Public Relations Review 43 (2017) 441–449

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Public Relations Review

Full length article

Like, comment, and share on Facebook: How each behavior differs from the other

Cheonsoo Kim*, Sung-Un Yang

Media School, Indiana University Bloomington, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 14 January 2016
Received in revised form 24 August 2016
Accepted 2 February 2017
Available online 15 February 2017

Keywords:
Facebook
Like
Comment
Share
Message
Engagement
Content analysis

ABSTRACT

People engage in communication on Facebook via three behaviors—*like*, *comment*, and *share*. Facebook uses an algorithm that gives different weight to each behavior to determine what to show in user's screen, suggesting that the strategic implication of each behavior may differ from the other. This study investigates when each behavior can be encouraged by organizational messages, thereby making clearer distinctions between three behaviors. A content analysis of organizational messages was conducted, where the researchers assessed message features and related them to each behavior separately. The findings indicated that different message features generated different behaviors: Sensory and visual features led to *like*, rational and interactive to *comment*, and sensory, visual, and rational to *share*. This suggests that *like* is an affectively driven, *comment* is a cognitively triggered behavior, and *share* is either affective or cognitive or a combination of both.

1. Introduction

Individuals engage in organizational communications on Facebook through three behaviors: *like*, *comment*, and *share*. People's behaviors on Facebook are not always the same. They *like* a post, *comment* on another, or *share* the other. Facebook gives different weight to different behaviors to determine what to show in user's screen. A *share* weights approximately as much as 2 *comments*, each of which has roughly equal weight to 7 *likes* (Calero, 2013). This suggests that the strategic implication of each behavior may differ from the other. Thus, it is imperative for public relations researchers and professionals to understand how each behavior differs from the other. However, to date no public relations research has clarified differences among three Facebook behaviors.

The goal of this study is to investigate when each Facebook behavior can be encouraged by organizational messages, thereby clarifying distinctions between three behaviors. To this end, this study classifies three Facebook behaviors into discrete levels, assesses message features, and relates each feature to each Facebook behavior separately. This study conducts a content analysis of Facebook messages of 20 famous companies. The findings of this study provide insights into distinctions between three Facebook behaviors and strategic implications for message strategies for organizations' Facebook campaigns.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: kim680@indiana.edu (C. Kim), yang223@indiana.edu (S.-U. Yang).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.02.006
0363-8111/

2. Approaches to organizational social media campaigns

Public relations scholarship has investigated how organizations engage publics to develop and maintain relationships on social media such as Facebook and Twitter. However, approaches to evaluating organizations' public relations campaigns on social media have differed. Some have investigated organizational social media communications from the organizational view (Men & Tsai, 2012; Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010; Waters, Burnett, Lamm, & Lucas, 2009; Waters & Jamal, 2011). Their focus has been primarily on what organizations do on social media for relationship management. For example, guided by the dialogic principle on organizational Web sites (Taylor, Kent, & White, 2001), Rybalko and Seltzer (2010) examined whether organizations used the five dialogic strategies (usefulness of information, conversation of visitors, generation of return visits, ease of interface, and dialogic loop) on Twitter. While the organization-oriented approach has clear benefits, it lacks in testing the effectiveness of organizations' public relations efforts.

On the other hand, others have tested the effectiveness of organizations' public relations efforts on social media from the public side. Extant studies that employed the public-oriented approach can be split into two groups: Those that measured public perception of organizations' public relations efforts through survey (Men & Tsai, 2014, 2015; Waters, 2009) and those that collected behavioral data on publics' responses to organizations' social media messages (Cho, Schweickart, & Haase, 2014; Saxton & Waters, 2014). While the former group has investigated publics' long-term reactions to organizations' public relations efforts, the latter has examined publics' immediate, short-term reactions to organizational messages (Saxton & Waters, 2014).

Facebook provides the environment in which public relations researchers to investigate publics' immediate reactions to organizational messages in a relatively convenient way. In other words, Facebook allows researchers to get solid measures of public behaviors such as numbers of likes, comments, and shares. Nonetheless, save for a few studies (Cho et al., 2014; Saxton & Waters, 2014), public relations researchers have neglected to use tangible Facebook-provided behavioral metrics to investigate the relationship between public behaviors and organizational public relations efforts.

In addition, although public behaviors on Facebook are not always the same and therefore have different strategical implications for organizational campaigns, the findings of prior studies have not provided a sound understanding of distinctions between publics' Facebook behaviors. For example, Cho et al. (2014) held that different Facebook behaviors such as like, comment, and share represent different levels of engagement with organizational posts. However, they did not explain how and why. Accordingly, for a better understanding, differences between publics' Facebook behaviors should be theorized and evidenced. In addition, prior studies employed real numbers of likes, comments, and shares as outcome measures without considering factors that may affect them. For example, organizational resources for Facebook campaigns may differ organization to organization. If an organization has a more budget for Facebook, they can hire more staffs for Facebook activities. Furthermore, Facebook has a service in which organizations can purchase audiences. This suggests that the more budget an organization has for Facebook, the greater audiences the organization can reach with their messages in the form of "sponsored" posts, which in turn may lead to greater numbers of likes, comments, and shares. Thus, previous findings might not show genuine relationships between organizational messages and publics' Facebook behaviors.

