with scholars taking opposing views in their own work, such as Gaver (1991, p. 79), who considered affordances as 'fundamental objects of perception' yet contradicted this notion by claiming that affordances were equally independent of perception. Furthermore, Norman (1998), admitted that his own definition lacked clarity and subsequently revised – or perhaps refined (following discussions with Gibson) – his initial phraseology and stated that 'there can be both real and perceived affordances' (Norman, 1999, p. 39).

This lack of clarity is compounded as affordances have been variously described as:

⟩ niche – occupying a specific place based on social construction and agency (Gibson, 1979)
⟩ false - they do not exist (Gaver, 1991)
⟩ hidden - lacking materiality (Gaver, 1991)
⟩ nested – they are dependent on other elements that are grouped or layered (Gaver, 1991; McGrenere and Ho, 2000; McVeigh-Schultz and Baym, 2015)
⟩ perceptible - demonstrating materiality and affected by agency and social construction founded on the presence or absence of perceptible information (Gaver, 1991)
⟩ imagined – similar to perceptible and combined with the expected affordance which is linked to materiality (Nagy and Neff, 2015)
⟩ vernacular – where the actors are involved with sense-making to gain the affordance (McVeigh-Schultz and Baym, 2015)

$)$ constrained – where not all affordances are the same (Hutchby, 2001).

Associated with the lack of lucid articulation around the terminology is a further weakness surrounding the absence of a coherent theory of affordances. Several scholars have attempted to progress the theory (McGrenere and Ho, 2000; Michaels, 2000; Chemero, 2003; Evans *et al.*, 2017), yet many simply utilise Gibson's original concept.

Whilst more work is required to better explicate the theory of affordances, this paper has initially sought to elucidate the construct of affordances as a framework to locate social media benefits for organisations. The next section will demonstrate how the different application of affordances were categorised within a framework to better understand opportunities for better organisational management of social media.

Method / conceptual framework
This paper is based on a mixed methods study, to gather different types of data and add richness, adopting an explanatory mixed-methods sequential design process (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2018), commencing with an online quantitative survey, followed by qualitative interviews, as this offered: (i) the possibility to use major themes from the first research phase; and (ii) the possibility to recruit a subset of participants for the qualitative phase from the quantitative phase.

As the first research phase was to explain a situation, an online survey was deployed. These have increased in popularity as the responses collected are simultaneously stored and ready for analysis (Vehovar and Manfreda, 2008), and there is wide availability of cost-effective online survey software systems (Hewson, Vogel and Laurent, 2016). However disadvantages include the non-response problem (Vehovar and Manfreda, 2008; Park and Fesenmaier, 2012), as participants may choose not to respond or withdraw during the questionnaire due to sensitive topics being raised or sensitive answers being required (Albaum, Roster and Smith, 2014). The population of interest comprised those working in marketing and lists of closed populations were accessed which represented a range of jobs roles, sectors, ages and skill sets. Thus in the absence of traditional random selection this was considered as a non-probability sample.

Adopting a mixed-methods approach, the quantitative survey results informed areas to explore in the second research phase, following an explanatory mixed-methods sequential design (Creswell and Creswell, 2005). Thus this qualitative approach was to add richness and further investigate areas of significance or interest that were identified in research phase one. The interview method was selected as 'a conversation that has a structure and a purpose' (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009, p. 3).

Results
In the online survey (research phase one) a total of 756 surveys were returned of which nine respondents (1.9%) did not consent to their data being used and were withdrawn as they were thus ineligible. Fifty respondents (6.6%) did not use social media at work and were therefore ineligible and immediately exited from the survey. Subsequently, 246 respondents (32.9%) answered no further questions after question 3, thus providing 448 useable surveys. The 448 respondents represented a range of job roles, with 149 in the C-suite (chief executive, chief marketing officer), 169 in manager roles, 55 specialists, 60 juniors and 15 academics. A range of sectors were represented with the smallest being utilities and automotive with 6 respondents in each and the largest being professional services with 63 respondents.

The online survey was used to ascertain the presence of the positive affordances that provided benefits for business. Of the 448 respondents, between 94 and 410 confirmed that they gained the following affordances: entertainment (n=232), offers (n=239), interaction (n=410), reviews (n=157), customer service (n=239), customer segmentation (n=122), brand management (n=272). Thus these were designated to be explored further in the semi-structured interviews.

For research phase two, there were 197 respondents who indicated that they would be willing to help further. All participants were contacted by email and twenty-six semi-structured interviews were completed where data saturation (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2011) was achieved. The knowledge of the participants was informed through a broad selection of sectors, comprising: charity, construction and materials, education, food and beverage, manufacture, media, professional services, retail, software and IT, travel & leisure, and utilities. Most of the respondents were in more senior roles: C-suite (n=12), manager (n=9), specialist (n=3) and junior (n=2). A range of sectors was represented: professional services (n= 8), education (n= 4), charity (n=3), retail (n=2), software and IT (n=2), travel and leisure (n=2), construction and materials (n=1), food and beverage (n=1), manufacture (n=1), media (n=1), and utilities (n=1).

The participants in the interviews responded on behalf of their organisations and demonstrated that they were at different stages of application of the social media affordances. Some social media affordances were embraced and others were actively avoided. Table 1 shows a summary of where participants applied, avoided or adopted an inconsistent approach towards the affordances.

Table 1 - Affordances and responses from participants in the interviews, concerning their organisation

AFFORDANCES	NO	MIXED	YES
To entertain customers	9	6	11
To provide offers	13	7	6
To interact with customers	3		23
To gain reviews	8		18
To deliver customer service	5		21
For customer segmentation	14		12
For brand management	1		25

Thus the participants confirmed seven affordances gained from social media for their organisations, to varying degrees. Some participants avoided certain affordances or addressed them at a basic level, whereas others had a more sophisticated and sometimes automated approach. Table 2 shows examples of participant quotations concerning the different affordances.

Table 2 - Quotations from interviews concerning their application of affordances

AFFORDANCE	PARTICIPANT QUOTATIONS
To entertain customers	We have like a certain understanding of our customers' kind of sense of humour, so any time we would see kind of like a video from like one of the big sites like (NAME) and stuff like that, that is maybe relevant. We will kind of like take it and put our spin on it, that will appeal to our users, and stuff like that can maybe get you know up to 50 per cent organic reach from our entire following. Whereas normal posts will maybe have you know 10 per cent, it's like you say it's quite a thing if they see something funny or amusing they will tag their friends, or share stuff like that there. So they kind of do that, it's mostly cute things there. (Manager, retail)
To provide offers	We do run various competitions at key times of the year. So that might be Christmas, or in the summer, so we will run small competitions. We don't offer … yeah so it's prizes and competitions as opposed to, offering a discount on a rate or something. (Manager, professional services)
To interact with customers	It is very just sort of rudimentary like what's working, what's not working and what sort of time of day are people interacting with us, and things like that so we can kind of get some very basic data as to what is going on. (C-suite, food and beverages)

Well we analyse, I analyse everything, I'm data-driven that's kind of how I have always operated. So one of these I am looking at, is I am putting an online analysis pack every month, so we all look at all the kind of posts we send out, what sort of engagement rating, engagement score and put together a kind of report. (Manager, manufacture) |
| To gain reviews | A few months ago, we took away the review function from our main page because it was just a place for people to rant about something that had nothing to do with a review. (Junior, charity)

A lot of the time we would request that after a project has finished, as part of our process, we would ask the client if they were happy, to leave us a review on one of the sites, so we can build it into our standard processes, especially with a new client, where we have finished a project. (C-suite, software and IT) |
| To deliver customer service | We don't push our customer service via social channels, but it's sort of, if someone encounters us via our social channels, we can provide a better level of service if we can. (Manager, travel and leisure)

We have standard responses and a bank of standard replies for Facebook messages and emails and everything. (Junior, charity) |

AFFORDANCE	PARTICIPANT QUOTATIONS
For customer segmentation	We are in the process of doing that, as it happens. It is something we have been aware of the possibility of doing, and we are looking at doing, for example a Facebook advertising campaign for the first time, which we have not done before. And part of the benefit of that is to be able to control better who sees them and engages with what we want to be seen and engaged with. So I would say we are kind of at an early stage of that, but we are doing that. (C-suite, professional services)
For brand management	Well one of the reasons that it's there is that if somebody types in, our company name I suppose because people are using social media in their personal lives, it's gone into their professional lives and they are thinking of all the social media, we wanted them to see that we are out there, that we are digitally aware, that we are … we are not stuck in the dark ages. (Specialist, construction and materials)
	From brand management I mean hopefully we are managing the messages around the brand that we wanted to get out, as opposed to going round and policing what other people may or may not have been using our (organisation name) assets for, because that wasn't really a major concern. (C-suite, utilities)

The next section will discuss the affordances identified in the empirical research and the levels of maturity demonstrated by participants in the second research phase, the interviews.

Discussion
Having confirmed the presence of affordances as positive benefits for organisations, the interviews indicated different levels of application and understanding by the participants. Thus a structure was created to categorise the variations of application, into different stages which concerned the levels of maturity demonstrated by participants in the interviews.

Thus the levels of maturity were classified into six parts, ranging from no application, to fully understood and well applied, demonstrating enlightened staff management practices. The six levels commenced with Level 0, where there was no evidence of activity or if application of this affordance was purposefully avoided. The next was Level 1, where there was evidence of an attempted application of the affordance, although there was no process in place. This was followed by Level 2, where the application was *ad hoc* and inconsistent. Level 3, was applied where there was a limited, reactive or basic application of the affordance. The final stages were Level 4, where there was evidence of a standardised and proactive application of the affordance and Level 5, where there was clear evidence of an integrated and agile approach to the application of the affordance. These maturity levels are placed into a scale which considers the different affordances and the levels of maturity, this is termed the social media affordances maturity scale and is shown in Table 3, which explicates the categorisation of each level.

Table 3 - Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale

	AFFORDANCES MATURITY LEVEL					
AFFORDANCE	**0. No activity, application avoided**	**1. Attempted application, no process in place**	**2. Ad hoc and inconsistent application**	**3. Basic application**	**4. Standardised and proactive application**	**5. Integrated and agile application**
To entertain customers	Avoid use of entertainment online	No process in place, trial and error	Occasional use of entertainment, seasonal or event-based	Limited use of entertainment on a manual basis	Proactive use of entertainment and understand customers' humour	Creative use of entertainment and staff empowered to contribute
To provide offers	No use of offers online	No process in place, trial and error	Adding offers on ad hoc basis	Limited promotion, or sharing offers from other organisations	Proactive promotion of offers	Integrated and automated application
To interact with customers	Avoid use of interaction online	No process in place, trial and error	Watching but not fully interacting	Reactive interaction	Proactive interaction with process in place	Integrated application with formal reporting
To gain reviews	No intention to seek reviews via social media	No process in place, trial and error	Inconsistent approach	Reactive approach	Proactive approach with process in place	Integrated and automated application
To deliver customer service	No customer service issues addressed online	No process in place, trial and error	Ad hoc customer service management	Reactive management of customer service	Proactive management of customer service	Integrated and automated application
For customer segmentation	No application of customer segmentation online	No process in place, trial and error	Ad hoc approach to customer segmentation	Reactive approach to customer segmentation	Proactive approach to customer segmentation	Integrated and automated application
For brand management	No application of brand management online	No process in place, trial and error	Brand management on limited basis	Reactive approach to brand management online	Proactive approach to brand management online and aware of brand constructs	Integrated application with empowered staff

To entertain customers

Whilst entertainment is recognised as a motivational factor for individuals in using social media (Shao, 2009; Whiting and Williams, 2013; Hamilton, Kaltcheva and Rohm, 2016), the literature review did not identify entertainment as a purpose for social media usage by organisations. However, as the extant literature indicated the benefit for individuals, this was included within the affordances to be investigated in the online survey and subsequently, entertainment was confirmed as an affordance of social media in both research phases and consequently this finding converged.

Furthermore, there were subtle variations such as understanding customers' emotions and the intertextual use of parody (Boxman-Shabtai, 2018). Whilst the use of parody by consumers has increased (Schroeder, 2017), further research into the use of parody by organisations is required as there is evidence of 'negative effects on attitudes and behaviors toward the parodied sponsoring brands' (Sabri, 2018, p. 533), which may have managerial implications for organisations.

The participants provided examples at all levels within the Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale, from those who avoided entertainment to those who demonstrated an

integrated and agile approach. Hitherto, entertainment as an affordance for organisations was not identified in the extant literature.

To provide offers (sales cycle)
Within organisations, generating sales as an affordance of social media application, included the provision of offers in the form of vouchers and reductions (Andzulis, Panagopoulos and Rapp, 2012; Tsimonis and Dimitriadis, 2014a). This was supported in the extant research and both studies.

Whilst the online survey confirmed offers as an affordance, the interviews provided a mixed response that showed a lack of understanding of the concept of offers, which were variously interpreted as promoting third-party campaigns, promoting the organisation's own business, providing competitions, or delivering an opportunity to make charitable donations. It may be that rather than the perception of an offer as a discount or bargain – as is often used in social media – for these participants in their organisations an offer constitutes a proposal or recommendation instead. Furthermore, the participants provided examples at all levels within the Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale and therefore offers – as part of the sales cycle, are confirmed as an affordance for organisations.