This study addresses these limitations in the prior public relations literature. To do this, this study first discusses how each Facebook behavior differs from the other with respect to the cognitive aspect of each behavior. Then, organizational message features available on Facebook are discussed. Finally, by relating each message feature to each Facebook behavior separately, this study attempts to clarify differences between Facebook behaviors further.

3. Facebook behavior: like, comment, and share

Social media behaviors fall into three levels: *consuming*, *contributing*, and *creating* (Muntinga, Moorman, & Smit, 2011, p. 15–17). *Consuming* is the lowest, involving participative behaviors without contributing to or creating contents such as reading and watching. As the middle level, c *ontributing* is the interactions between users and contents as well as among users, which include participating in forums or commenting on posts. *Creating* is the highest level, which involves producing and publishing content.

Each social media behavior needs a different amount of cognitive effort from the other. People use more cognitive effort when creating (e.g., writing) than when consuming a message (e.g., reading) (Piolat, Olive, & Kellogg, 2005). Similarly, as people commit to a higher level of social media behavior (i.e., creating), they exert more cognitive effort into the behavior. Thus, diverse social media behaviors that can be categorized as consuming, contributing, and creating can manifest different levels of psychological effort.

In a similar way, Facebook behaviors also fall into discrete levels. First, *like* is the lowest. *Like* requires less commitment than others do. While a click is enough for *like*, *comment* and *share* need additional actions that ask extra commitment or cognitive effort. Second, *share* may be a higher level than *comment*. When *commenting* on a post, the post appears on News Feed, but other posts push it out of News Feed before long. On the other hand, when *sharing* a post, the post not only appears on News Feed but also goes to user's profile page, suggesting that the shared post constitutes a part of user's self-presentation. Social media users are strategic in self-presentation (van Dijck, 2013). For example, when presenting the self on Facebook, individuals carefully consider public evaluation of the self (Rui & Stefanone, 2013) and whether online self-presentation is consistent with offline self-presentation (DeAndrea & Walther, 2011). This suggests that *share* may be a strategic behavior related to self-presentation and thus needs more cognitive effort than does *comment*. In other words,

when *sharing* a post, users are more committed to assessing its value regarding the self than when *commenting* on a post. In addition, technologically, Facebook allows users to add comments on the shared post, which also may mean that *share* needs more cognitive effort that does *comment*.

Based on the discussion, the present research categorizes *share* as the highest, *comment* as the intermediate, and *like* as the lowest level. Regardless of hierarchical levels of Facebook behaviors, however, the more important meaning of this categorization is that each behavior has a psychological (at least cognitively) implication that is different from the other.

4. Message features

A message is the unit of every Facebook communication, but not every message draws the equal amount of attention from Facebook audiences (Brafton, 2014). In this competitive online context, organizations seek to attract more attention from the public, using messages with various features, thereby generating publics' reactions. Whether organizations are successful in eliciting responses from the public relies on what messages they use. In the following sections, this study discusses organizational message features available on Facebook with a focus on four aspects of messages: strategy, form, posting type, and interactivity.

4.1. Message strategy

Message strategy is a guide for communication efforts (Taylor, 1999). Organizations disseminate information about their activities, products, or services to their publics by using various message strategies. Scholars have held that, when developing message strategies, organizations need to consider a variety of conditions such as product type, target public, and organizational situation (e.g., Rossiter, Percy, & Donovan, 1991). For example, open strategies in pursuit of mutual understanding are useful in engaging publics in the context of organizational crisis (Yang, Kang, & Johnson, 2010), whereas positive messages increase people's intention of liking, commenting on, and sharing organizational messages in the context of an anti-cyberbullying campaign (Alhabash et al., 2013).

To assess what message strategies organizations use for Facebook campaigns, this study adopts the six-segment strategy (Taylor, 1999). Message strategy falls into two dimensions: *informational* and *transformational* (Wells, 1980). While the former refers to appeals to people's cognition or logic, the latter denotes appeals to audiences' emotions or any of the five senses. Informational strategies encourage cognitive responses but discourage affective reactions, whereas the opposite is the case with transformational strategies (Chaudhuri & Buck, 1995). The two dimensions are further grouped into six segments, three for each. Informational strategies are split into *ration, acute needs,* and *routine*; transformational strategies are broken into *ego*, *social*, and *sensory*.