To interact with customers
Interaction is a key element within social media marketing and was found within definitions of social media (Hogan and Quan-Haase, 2010; Kent, 2010; Järvinen *et al.*, 2012; Ryan, 2014; Carr and Hayes, 2015). Also termed engagement, this was acknowledged in the literature (Shao, 2009; Muntinga, Moorman and Smit, 2011; Whiting and Williams, 2013; Krishen *et al.*, 2016), as well as an affordance for organisations (de Vries, Gensler and Leeflang, 2012; Kietzmann *et al.*, 2012; Hollebeek, Glynn and Brodie, 2014; Argyris and Monu, 2015).

The use of interaction as an affordance of social media marketing was found in both studies, therefore this finding converged. The interviews provided greater insights and demonstrated recognition of the evolution of social media (Hooley, Marriott and Wellens, 2012), and how interaction is growing. There was understanding of the scope of interaction situated within a global dimension and within a ubiquitous always-on state (Lamberton and Stephen, 2016). However, moving beyond simple transactional interaction, where the purpose is to increase the audience, this interaction ranged from a semi-formal approach to share best practice, to an informal conversation. The ability to share content (Shao, 2009; Muntinga, Moorman and Smit, 2011; Whiting and Williams, 2013; Argyris and Monu, 2015), concerned interaction as an exchange, which represents a primary purpose of social media.

Once identified in the online survey, the subsequent interviews provided examples of interaction at all levels within the Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale. Looking back at McQuail's (1983), mass communication theory, social interaction was identified as a key factor which remains valid as social media enables a method of multi-way interaction, sharing suggestions and providing feedback (Canhoto and Clark, 2013). The use of interaction allows customers to seek and share content (Kietzmann *et al.*, 2012; Abrantes *et al.*, 2013), is both a recurring theme in social media and a recognised phenomenon between businesses and customers (Järvinen *et al.*, 2012).

To gain reviews

Reviews and testimonials where individuals add or read user-generated content, has been recognised in the literature (Bruns, 2006; Muntinga, Moorman and Smit, 2011) and was confirmed as an affordance in the online survey. This construct is further acknowledged as an affordance of social media by organisations (Weinberg *et al.*, 2013; Saboo, Kumar and Ramani, 2016), as reviews represent brand-related content (Muntinga, Moorman and Smit, 2011), and can impact sales (Baird and Parasnis, 2011; Babi *et al.*, 2015).

Thus the empirical research supported the extant literature. Participants within the interviews provided evidence that their organisations were at different stages of obtaining reviews, some of whom had fully automated systems, whereas others explicitly avoided online reviews.

Whilst it has been found that online feedback could provide insights for organisations (Quinton, 2013), the application of online reviews may be based on the level of maturity of social media affordances within the organisation.

Managing and responding to online reviews, termed Webcare (Ghosh, 2017), has become a critical marketing function (Ahmad and Laroche, 2016), which can mitigate service failure (Ghosh and Amar, 2018; Weitzl, Hutzinger and Einwiller, 2018), and reduce future brand damage. Thus, there are managerial implications as the skill of managing online reviews will need to be addressed by organisations, as the ability to post reviews, whether positive or negative, is effortless (Shin, Song and Biswas, 2014). As noted by Lamberton and Stephen (2016, p. 154), when discussing Era 2 of digital, social media and mobile marketing, using the example of the online review site Yelp, 'Between 2005 and 2006, the number of reviewers skyrocketed from 12,000 to 100,000' and this increased significantly to 157 million by 2017 (Nakayama and Wan, 2018), and consequently the number of reviews is likely to continue.

To deliver customer service

Online customer service presents individuals with the chance of being heard, gaining better service from organisations and resolving complaints (Muñiz, Jr. and Schau, 2007; Dollinger, 2015; Istanbulluoglu, 2017), and for organisations, this can facilitate long-term customer relationships (Canhoto and Clark, 2013). Thus customer service as an affordance was found in the literature and as Canhoto and Clark (2013, p.523), commented 'the change in how people use the Internet has produced a new set of expectations'; part of this is customer service. Identified in the online survey and subsequently in the interviews, all levels of the Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale were found including Level 0, as some participants purposefully avoided any form of online customer service.

According to Kietzmann *et al.* (2011, p. 249), customer service via social media has highlighted that organisations are 'no longer in control of the conversation' and as social media is increasingly used as a customer service tool (Gunarathne, Rui and Seidmann, 2018), and is further driven by customers, this should thus form a cornerstone of organisations' social media strategies. The challenge for smaller organisations is the 'always-on' state of social media and the need to respond promptly. It may be that guidelines within a social customer relationship management framework (Wang and Kim, 2017), are required.

Consequently, there are managerial implications for those at the lower levels of the Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale.

For customer segmentation

According to Jones, Shaw and McLean (2013), market segmentation is attributed to Smith (1956), and this concept has developed into a marketing approach where individuals, groups or organisations are classified when they demonstrate 'one or more similar characteristics that cause them to have relatively similar product needs and buying characteristics' (Simkin *et al.*, 2016, p. 204). Canhoto, Clark and Fennemore (2013), argued that customer segmentation is a recognised aspect of both marketing theory and practice and can be enhanced by social media.

Customer segmentation was explored in the online survey and 122 out of 448 respondents stated that they gained this affordance. The interviews sought explanations from participants which found that the segmentation was either one aspect of demographics (age, gender, geographic location), or psychographics (purchasing behaviour), or webographics (email subscriber behaviour, preferred content). The challenge is that obtaining such limited fragments of the segments does not lead to full persona development (Hendriks and Peelen, 2013). As noted by Canhoto, Clark and Fennemore (2013), segmentation processes and application are not without difficulties within a social media environment. Whilst Facebook Insights provides basic details regarding the number of those visiting the site, seeing the articles and interacting, which can contribute towards digital metrics, there is little opportunity to fully segment customers in this way. Similarly, using LinkedIn as a research tool, or monitoring Twitter followers, enables the organisations to provide richer data for the customer database, but does not segment customers. This concurs with research from Chen, Lin and Yuan (2017, p. 580), who discussed these tools as being able to 'monitor, analyze and manage social media information statistics and the impact of social brands', rather than facilitating customer segmentation.

However, one element of segmentation that is partly offered within Facebook Adverts, is to group audiences, which was employed by some participants. Although due to the platform's limited data sharing, they could not identify 'key aspects of that segment's typical customer's needs and experiences' (Lemon and Verhoef, 2016, p. 73). Furthermore, this generic grouped data cannot be attributed to specific individuals (Facebook, 2018), thus some segmentation variables may be difficult to ascertain and there may be disparity between the programmes used and associated customer identity. Moreover the associated customer identity information from social media platforms is liable to change and users now control access to their data (Constantinides, Henfridsson and Parker, 2018).

Thus whilst evidence of the process of customer segmentation was supported in the literature, this was only partly explained in the empirical research. However, this was applied at different levels of the Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale, with many participants demonstrating a superficial understanding.

For brand management

Visibility and the need to be present on social media emerged from the participants in the interviews and has been recognised as an extension of the notion of brand awareness. Argyris and Monu (2015, p. 149), termed the notion as 'presentability' and managing the organisation's online image, which 'has an influence on organizational perceptions in times of crisis, buying preferences, and trust' (Yang and Kent, 2014, p. 563). Having been identified in the literature, this was supported in the empirical research. The online survey found that 407 respondents (out of 448) stated that brand management in terms of brand building and awareness was an affordance of social media marketing. This converged within

the interviews as all participants used social media as part of their application of brand management.

Conclusions

This paper has discussed the application of affordances which were confirmed as being present in the online survey and further explored in semi-structured interviews, based on gathering evidence from participants. Following the empirical research, *post-hoc* development of the application of affordances was performed, which was based on the participants' abilities, described as maturity, in order to construct a social media affordances maturity scale.

This research supports the agenda for a method that provides a mechanism to assess current practice and identify the requirements to adopt better practice, rather than encouraging organisations to 'adopt new technologies as they emerge' (Kannan and Li, 2017, p. 41). This could enable organisations to optimise resources by focusing on the affordances of social media.

There are implications for those managing social media within organisations. Hence, organisations gain specific affordances from social media, beyond the functional and intentional aspects of the platforms (such as connectivity and communication) which offer positive benefits for organisations. The identification of affordances of social media contributes towards the understanding of social media application within an organisational setting, thus enabling managers to focus social media efforts on the areas delivering the positive benefits. One of the affordances which generated many conversations in the interviews, was concern over reviews amongst those who were unclear as how to manage customer-created content, highlighting a skills gap. Another issue was managing customer service within an always-on state. These areas may represent opportunities for further training.

Furthermore, the application of the affordances has been applied to the levels of maturity demonstrated through a scale from Level 0, where there is no evidence of activity, to Level 5, where there is clear evidence of an integrated and agile approach to the application of the affordance. Termed the Social Media Affordances Maturity Scale, this is a useful framework which enables organisations to assess their current social media application and identify the action required to move to the next level of maturity.

There are limitations to this study. The second research phase mainly concerned evidence from those in the C-Suite and in management roles, thus the views of those in more junior roles may have provided different evidence.

Furthermore, whilst this framework followed a 'what works' approach (Creswell *et al.*, 2011, p. 4), it may require further testing, although in this paper the knowledge production has focused on solving practitioner problems (Hunt, 2007), and has therefore contributed to the management of marketing.

References

ABRANTES, J. L., SEABRA, C., LAGES, C. R. AND JAYAWARDHENA, C. (2013) 'Drivers of in-group and out-of-group electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM)', *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(7), pp. 1067–1088. doi: 10.1108/03090561311324219.

ADJEI, M. T., NOBLE, S. M. AND NOBLE, C. H. (2009) 'The influence of C2C communications in online brand communities on customer purchase behavior', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38(5), pp. 634–653. doi: 10.1007/s11747-009-0178-5.

AHMAD, S. N. AND LAROCHE, M. (2016) 'How Do Expressed Emotions Affect the Helpfulness of a Product Review? Evidence from Reviews Using Latent Semantic Analysis', *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 20(1), pp. 76–111. doi: 10.1080/10864415.2016.1061471.

ALADWANI, A. M. (2015) 'Facilitators, characteristics, and impacts of Twitter use: Theoretical analysis and empirical illustration', *International Journal of Information Management*. Elsevier Ltd, 35(1), pp. 15–25. doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2014.09.003.

ALBAUM, G., ROSTER, C. A. AND SMITH, S. M. (2014) 'Topic sensitivity and research design: effects on internet survey respondents' motives', *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 26(1), pp. 147–161. doi: 10.1108/09574090910954864.

ANDZULIS, J. 'MICK', PANAGOPOULOS, N. G. AND RAPP, A. (2012) 'A Review of Social Media and Implications for the Sales Process', *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 32(3), pp. 305–316. doi: 10.2753/PSS0885-3134320302.

ARGYRIS, Y. A. AND MONU, K. (2015) 'Corporate Use of Social Media: Technology Affordance and External Stakeholder Relations', *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce*. Taylor & Francis, 25(2), pp. 140–168. doi: 10.1080/10919392.2015.1033940.

BABI , A., SOTGIU, F., DE VALCK, K., BIJMOLT, T. H. A., BABI ROSARIO, A., SOTGIU, F., DE VALCK, K. AND BIJMOLT, T. H. A. (2015) 'The Effect of Electronic Word of Mouth on Sales: A Meta-Analytic Review of Platform, Product, and Metric Factors', *Journal of Marketing Research*, LIII(June), p. 150817081817000. doi: 10.1509/jmr.14.0380.

BAIRD, C. H. AND PARASNIS, G. (2011) 'From social media to social customer relationship management', *Strategy & Leadership*, 39(5), pp. 30–37. doi: 10.1108/10878571111161507.

BOXMAN-SHABTAI, L. (2018) 'Reframing the popular: A new approach to parody', *Poetics*, 67(March), pp. 1–12. doi: 10.1016/j.poetic.2018.03.001.

BOYD, DANAH M. (2010) 'Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications', in Papacharissi, Z. (ed.) *Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites*. New York: Routledge, pp. 39–58. doi: 10.1162/dmal.9780262524834.119.

BRANDTZÆG, P. B. (2010) 'Towards a unified Media-User Typology (MUT): A meta-analysis and review of the research literature on media-user typologies', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(5), pp. 940–956. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.02.008.

BRUNS, A. (2006) 'Towards Produsage: Futures for User-Led Content Production', in *Cultural Attitudes towards Communication and Technology*. Tartu, Estonia, pp. 275–284. doi: 10.1016/S0190-9622(06)01179-0.

BRYMAN, A. AND BELL, E. (2011) *Business Research Methods*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BUCHER, T. AND HELMOND, A. (2018) 'The Affordances of Social Media Platforms', in Burgess, J., Marwick, A., and Poell, T. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, pp. 233–253. doi: 10.4135/9781473984066.n14.

BULUT, Z. A. AND DOGAN, O. (2017) 'The ABCD typology: Profile and motivations of Turkish social network sites users', *Computers in Human Behavior*, 67(January 2016), pp. 73–83. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2016.10.021.

CABIDDU, F., DE CARLO, M. AND PICCOLI, G. (2014) 'Social media affordances: Enabling customer engagement', *Annals of Tourism Research*. Elsevier Ltd, 48, pp. 175–192. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2014.06.003.

CANDI, M., ROBERTS, D. L., MARION, T. AND BARCZAK, G. (2018) 'Social Strategy to Gain Knowledge for Innovation', *British Journal of Management*, 29(4), pp. 731–749. doi: 10.1111/1467-8551.12280.