As for informational strategies, the *ration* explains people's needs for information, thus offers details about organizations' activities, services, and products under the assumption that people are rational. *Acute needs* is based on individuals' immediate needs, thus contains cues or reminders in the context of an urgent situation. *Routine* draws on people's habitual behavior, references repetitive activity, and considers that actual behavior often occurs without a great deal of thought.

As for the transformational strategy, *ego* is to the strategy of appealing to a person's ego. Messages of the *ego* strategy are tied to individuals' self-perceptions by allowing them to make a statement to themselves about who they are. *Social* is based on people's emotional desires for social approval. Messages of this segment help people to make a statement to others. The *sensory* strategy emphasizes any of the five senses: sight, hearing, smell, taste, or touch. It provides information on moments of pleasure based on the five senses.

Recently, the relationship between message strategy and public response in the context of social media has been identified (Alhabash et al., 2013; Ashley & Tuten, 2015; Chauhan & Pillai, 2013; Saxton & Waters, 2014; Swani, Milne, & Brown, 2013). Still, to date few have shown how different message strategies are related to different types of Facebook behaviors. To fill the void, drawing on the six-segment strategy, this study assesses organizational messages strategies and tests the relationship between each message strategy and each behavior separately.

RQ1: What are the relationships between message strategies and three Facebook behaviors (*like*, *comment*, and *share*)?

4.2. Message form

Message usefulness enhances engagement (Taylor et al., 2001). Message usefulness is the extent to which a message addresses the needs, interests, values, and concerns of the public (Kent & Taylor, 1998). The use of various forms (e.g., text, photo, audio, and video) together is useful for increasing message usefulness (Kent, Taylor, & White, 2003). Hence, combined use of diverse message forms will be more likely to elicit engagement behavior. Recent works have examined how organizations use a variety of message forms but have not associated message forms with different types of social media behaviors (Men & Tsai, 2012; Waters et al., 2009). To have an understanding of the relationship between each message form and each Facebook behavior, this study addresses the following research question.

RQ2: What are the relationships between message forms (text, photo, audio, and video) and three Facebook behaviors (*like*, *comment*, and *share*)?

4.3. Posting type

Organizational Facebook messages can be grouped into two types of posting: *created* and *shared*. Before the arrival of social media, organizations had no choice but to create messages to interact with the public online. In addition to creation, they are currently able to get other-generated messages to their social media pages seamlessly. However, while a shared message can save organizational resources such as time and money, its usefulness may be lower than a created message. This is because the latter addresses the interests, values, and concerns of the public in a more direct fashion than does the former. Thus, it is conceivable that a created message will be more likely than a shared one to generate engagement behavior. This study expects that created messages will be more positively related to all types of Facebook behaviors than share messages.

H1. Created messages will be more positively related to Facebook behavior than shared message across three types (*like*, *comment*, and *share*).

4.4. Message interactivity

Perceived interactivity—a user's perception of the degree to which his/her communication with mediated others is two-way, controllable, and responsive (Mollen & Wilson, 2010)—is critical to Facebook engagement. From a technological point of view, interactivity refers to "the extent to which users can participate in modifying the form and content of a mediated environment in real time" (Steuer, 1992; p. 84). Within this perspective, interactivity is mainly about a user's control of relationships within the interactive structure of media (Steuer, 1992). Although useful, however, this understanding of interactivity tends to overlook the experiential aspect of interactivity in online communication (Liu & Shrum, 2002).

On Facebook, experiential interactivity plays a more crucial role in engaging publics, because Facebook gives every organization an equal level of structural interactivity (Lovejoy & Saxton, 2012). In this environment, perceived interactivity on Facebook does not depend on its interactive structure, but on the extent to which organizations use its interactive structure (Saffer, Sommerfeldt, & Taylor, 2013) or the degree to which organizations seek to initiate two-way communication (Lee & Park, 2013). In this sense, using interactive messages that intend to solicit reactions from audiences is one of the viable options organizations can take for increasing perceived interactivity on Facebook. It is likely that perceived interactivity of a message seeking responses from the public will be greater, because soliciting responses increases the likelihood of two-way communication as well as responsiveness of an interaction (Foss & Griffin, 1995). Thus, response-inviting posts will be more likely to elicit Facebook behavior. However, how distinctively an interactive message generates each Facebook behavior is unknown. Due to lack of previous literature, this study addresses the following research question.

RQ3: What are the relationships between a response-inviting message and three Facebook behaviors (*like*, *comment*, and *share*)?