CANHOTO, A. I. AND CLARK, M. (2013) 'Customer service 140 characters at a time: The users' perspective', *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29(5–6), pp. 522–544. doi: 10.1080/0267257X.2013.777355.

CANHOTO, A. I., CLARK, M. AND FENNEMORE, P. (2013) 'Emerging segmentation practices in the age of the social customer', *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 21(5), pp. 413–428. doi: 10.1080/0965254X.2013.801609.

CARR, C. T. AND HAYES, R. A. (2015) 'Social Media: Defining, Developing, and Divining', *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 23(1), pp. 46–65. doi: 10.1080/15456870.2015.972282.

CHEMERO, A. (2003) 'An Outline of a Theory of Affordances', *Ecological Psychology*, 15(2), pp. 181–195. doi: 10.1207/S15326969ECO1502.

CHEN, Q., XU, X., CAO, B. AND ZHANG, W. (2016) 'Social media policies as responses for social media affordances: The case of China', *Government Information Quarterly*. Elsevier Inc., 33(2), pp. 313–324. doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2016.04.008.

CHEN, S., LIN, L. AND YUAN, X. (2017) 'Social Media Visual Analytics', *Computer Graphics Forum*, 36(3), pp. 563–587. doi: 10.1111/cgf.13211.

CONSTANTINIDES, P., HENFRIDSSON, O. AND PARKER, G. G. (2018) 'Introduction — Platforms and Infrastructures in the Digital Age', *Information Systems Research*, 29(2), pp. 381–400.

CRESWELL, J. W. AND CRESWELL, J. D. (2005) 'Mixed methods research: developments, debates, and dilemma', in Swanson, R. A. and Holton, E. F. (eds) *Research in Organizations: Foundations and Methods of Inquiry*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc, pp. 315–326.

CRESWELL, J. W., KLASSEN, A. C., PLANO CLARK, V. L. AND SMITH, K. C. (2011) *Best Practices for Mixed Methods Research in the Health Sciences*. National Institutes of Health. doi: 10.1002/cdq.12009.

CRESWELL, J. W. AND PLANO CLARK, V. L. (2018) *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Inc.

CROWSTON, K. AND FAGNOT, I. (2018) 'Stages of motivation for contributing user-generated content: A theory and empirical test', *International Journal of Human Computer Studies*. Elsevier Ltd, 109(November 2016), pp. 1339–1351. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhcs.2017.08.005.

DEAN, J. (2010) *Blog Theory: Feedback and Capture in the Circuits of Drive*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

DOBELE, A., STEEL, M. AND COOPER, T. (2015) 'Sailing the seven C's of blog marketing: understanding social media and business impact', *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(7), pp. 1087–1102. doi: 10.1108/MIP-02-2015-0039.

DOLLINGER, M. J. (2015) 'Social media: Cui bono? Who benefits from all this socialness?', *Business Horizons*, 58(3), pp. 235–236. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2014.11.007.

EARL, J. AND KIMPORT, K. (2013) *Digitally Enabled Social Change - Activism in the Internet Age*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

ELLISON, N. B. AND VITAK, J. (2014) 'Social Network Site Affordances and Their Relationship to Social Capital Processes', in Sundar, S. S. (ed.) *The Handbook of Psychology of Communication Technology*. Wiley Blackwell, pp. 205–227. Available at: http://www-personal.umich.edu/~enicole/EllisonVitak2015.pdf.

EVANS, S. K., PEARCE, K. E., VITAK, J. AND TREEM, J. W. (2017) 'Explicating Affordances: A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Affordances in Communication Research', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 22(1), pp. 35–52. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12180. FACEBOOK (2018) *Facebook Business*, *Facebook.com*. Available at: https://www.facebook.com/business/ads/ad-targeting?ref=ens_rdr.

FACEBOOK INC. (2012) *Facebook Annual Report 2012*, *Facebook Annual Report 2012*. Available at: https://materials.proxyvote.com/Approved/30303M/20130409/AR_166822 (Accessed: 21 June 2018).

FAYARD, A. L. AND WEEKS, J. (2014) 'Affordances for practice', *Information and Organization*. Elsevier Ltd, 24(4), pp. 236–249. doi: 10.1016/j.infoandorg.2014.10.001.

FOURNIER, S. AND AVERY, J. (2011) 'The uninvited brand', *Business Horizons*, 54(3), pp. 193–207. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.001.

FULGONI, G. M. AND LIPSMAN, A. (2014) 'Numbers, please: Digital game changers: How social media will help usher in the era of mobile and multi-platform campaign-effectiveness measurement', *Journal of Advertising Research*, 54(1), pp. 11–16. doi: 10.2501/JAR-54-1-011-016.

GALLAUGHER, J. AND RANSBOTHAM, S. (2010) 'Social media and customer dialog management at Starbucks', *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 9(4), pp. 197–212.

GAVER, W. W. (1991) 'Technology affordances', in *Proceedings of the CHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*. New Orleans, pp. 79–84. doi: 10.1145/108844.108856.

GHOSH, T. (2017) 'Managing Negative Reviews: The Persuasive Role of Webcare Characteristics', *Journal of Internet Commerce*, 16(2), pp. 148–173. doi: 10.1080/15332861.2017.1305254.

GHOSH, T. AND AMAR, R. G. (2018) 'Gulping the Poison: How Webcare Attributes Reduce Damages to Brands Caused by Negative Reviews', *Journal of Internet Commerce*. Routledge, 17(3), pp. 216–254. doi: 10.1080/15332861.2018.1463793.

GIBSON, J. J. (1979) 'The Theory of Affordances', in *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

GIBSON, J. J. (1986) *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

GLASER, B. G. AND STRAUSS, A. L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine. doi: 10.2307/2575405.

GRANOVETTER, M. S. (1973) 'The strength of weak ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), pp. 1360–1380. doi: 10.1037/a0018761.

GRAVES, L. (2007) 'The affordances of blogging: A case study in culture and technological effects', *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 31(4), pp. 331–346. doi: 10.1177/0196859907305446.

GUNARATHNE, P., RUI, H. AND SEIDMANN, A. (2018) 'When social media delivers customer service: differential customer treatment in the airline industry', *MIS Quarterly*, 42(2), pp. 489–520. doi: 10.25300/MISQ/2018/14290.

HAMILTON, M., KALTCHEVA, V. D. AND ROHM, A. J. (2016) 'Hashtags and handshakes: consumer motives and platform use in brand-consumer interactions', *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 33(2), pp. 135–144. doi: 10.1108/JCM-04-2015-1398.

HANNA, R., ROHM, A. AND CRITTENDEN, V. L. (2011) 'We're all connected: The power of the social media ecosystem', *Business Horizons*, 54(3), pp. 265–273.

HARRIGAN, P., SOUTAR, G., CHOUDHURY, M. M. AND LOWE, M. (2015) 'Modelling CRM in a social media age', *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 23(1), pp. 27–37. doi: 10.1016/j.ausmj.2014.11.001.

HAUGE, A. M. (2018) 'Situated valuations: Affordances of management technologies in organizations', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 34(June), pp. 245–255. doi: 10.1016/j.scaman.2018.06.001.

HEFT, H. (2003) 'Affordances, Dynamic Experience, and the Challenge of Reification', *Ecological Psychology*, 15(2), pp. 149–180. doi: 10.1207/S15326969ECO1502.

HENDRIKS, M. AND PEELEN, E. (2013) 'Personas in action: linking event participation motivation to charitable giving and sports', *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 18(1), pp. 60–72. doi: 10.1002/nvsm.1458.

HENNIG-THURAU, T., MALTHOUSE, E. C., FRIEGE, C., GENSLER, S., LOBSCHAT, L., RANGASWAMY, A. AND SKIERA, B. (2010) 'The Impact of New Media on Customer Relationships', *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), pp. 311–330. doi: 10.1177/1094670510375460.

HEWSON, C., VOGEL, C. AND LAURENT, D. (2016) *Internet research methods*. 2nd edn. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

HOGAN, B. AND QUAN-HAASE, A. (2010) 'Persistence and Change in Social Media', *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 30(5), pp. 309–315. doi: 10.1177/0270467610380012.

HOLLEBEEK, L., GLYNN, M. AND BRODIE, R. (2014) 'Consumer Brand Engagement in Social Media: Conceptualization, Scale Development and Validation', *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28, pp. 149–165.

HOOLEY, T., MARRIOTT, J. AND WELLENS, J. (2012) *What is online research?* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

HUNT, S. D. (2007) 'A Responsibilities Framework for Marketing as a Professional Discipline', *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 26(2), pp. 277–283. doi: 10.1525/sp.2007.54.1.23.

HUTCHBY, I. (2001) 'Technologies, texts and affordances', *Sociology*, 35(2), pp. 441–456. doi: 10.1017/S0038038501000219.

ILTEN, C. (2015) '"Use Your Skills to Solve This Challenge!": The Platform Affordances and Politics of Digital Microvolunteering', *Social Media and Society*, 1(2). doi: 10.1177/2056305115604175.

ISTANBULLUOGLU, D. (2017) 'Complaint handling on social media: the impact of multiple response times on consumer satisfaction', *Computers in Human Behavior*. Elsevier Ltd, 74, pp. 72–82. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2017.04.016.

JANSEN, B. J., ZHANG, M., SOBEL, K. AND CHOWDURY, A. (2009) 'Twitter Power: Tweets as Electronic Word of Mouth', *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(11), pp. 2169–2188. doi: 10.1002/asi.21149.

JÄRVINEN, J., TOLLINEN, A., KARJALUOTO, H. . AND JAYAWARDHENA, C. (2012) 'Digital and Social Media Marketing Usage in B2B Industrial Section', *Marketing Management Journal*, 22(2), pp. 102–117.

JONES, D. G. B., SHAW, E. H. AND MCLEAN, P. A. (2013) 'The modern schools of marketing thought', in Saren, M., Maclaran, P., Tadajewski, M., and Stern, B. B. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Marketing Theory*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, pp. 42–58.

KAPLAN, A. M. AND HAENLEIN, M. (2010) 'Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media', *Business Horizons*, 53(1), pp. 59–68. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003.

KARAHANNA, E., XIN XU, S., XU, Y. AND ZHANG, N. (ANDY) (2018) 'The Needs–Affordances–Features Perspective for the Use of Social Media', *MIS Quarterly*, 42(3), pp. 737–756. doi: 10.25300/MISQ/2018/11492.

KENT, M. L. (2010) 'Directions in Social Media for Professionals and Scholars', in Heath, R. (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Public Relations*. Second. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Inc., pp. 643–656.

KHAZRAEE, E. AND NOVAK, A. N. (2018) 'Digitally Mediated Protest: Social Media Affordances for Collective Identity Construction', *Social Media and Society*, 4(1). doi: 10.1177/2056305118765740.

KIETZMANN, J. H., HERMKENS, K., MCCARTHY, I. P. AND SILVESTRE, B. S. (2011) 'Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media', *Business Horizons*. 'Kelley School of Business, Indiana University', 54(3), pp. 241–251. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.005.

KIETZMANN, J. H., SILVESTRE, B. B. S., MCCARTHY, I. P. AND PITT, L. F. (2012) 'Unpacking the social media phenomenon: towards a research agenda', *Journal of Public Affairs*, 12(2), pp. 109–119. doi: 10.1002/pa.

KLANG, M. AND NOLIN, J. (2011) 'Disciplining social media: An analysis of social media policies in 26 Swedish municipalities', *First Monday*, July. Available at: http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3490/3027.

KNOBEL, M. AND LANKSHEAR, C. (2007) *A new literacies sampler*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc. Available at: http://literacyandtech.pbworks.com/f/Text.pdf#page=209.

KORSCHUN, D. AND DU, S. (2013) 'How virtual corporate social responsibility dialogs generate value: A framework and propositions', *Journal of Business Research*. Elsevier Inc., 66(9), pp. 1494–1504. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.09.011.

KOZINETS, R. V. (1999) 'E-tribalized marketing?: The strategic implications of virtual communities of consumption', *European Management Journal*, 17(3), pp. 252–264.

KRISHEN, A. S., BEREZAN, O., AGARWAL, S. AND KACHROO, P. (2016) 'The generation of virtual needs: Recipes for satisfaction in social media networking', *Journal of Business Research*. Elsevier Inc., 69(11), pp. 5248–5254. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.120.

KUMAR, A., BEZAWADA, R., RISHIKA, R., JANAKIRAMAN, R. AND KANNAN, P. K. (2016) 'From Social to Sale: The Effects of Firm Generated Content in Social Media on Customer Behavior', *Journal of Marketing*, 80(January), pp. 7–25. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.

KVALE, S. AND BRINKMANN, S. (2009) *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Inc.

LABRECQUE, L. I. (2014) 'Fostering Consumer–Brand Relationships in Social Media Environments: The Role of Parasocial Interaction', *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. Elsevier B.V., 28(2), pp. 134–148. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.003.

LAMBERTON, C. AND STEPHEN, A. T. (2016) 'A Thematic Exploration of Digital, Social Media, and Mobile Marketing Research's Evolution from 2000 to 2015 and an Agenda for Future Research', *Journal of Marketing*, 6(6), pp. 146–172. doi: 10.1509/jm.15.0415.

LANGVARDT, K. (2018) 'Regulating Online Content Moderation', *The Georgetown Law Journal*, pp. 1353–1388.

LEMON, K. N. AND VERHOEF, P. C. (2016) 'Understanding Customer Experience Throughout the Customer Journey', *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), pp. 69–96. doi: 10.1509/jm.15.0420.