5. Method

5.1. Sampling

A content analysis of 20 companies' Facebook posts was conducted. Since probability sampling of Facebook posts is challenging due to the indeterminateness of the population, this study used convenience sampling (Krippendorff, 2013). For sampling, 10 companies from the *Fortune* list of *Most Admired Companies* (Shaughnessy, 2013) and another 10 from the *24/7 Wall Street* list of *Most Hated Companies in America* (McIntyre & Sauter, 2013) were selected. Among the admired companies, two Facebook pages have no sufficient posts. The 11th and 12th ranked were used in their stead. Although the two lists were created based on different criteria, sampling each group of firms from two-contrasting lists has two merits. First, this study can consider the effects of corporate reputations on Facebook behaviors. Organizational reputations should be controlled, because the more favorably people feel an organization, the more likely they engage in the organization's communication (Hong & Yang, 2011). Second, regardless of reputational valence, they are all famous companies. All other things being equal, people may engage with prominent organizations on Facebook in larger numbers, representing a more general trend of Facebook behaviors. For sampling messages ($n = 600$), this study collected 30 posts from each corporate Facebook, capturing the most recent posts before November 1, 2013 in a reverse chronological order.

5.2. Coding

Coding categories for "message form," "posting type," and "message interactivity" were devised to identify whether text, photo, audio, and video are used, whether a post is created, and whether a post solicits responses respectively. Categories for "message form" and "message interactivity" are not mutually exclusive because a post may contain more than one (e.g., text and photo, video soliciting responses). Those for "message strategy" were adapted from previous works (Hwang, McMillan, & Lee, 2003; Taylor, 1999). They are not mutually exclusive either, because more than two strategies can be used simultaneously (e.g., "Bright, lively, spicy and sweet. Christmas Blend is the gift that's okay to open a little early"—a combination of sensory and acute needs).

Table 1
Posting type, message form, and solicitation of a response ($n = 600$).

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Created	495	82.5
Text	575	95.8
Photo	444	74.0
Audio	0	0.0
Video	100	16.7
Solicitation of response	114	19.0

Table 2
Message strategy ($n = 600$).

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Informational strategy		
Ration	203	33.8
Acute Needs	129	21.5
Routine	42	7.0
Transformational strategy		
Ego	167	27.8
Social	64	10.7
Sensory	181	30.2

Before coding, two coders had several training sessions to ensure their proficiency in the use of the coding scheme. The data was equally divided into two sets; each coder coded each set independently. The unit of analysis is a post. After coding, to ensure inter-coder reliability, 10% of the posts ($n = 30$), which were randomly subsampled from each data set, were switched between coders and coded independently. Krippendorff's αs for message form, posting type, and message interactivity were all one. Those for message strategies were 0.81 (ration); 0.85 (acute); 0.90 (routine); 0.77 (ego); 0.79 (social); and 0.75 (sensory) respectively, all of which approach the acceptable range (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Bracken, 2002).

5.3. Measurement

Three behavioral metrics were used as dependent variables: *like* ($M = 6{,}076.68$, $SD = 14{,}201.50$), *comment* ($M = 582.72$, $SD = 2{,}048.66$), and *share* ($M = 499.70$, $SD = 1{,}417.27$). All were skewed, thus log-transformed: *like* ($M = 7.32$, $SD = 1.71$), *comment* ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 1.98$), and *share* ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.97$). Facebook provides a service, in which organizations can adjust their budgets according to the audience size they want to reach. If an organization has a bigger budget, they will have more Facebook users as audiences, generating more *like*, *comment*, and *share*. Thus, organizational Facebook budget must be a significant predictor of the number of likes, comments, and shares. However, such confidential data are unavailable in general. To collapse the unknown factors, this study obtained each firm's standardized value of the log-transformed data and used them as final dependent variables. Standardized metrics of a firm indicate the distances of data points from the firm's mean divided by the firm's standard deviation, suggesting they have no mean information, which may fluctuate depending on the factors peculiar to each firm. Thus, the dependent measures employed facilitate accurate tests of the links between message features and Facebook behaviors by eliminating the effects of unknown differences among firms.

6. Results

In terms of posting type, 85% ($n = 495$) of the posts were created. As for message form, almost all posts (95.8%, $n = 575$) had texts. 74% ($n = 444$) and 16.7% ($n = 100$) had photos and videos respectively. No post with audios was found. About a fifth of the posts (19%, $n = 114$) solicited responses from audiences. With regard to message strategies, ration was the most used strategy (33.8%, $n = 203$), followed by sensory (30.2%, $n = 181$), ego (27.8%, $n = 167$), acute needs (21.5%, $n = 129$), social (10.7%, $n = 64$), and routine (7%, $n = 42$) (Tables 1 and 2).

To estimate the relationships between message features and Facebook behaviors, three ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions were specified with corporate reputation as a control (1 = most admired). All predictors were binary. Corporate reputation failed to predict any of three behaviors. The models explained 10% ($p < 0.001$) of the variance in the number of likes, 11% ($p < 0.001$) for comments, and 13% ($p < 0.001$) for shares.