LIU, S.-H., CHOU, C.-H. AND LIAO, H.-L. (2015) 'An exploratory study of product placement in social media', *Internet Research*, 25(2), pp. 300–316. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0216.

LUCHMAN, J. N., BERGSTROM, J. AND KRULIKOWSKI, C. (2014) 'A motives framework of social media website use: A survey of young Americans', *Computers in Human Behavior*. Elsevier Ltd, 38, pp. 136–141. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2014.05.016.

MAJCHRZAK, A., FARAJ, S., KANE, G. C. AND AZAD, B. (2013) 'The contradictory influence of social media affordances on online communal knowledge sharing', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19(1), pp. 38–55. doi: 10.1111/jcc4.12030.

MALSBENDER, A., HOFMANN, S. AND BECKER, J. (2014) 'Aligning capabilities and social media affordances for open innovation in governments', *Australasian Journal of Information Systems*, 18(3), pp. 317–330. doi: 10.3127/ajis.v18i3.1100.

MARKUS, M. L. AND SILVER, M. S. (2008) 'A Foundation for the Study of IT Effects: A New Look at DeSanctis and Poole's Concepts of Structural Features and Spirit', *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 9(10), pp. 609–632. doi: 10.1.1.183.3995.

MCGRENERE, J. AND HO, W. (2000) 'Affordances: Clarifying and Evolving a Concept', in *Graphics Interface*. Montreal, pp. 1–8.

MCQUAIL, D. (1983) *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

MCTAGGART, T. R. AND BENINA, Y. (2014) 'Avoiding "Epic Fails": FFIEC Supervisory Guidance on Financial Institutions' Use of Social Media', *Journal of Taxation & Regulation of Financial Institutions*, 28(2), pp. 15–23.

MCVEIGH-SCHULTZ, J. AND BAYM, N. K. (2015) 'Thinking of You: Vernacular Affordance in the Context of the Microsocial Relationship App, Couple', *Social Media and Society*, 1(2), p. 1-. doi: 10.1177/2056305115604649.

MEEKS, L. (2018) 'Tweeted, deleted: theoretical, methodological, and ethical considerations for examining politicians' deleted tweets', *Information Communication and Society*. Taylor & Francis, 21(1), pp. 1–13. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2016.1257041.

MICHAELS, C. F. (2000) 'Information, Perception, and Action: What Should Ecological Psychologists Learn From Milner and Goodale (1995)?', *Ecological Psychology*, 12(3), pp. 241–258. doi: 10.1207/S15326969ECO1203.

MILLS, A. J. AND PLANGGER, K. (2015) 'Social media strategy for online service brands', *The Service Industries Journal*, 35(10), pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1080/02642069.2015.1043277.

MUÑIZ, JR., A. M. AND SCHAU, H. J. (2007) 'Vigilante Marketing and Consumer-Created Communications', *Journal of Advertising*, 36(3), pp. 35–50. doi: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367360303.

MUNTINGA, D. G., MOORMAN, M. AND SMIT, E. G. (2011) 'Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for Brand-Related social media use', *International Journal of Advertising*, 30(1). doi: 10.2501/IJA-30-1-013-046.

NAGY, P. AND NEFF, G. (2015) 'Imagined Affordance: Reconstructing a Keyword for Communication Theory', *Social Media and Society*, 1(2). doi: 10.1177/2056305115603385.

NAKAYAMA, M. AND WAN, Y. (2018) 'Is culture of origin associated with more expressions? An analysis of Yelp reviews on Japanese restaurants', Tourism Management. Elsevier Ltd, 66, PP. 329–338. DOI: 10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2017.10.019.

NORMAN, D. A. (1988) *The Design of Everyday Things*, *The Design of Everyday Things*. New York: Currency Doubleday.

PALFREY, J. G. AND GASSER, U. (2008) *Born digital: understanding the first generation of digital natives*. New York: Basic Books.

PARCHOMA, G. (2014) 'The contested ontology of affordances: Implications for researching technological affordances for collaborative knowledge production', *Computers in Human Behavior*. Elsevier Ltd, 37, pp. 360–368. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2012.05.028.

PARK, S. AND FESENMAIER, D. R. (2012) 'Non response bias in internet based advertising conversion studies', *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 6(4), pp. 340–355. doi: 10.1108/17506181211265077.

PHAM, M. T. (2013) 'The seven sins of consumer psychology', *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 23(4), pp. 411–423. doi: 10.1016/j.jcps.2013.07.004.

POLS, A. J. K. (2012) 'Characterising affordances: The descriptions-of-affordances-model', *Design Studies*. Elsevier Ltd, 33(2), pp. 113–125. doi: 10.1016/j.destud.2011.07.007.

POSTIGO, H. (2016) 'The socio-technical architecture of digital labor: Converting play into YouTube money', *New Media and Society*, 18(2), pp. 332–349. doi: 10.1177/1461444814541527.

POWERS, T., ADVINCULA, D., AUSTIN, M. S., GRAIKO, S. AND SNYDER, J. (2012) 'Digital and social media in the purchase-decision process: A special report from the advertising research foundation', *Journal of Advertising Research*, 52(4), pp. 479–490. doi: 10.2501/JAR-52-4-479-489.

QU, Z., WANG, Y., WANG, S. AND ZHANG, Y. (2013) 'Implications of online social activities for e-tailers' business performance', *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(8), pp. 1190–1212. doi: 10.1108/03090561311324282.

QUINTON, S. (2013) 'The digital era requires new knowledge to develop relevant CRM strategy: a cry for adopting social media research methods to elicit this new knowledge', *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 21(5), pp. 402–412. doi: 10.1080/0965254X.2013.801611.

RAPP, A., BEITELSPACHER, L. S., GREWAL, D. AND HUGHES, D. E. (2013) 'Understanding social media effects across seller, retailer, and consumer interactions', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 41(5), pp. 547–566. doi: 10.1007/s11747-013-0326-9.

RATHNAYAKE, C. AND SUTHERS, D. D. (2018) 'Twitter Issue Response Hashtags as Affordances for Momentary Connectedness', *Social Media + Society*, 4(3), p. 205630511878478. doi: 10.1177/2056305118784780.

RHEINGOLD, H. (1993) *A slice of my life in my virtual community*. Available at: http://www.cs.indiana.edu/docproject/bdgtti/bdgtti_18.html (Accessed: 29 December 2014).

RYAN, D. (2014) *Understanding Digital Marketing: Marketing Strategies for Engaging the Digital Generation*. 3rd edn. London: Kogan Page.

SABOO, A. R., KUMAR, V. AND RAMANI, G. (2016) 'Evaluating the impact of social media activities on human brand sales', *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. Elsevier B.V., 33(3), pp. 524–541. doi: 10.1016/j.ijresmar.2015.02.007.

SABRI, O. (2018) 'The Detrimental Effect of Cause-Related Marketing Parodies', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(2), pp. 517–537. doi: 10.1007/s10551-016-3232-5.