RQ1 concerned the links between message strategy and Facebook behaviors. The sensory strategy was the sole predictor of the number of likes ($\beta = 0.15$, $p < 0.01$), indicating Facebook users are more likely to like posts stimulating any of the five senses. In terms of the number of comments, the ration strategy was the only predictor ($\beta = 0.13$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests providing rational information is more likely to trigger people to comment. Three message strategies were significantly related to message sharing. While the ration ($\beta = 0.11$, $p < 0.05$) and sensory strategies ($\beta = 0.11$, $p < 0.05$) positively predicted the number of shares, the ego strategy was negatively related to *share* ($\beta = -0.10$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 3
Regression analysis of Facebook behaviors.

	Engagement behavior		
	Like	Comment	Share
Posting type (1 = Created)	0.19***	0.15***	0.27***
	0.02	0.03	0.07
Photo	0.19**	−0.20**	0.26***
Video	0.07	−0.10	0.28***
Solicitation of a response	0.07	0.22***	0.03
Informational strategy			
Ration	0.09	0.13**	0.11*
Acute needs	−0.03	−0.02	0.02
Routine	0.02	0.03	0.03
Transformational strategy			
Ego	−0.08	−0.07	−0.10*
Social	−0.04	−0.07	−0.03
Sensory	0.15**	0.05	0.10*
N	600	597	590
R^2	0.10***	0.11***	0.13***

Note: Standardized, list-wise; $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{***}p < 0.001$.

RQ2 addressed the relationship between message form and Facebook behaviors. Posts with photos were positively related to the number of likes ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$), but negatively to comments ($\beta = -0.20$, $p < 0.01$). Those with photos ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < 0.001$) and videos ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.001$) were more likely to be shared (Table 3).

H1 predicted that a created post would be more positively related to Facebook behavior than a shared one across three behaviors. A created post was positively related to the numbers of likes ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.001$), comments ($\beta = 0.15$, $p < 0.001$), and shares ($\beta = 0.27$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting creating is more likely than sharing to trigger three Facebook behaviors. Data supported H1.

RQ3 asked the link between response-inviting messages and Facebook behaviors. They were positively related to comment behavior ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.001$), but not the other two. This suggests a message soliciting responses is more likely to encourage people to comment.

7. Discussion

The purpose of the study was to investigate when each Facebook behavior can be encouraged by organizational messages, thereby clarifying distinctions between three Facebook behaviors such as *like*, *comment*, and *share*. To this end, this study assessed features of messages 20 well-known companies were sending on Facebook via a content analysis and related them to each Facebook behavior separately.

The findings showed a number of distinctive relationships between message features and three Facebook behaviors. Posts created, with photos, and stimulating any of the five senses were more likely to encourage Facebook users to click the like. Users were more likely to comment on messages that solicit responses and have logical information. In contrast, posts with photos were less likely to receive comments. Lastly, posts created, with photos or videos, and using the ration or the sensory strategies were more likely to trigger people to share, whereas those using the ego strategy were less likely to be shared.

Message features verified distinctions between three Facebook behaviors. First, photos were likely to increase *like*, but to decrease *comment*. Given images elicit more emotions than do texts (Brantner, Lobinger, & Wetzstein, 2011), it is likely that *like* was emotionally driven, but *comment* was not. This appears to be consistent with the findings on message strategies. The ration (informational) and the sensory (transformational) strategies positively predicted *comment* and *like* respectively. Prior research found that informational strategies encourage cognitive responses but discourage affective ones, but the opposite is the case with transformational strategies (Chaudhuri & Buck, 1995). Therefore, it is likely that *like* is an affective response to messages, whereas *comment* is a cognitive one.

Second, visuals elements (photos and videos), and the ration (informational) and the sensory (transformational) strategies were positive predictors of *share*. This seems to reflect the nature of *share* behavior on Facebook, which embraces *like* and *comment*. When sharing a post, users can choose whether to *comment* on it. If a user comments on the post, *share* behavior may be similar to *comment* (a cognitive reaction). Otherwise, it may be closer to *like* (an affective response). This suggests that *share* on Facebook may be either affective or cognitive or a combination of both depending on whether users add comments on the shared post.

The self-presentational aspect of Facebook interactions explains the inverse link between the ego strategy and *share* (Donath & boyd, 2004). A shared message goes to user's profile page as well as is publicly displayed to network friends. A post in user's profile page constitutes a part of self-presentation. Users edit their profiles for selective self-presentation, highlighting certain aspects of the self and downplaying and concealing others (Bullingham & Vasconcelos, 2013). If a post

has self-related information a user wants to say "only to oneself not to others" (the ego strategy) and is seen as detrimental to his/her public image, the post will be shared less likely.

7.1. Theoretical implications

This study addressed the aforementioned shortcomings in the extant public relations literature. First, this research provided evidence of how and why each Facebook behavior differs from the other. Facebook behaviors fall into "distinctive types" as well as "different levels." On the one hand, in terms of levels, *like* is the lowest, *comment* is the intermediate, and *share* is the highest level. With respect to types, on the other hand, *like* is affectively, *comment* is cognitively elicited, and *share* is either affective or cognitive or a combination of both. In addition, *share* may lead to selective self-presentation on Facebook. These findings suggest that public relations researchers need to treat three Facebook behaviors separately, not to lump them together.

Second, this study controlled variables that may affect aggregated numbers of likes, comments, and shares. Prior studies have employed real numbers of likes, comments, and shares as dependent measures (Cho et al., 2014; Saxton & Waters, 2014). When testing the relationships between message features and Facebook behaviors, using real behavioral metrics as outcome variables without considering factors such as organizational resources may yield spurious results. Organizational resources for social media activities such as budgets differ organization to organization and have substantial effects on numbers of likes, comments, and shares. To illustrate, if an organization has a bigger budget, they can reach a larger number of Facebook users, generating more likes, comments, and shares. This suggests that real numbers may have variances in them that can be accounted for by organizations' Facebook budgets. Therefore, the findings of prior studies may not be genuine, because they did not control the factors unrelated to message features. Admittedly, it is difficult for public relations researchers to gather such confidential organizational information. This study avoided the obstacle by modifying the real metrics into standardized measures. When the information about organizations' resources is not available as in this study, the use of standardized behavioral metrics may be an alternative way to improve the reliability of the findings.

7.2. Practical implications

This study also suggests to public relations professionals useful implications for Facebook campaign strategies for adapting messages to their goals. First, if professionals intend to expose messages as broadly as possible, utilize posts appealing any of the five senses or with photos. More people will click the *like* of the posts and, as a result, messages will spread into Facebook networks more quickly and more broadly. Second, if professionals intend to have a two-way communication, update posts soliciting responses or containing logical and in-depth information. More people will *comment* on them. Lastly, if professionals aim to engage the public more intensely, use posts reflecting the intersection of identity between organizations and target publics (Malär, Krohmer, Hoyer, & Nyffenegger, 2011). More people will *share* the posts and use them for their self-presentations. Co-creating values related to publics' desired selves helps organizations have long-term and quality relationships with their publics (Botan & Taylor, 2004).

7.3. Limitations

The present study has some limitations. First, because of the indeterminateness of the population of Facebook messages, this adopted a convenience sampling technique. This may limit the generalizability of the findings (Krippendorff, 2013). Second, compared to the enormous scale of message production on Facebook—41,000 posts per second (Smith, 2013)—the present sample size is relatively small. In recent, researchers have used a big data approach to analyze as many messages as possible. However, automated content analysis is improper to identify the nuanced use of language and strategy (Collister, 2013), which can be more effectively found via human coding. Therefore, it is inappropriate to assume that a large sample analyzed by the automated technique will more accurately represent message features than will a small sample analyzed by humans. However, this does not guarantee the generalizability of the present findings.

8. Conclusion

This study addresses an important and pressing question: What message features generate what Facebook behaviors. The strategic implication of each Facebook behavior differs from the other, because Facebook uses an algorithm that gives different weight to each behavior to determine secondary exposure of organizational posts. Thus, public relations researchers and professionals need a correct understanding of not only the nature of each Facebook behavior and but also message features generating Facebook behaviors that fit their campaign goals. This study meets such needs by providing a detailed understanding of differences among three Facebook behaviors, which are related to different organizational message features. This study contributes to the body of public relations scholarship on the organization-public relationship as well as social media engagement.

Appendix A.

Table A1

Table A1
Coding scheme.