SASHITTAL, H. C., SRIRAMACHANDRAMURTHY, R. AND HODIS, M. (2012) 'Targeting college students on Facebook? How to stop wasting your money', *Business Horizons*, 55(5), pp. 495–507. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2012.05.006.

SCHMIDT, G. B. AND O'CONNOR, K. W. (2015) 'Fired for Facebook: Using NLRB guidance to craft appropriate social media policies', *Business Horizons*, 58(5), pp. 571–579. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2015.05.008.

SCHROEDER, J. E. (2017) 'Corporate branding in perspective: a typology', *European Journal of Marketing*, 51(9/10), pp. 1522–1529.

SHAO, G. (2009) 'Understanding the appeal of user generated media: a uses and gratification perspective', *Internet Research*, 19(1), pp. 7–25. doi: 10.1108/10662240910927795.

SHIN, D., SONG, J. H. AND BISWAS, A. (2014) 'Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) generation in new media platforms: The role of regulatory focus and collective dissonance', *Marketing Letters*, 25(2), pp. 153–165. doi: 10.1007/s11002-013-9248-z.

SIMKIN, L., DIBB, S., PRIDE, W. M. AND FERRELL, O. C. (2016) *Marketing: Concepts and Strategies*. 7th edn. Andover, Hampshire: CENGAGE Learning.

SMETS, G., OVERBEEKE, K. AND GAVER, W. (1994) 'Form-giving', *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems celebrating interdependence - CHI '94*, pp. 79–84. doi: 10.1145/191666.191706.

SMITH, W. R. (1956) 'Product Differentiation and Market Segmentation As Alternative Marketing Strategies.', *Journal of Marketing*, 21(1), pp. 3–8. doi: 10.2307/1247695.

TREEM, J. W. AND LEONARDI, P. M. (2013) 'Social Media Use in Organizations Exploring the Affordances of Visibility, Editability, Persistence, and Association', in Salmon, C. T. (ed.) *Communication Yearbook*. New York: Routledge, pp. 143–189. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2129853.

TREPTE, S. (2015) 'Social Media, Privacy, and Self-Disclosure: The Turbulence Caused by Social Media's Affordances', *Social Media and Society*, 1(1), p. 2056305115578681. doi: 10.1177/2056305115578681.

TSAI, W.-H. S. AND MEN, L. R. (2013) 'Motivations and Antecedents of Consumer Engagement With Brand Pages on Social Networking Sites', *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 13(2), pp. 76–87. doi: 10.1080/15252019.2013.826549.

TSIMONIS, G. AND DIMITRIADIS, S. (2014a) 'Brand strategies in social media', *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 32, pp. 328–344. doi: 10.1108/MIP-04-2013-0056.

TSIMONIS, G. AND DIMITRIADIS, S. (2014b) 'Consumer-Brand Relationships in Social Media', in *47th Academy of Marketing Conference*. Bournemouth, 7-10 July 2014: Academy of Marketing, pp. 1–10.

TURVEY, M. T. (1992) 'Affordances and Prospective Control: An Outline of the Ontology', *Ecological Psychology*, 4(3), pp. 173–187. doi: 10.1207/s15326969eco0403_3.

VEHOVAR, V. AND MANFREDA, K. L. (2008) 'Overview: Online Surveys', in Fielding, N., Lee, R. M., and Blank, G. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Online Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 177–194.

VERČIČ, D., VERČIČ, A. T. AND SRIRAMESH, K. (2015) 'Looking for digital in public relations', *Public Relations Review*, 41(2), pp. 142–152. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.12.002.

VERMA, V., SHARMA, D. AND SHETH, J. N. (2015) 'Does relationship marketing matter in online retailing? A meta-analytic approach', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, pp. 206–217. doi: 10.1007/s11747-015-0429-6.

DE VRIES, L., GENSLER, S. AND LEEFLANG, P. S. H. (2012) 'Popularity of Brand Posts on Brand Fan Pages: An Investigation of the Effects of Social Media Marketing', *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26(2), pp. 83–91. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2012.01.003.

VUORI, V. AND JUSSILA, J. (2016) 'The 5C Categorization of Social Media Tools', in *AcademicMindtrek'16*. Tampere, Finland: ACM. doi: http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2994310.2994367.

WALTHER, J. (2011) 'Computer-Mediated Communication and Interpersonal Relations', in Knapp, M. L. and Daly, J. A. (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Interpersonal Communication*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications Inc., pp. 443–479. Available at: http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Theories+of+Computer-+Mediated+Communication+and+Interpersonal+Relations#0.

WANG, Z. AND KIM, H. G. (2017) 'Can Social Media Marketing Improve Customer Relationship Capabilities and Firm Performance? Dynamic Capability Perspective', *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. Direct Marketing Educational Foundation, Inc. dba Marketing EDGE, 39, pp. 15–26. doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2017.02.004.

WEINBERG, B. D., RUYTER, K. DE, DELLAROCAS, C., BUCK, M. AND KEELING, D. I. (2013) 'Destination Social Business: Exploring an Organization's Journey with Social Media, Collaborative Community and Expressive Individuality', *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 27, pp. 299–310.

WEITZL, W., HUTZINGER, C. AND EINWILLER, S. (2018) 'An empirical study on how webcare mitigates complainants' failure attributions and negative word-of-mouth', *Computers in Human Behavior*. Elsevier, 89(August), pp. 316–327. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2018.07.012.

WELLMAN, B., QUAN HAASE, A., BOASE, J., CHEN, W., HAMPTON, K., DÍAZ, I. AND MIYATA, K. (2006) 'The Social Affordances of the Internet for Networked Individualism', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 8(3).

WHITING, A. AND WILLIAMS, D. (2013) 'Why people use social media: a uses and gratifications approach', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 16(4), pp. 362–369. doi: 10.1108/QMR-06-2013-0041.

WILCOX, K. AND STEPHEN, A. T. (2013) 'Are Close Friends the Enemy? Online Social Networks, Self-Esteem, and Self-Control', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(1), pp. 90–103. doi: 10.1086/668794.

YANG, A. AND KENT, M. (2014) 'Social media and organizational visibility: A sample of Fortune 500 corporations', *Public Relations Review*. Elsevier Inc., 40(3), pp. 562–564. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.04.006.

ZHANG, J. Q., CRACIUN, G. AND SHIN, D. (2010) 'When does electronic word-of-mouth matter? A study of consumer product reviews', *Journal of Business Research*. Elsevier Inc., 63(12), pp. 1336–1341. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.12.011.

ZHAO, Y., LIU, J., TANG, J. AND ZHU, Q. (2013) 'Conceptualizing perceived affordances in social media interaction design', *Aslib Proceedings*, 65(3), pp. 289–303. doi: 10.1108/00012531311330656.