Message type [check all that apply (1 = yes, 0 = no)]	
Created	Is the post created (1) or shared (0) by a company? Does the post have texts?
Photo	Does the post have photographs?
Audio	Does the post have audio files?
Video	Does the post have video files?
Solicitation of response	Does the post solicit responses from the public directly?
Message strategy [check all that apply (1 = yes, 0 = no)]	
Ration	Rational audience assumed; Needs a large amount of deliberation (lots of corporate information); Program solving offered; Emphasizing the differences or competitive advantages Usual strategy: Comparative, USP (Unique Selling Proposition), Generic (e.g., 'Get the wider picture/Faster Pentium 4 with 256 MB memory under $1500/X Pizza, a low cost, nutritional, healthy dinner')
Acute needs	Limited time to make decision (timely decision); Serving a cue or a reminder in an urgent situation; Requiring immediate action Usual strategy: Brand or corporate familiarity (e.g., 'Fall 2013 fashion/Call now to process the claim/When there's nothing left to fix for dinner, order X Pizza')
Routine	Habitual purchase/doesn't need deliberation; Serving a cue or a reminder (brand or corporate name and package emphazied); Appeals to convenience and trivial interests Usual strategy: Hyperbole, preemptive, brand and corporate familiarity (e.g., 'Future of memory/Welcome to Mesa electronics/Every Friday nights: X Pizza!')
Ego	Appeal to vanity, self-actualization (Not corporate image but consumer image); Emotional needs relating to self are fulfilled; Image based executions (visual dominance) with little or no factual information; Unstructured and ambiguous enough so each person can fit him/herself into the message Usual strategy: User image, communication about the brand (e.g., 'For the computer mania/X Pizza, pizza for the true pizza lover')
Social	Valuing on others' (thoughts, opinions, evaluations, etc.); Stating to others, not to self; Showing social situation motivating consumers (Group identification); Showing target market member as socially important to others Usual strategy: User image (in a social situation), Use occasion (e.g., 'Share it with a friend/Sept 11 Tragedy, our hearts and minds are burdened/X Pizza pleases family and friends')
Sensory	Five senses emphasized; Sensory gratification; Pleasure moments Usual strategy: Moment of pleasure (e.g., 'Yum/Feel the speed/Savor the rich blend of cheese and tomatoes in each X Pizza')

Note: Adapted from Taylor (1999) and Hwang et al. (2003)

References

Alhabash, S., McAlister, A. R., Hagerstrom, A., Quilliam, E. T., Rifon, N. J., & Richards, J. I. (2013). Between likes and shares: Effects of emotional appeal and virality on the persuasiveness of anticyberbullying messages on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *16*(3), 175–182. http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2012.0265

Ashley, C., & Tuten, T. (2015). Creative strategies in social media marketing: An exploratory study of branded social content and consumer engagement. *Psychology & Marketing*, *32*(1), 15–27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/mar.20761

Botan, C. H., & Taylor, M. (2004). Public relations: State of the field. *Journal of Communication*, *54*(4), 645–661. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02649.x

Brafton. (2014). *Zuckerberg answers questions about organic Facebook reach in Q&A.*. Retrieved from http://www.brafton.com/news/zuckerberg-answers-questions-organic-facebook-reach-qa

Brantner, C., Lobinger, K., & Wetzstein, I. (2011). Effects of visual framing on emotional responses and evaluations of news stories about the Gaza conflict 2009. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *88*(3), 523–540. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/107769901108800304

Bullingham, L., & Vasconcelos, A. C. (2013). The presentation of self in the online world: Goffman and the study of online identities. *Journal of Information Science*, *39*(1), 101–112. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0165551512470051

Calero, A. (2013). *Likes vs. comments vs. shares.*. Retrieved from http://www.antoniocalero.com/2013/05/06/facebook-likes-comments-shares

Chaudhuri, A., & Buck, R. (1995). Affect, reason, and persuasion advertising strategies that predict affective and analytic-cognitive responses. *Human Communication Research*, *21*(3), 422–441. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1995. tb00353.x

Chauhan, K., & Pillai, A. (2013). Role of content strategy in social media brand communities: A case of higher education institutes in India. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *22*(1), 40–51. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10610421311298687

Cho, M., Schweickart, T., & Haase, A. (2014). Public engagement with nonprofit organizations on Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, *40*(3), 565–567. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2014.01.008

Collister, S. (2013). The public relations power of big data. In R. Brown, & S. Waddington (Eds.), *Share this too: More social media solutions for PR professionals*. London, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

DeAndrea, D. C., & Walther, J. B. (2011). Attributions for inconsistencies between online and offline self-presentations. *Communication Research*, *38*(6), 805–825. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093650210385340
Donath, J., & boyd, D. (2004). Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal*, *22*(4), 71–82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:BTTJ.0000047585.06264.cc
Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1995). Beyond persuasion: A proposal for an invitational rhetoric. *Communication Monographs*, *62*(1), 2–18. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637759509376345
Hong, S. Y., & Yang, S. U. (2011). Public engagement in supportive communication behaviors toward an organization: Effects of relational satisfaction and organizational reputation in public relations management. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *23*(2), 191–217. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1062726x.2011.555646
Hwang, J.-S., McMillan, S. J., & Lee, G. (2003). Corporate web sites as advertising: An analysis of function, audience, and message strategy. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, *3*(2), 10–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15252019.2003.10722070
Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web. *Public Relations Review*, *24*(3), 321–334. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0363-8111(99)80143-x
Kent, M. L., Taylor, M., & White, W. J. (2003). The relationship between Web site design and organizational responsiveness to stakeholders. *Public Relations Review*, *29*(1), 63–77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0363-8111(02)00194-7
Krippendorff, K. (2013). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Lee, H., & Park, H. (2013). Testing the impact of message interactivity on relationship management and organizational reputation. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *25*(2), 188–206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2013.739103
Liu, Y., & Shrum, L. J. (2002). What is interactivity and is it always such a good thing? Implications of definition, person, and situation for the influence of interactivity on advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, *31*(4), 53–64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2002.10673685
Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human Communication Research*, *28*(4), 587–604. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00826.x
Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *17*(3), 337–353. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01576.x
Malär, L., Krohmer, H., Hoyer, W. D., & Nyffenegger, B. (2011). Emotional brand attachment and brand personality: The relative importance of the actual and the ideal self. *Journal of Marketing*, *75*(4), 35–52. http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.75.4.35
McIntyre, D. A., & Sauter, M. B. (2013). *The 10 most hated companies in America*.. Retreived from http://247wallst.com/special-report/2013/01/09/the-10-most-hated-companies-in-america-2
Men, L. R., & Tsai, W.-H. S. (2012). How companies cultivate relationships with publics on social network sites: Evidence from China and the United States. *Public Relations Review*, *38*(5), 723–730. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.10.006
Men, L. R., & Tsai, W.-H. S. (2014). Perceptual, attitudinal, and behavioral outcomes of organization-public engagement on corporate social networking sites. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *26*(5), 417–435. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1062726x.2014.951047
Men, L. R., & Tsai, W.-H. S. (2015). Infusing social media with humanity: Corporate character, public engagement, and relational outcomes. *Public Relations Review*, *41*(3), 395–403. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.02.005
Mollen, A., & Wilson, H. (2010). Engagement, telepresence and interactivity in online consumer experience: Reconciling scholastic and managerial perspectives. *Journal of Business Research*, *63*(9–10), 919–925. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.014
Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M., & Smit, E. G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for brand-related social media use. *International Journal of Advertising*, *30*(1), 13–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.2501/ija-30-1-013-046
Piolat, A., Olive, T., & Kellogg, R. T. (2005). Cognitive effort during note taking. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *19*(3), 291–312. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/acp.1086
Rossiter, J. R., Percy, L., & Donovan, R. J. (1991). A better advertising planning grid. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *31*(5), 11–21.
Rui, J. R., & Stefanone, M. A. (2013). Strategic image management online: Self-presentation, self-esteem and social network perspectives. *Information, Communication & Society*, *16*(8), 1286–1305. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2013.763834
Rybalko, S., & Seltzer, T. (2010). Dialogic communication in 140 characters or less: How Fortune 500 companies engage stakeholders using Twitter. *Public Relations Review*, *36*(4), 336–341. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.08.004
Saffer, A. J., Sommerfeldt, E. J., & Taylor, M. (2013). The effects of organizational Twitter interactivity on organization-public relationships. *Public Relations Review*, *39*(3), 213–215. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2013.02.005
Saxton, G. D., & Waters, R. D. (2014). What do stakeholders like on Facebook? Examining public reactions to nonprofit organizations' informational, promotional, and community-building messages. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *26*(3), 280–299. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1062726x.2014.908721
Shaughnessy, H. (2013). *Apple remains world's most admired company, followed by Google and Amazon*. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/haydnshaughnessy/2013/02/28/apple-remains-worlds-most-admired-followed-by-google-and-amazon
Smith, C. (2013). *How many Facebook posts are made each minute? [infographic]*. pp. 6. Retrieved from https://blog.dlvrit.com/2013/08/how-many-facebook-posts-are-made-each-minute-infographic
Steuer, J. (1992). Defining virtual reality: Dimensions determining telepresence. *Journal of Communication*, *42*(4), 73–93. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1992.tb00812.x
Swani, K., Milne, G., & Brown, B. P. (2013). Spreading the word through likes on Facebook. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, *7*(4), 269–294. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jrim-05-2013-0026
Taylor, M., Kent, M. L., & White, W. J. (2001). How activist organizations are using the Internet to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, *27*(3), 263–284. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0363-8111(01)00086-8
Taylor, R. E. (1999). A six-segment message strategy wheel. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *39*(6), 7–17.
van Dijck, J. (2013). 'You have one identity': Performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn. *Media Culture & Society*, *35*(2), 199–215. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0163443712468605
Waters, R. D., & Jamal, J. Y. (2011). Tweet, tweet, tweet: A content analysis of nonprofit organizations' Twitter updates. *Public Relations Review*, *37*(3), 321–324. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.03.002
Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, *35*(2), 102–106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.006
Waters, R. D. (2009). Comparing the two sides of the nonprofit organization-donor relationship: Applying coorientation methodology to relationship management. *Public Relations Review*, *35*(2), 144–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.011
Wells, W. D. (1980). *How advertising works*. Chicago, IL: Needham Harper Worldwide.
Yang, S.-U., Kang, M., & Johnson, P. (2010). Effects of narratives, openness to dialogic communication, and credibility on engagement in crisis communication through organizational blogs. *Communication Research*, *37*(4), 473–497. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093650210362682