

COVENTRY
BUSINESS
SCHOOL

BACHELOR'S DISSERTATION

Supervisor:
Amir Daneshvar Hakimi Meibodi

Bachelors of Arts
Business Administration

Jianu Tudor
Student ID: 8038100

The Relationship Between Personality
And The Factors Affecting The Attitudes
Towards Social Network Advertising

I certify that this dissertation is my own work. I have read the University regulations concerning plagiarism.

I am not willing to allow Coventry Business School to use my dissertation as a sample for future students.

Jianu Tudor
Date 29.04.2020

Acknowledgements

I would like to take the opportunity to thank the following people for just being themselves: Alexandra Ardelean; Alexandru Lazar; Anna Michalska; Artem Kokhanchuk; Daniel Encutu; David McKernan; Horia Marian; Karolina Vitanova; Ramona Ghearvasia; Zuzanna Mleczak.

ABSTRACT	4	TABLES	
		Table 1. Social Media Usage	5
INTRODUCTION	4	Table 2. Scales Used	12
		Table 3. Frequencies	13
LITERATURE REVIEW	5	Table 4. Skewness and Kurtosis	14
Social Network Advertising:	5	Table 5. Correlation Matrix	17
FACTORS AFFECTING THE ATTITUDES	6	Table 6. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov	18
Advertising Value:	6	Table 7. Summary of Tested Hypotheses	16
Advertising Intrusiveness:	6		
Privacy Concern:	6	FIGURES	
Peer Influence (Electronic Word of Mouth - eWOM):	6	Figure 1. Scatter Plot	26
PERSONALITY:	7		
Trait and Factor theory:	7		
Five Factor Model:	7		
Extraversion:	7		
Agreeableness:	8		
Conscientiousness:	8		
Neuroticism:	9		
Openness to experience:	9		
Big Five:	9		
METHODOLOGY	10		
Sample selection and data collection:	10		
Measurement:	10		
Ethical Considerations:	11		
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	11		
Descriptives:	11		
Skewness and Kurtosis:	12		
Kolmogorov-Smirnov:	12		
Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation:	13		
Extraversion:	13		
Agreeableness:	13		
Conscientiousness:	14		
Neuroticism:	14		
Openness to Experience:	15		
Discussion of the Results:	15		
CONCLUSION	16		
REFERENCES	17		
APPENDIX	22		

ABSTRACT

Using a student sample (N = 100), this aims to explore the relationship between personality and the factors that affect the attitudes towards social network advertising. Following the introduction of the reader to the topic in discussion, the study proceeds by presenting the factors that influence the individual's attitudes towards Social Network Advertising and the factors of measurement of personality. Furthermore, it presents the instrument used for the analysis of the personality. Additionally, the study presents the method of selection, and the instruments used in order to accomplish its goal. The study aims at describing the participants through the facets of personality (Big Five) and the factors that influence the attitudes towards Social Network Advertising (positive factors, inhibitors, influence and eWOM). Additionally it aims at describing the relationships between those. Following a correlation analysis, the study showed that extroverts are more likely to seek and give information, believing that advertising is less intrusive while they are more concerned about privacy. Whilst Agreeable individuals are shown to be influenced by the norms, Conscientiousness indicates a greater likelihood that the individual is concerned about his privacy while less influenced by information from peers, whilst Openness to experience showed no relationship with any factor.

INTRODUCTION

Personality and Marketing

Starting with the work of Freud with his psychoanalytic theory, the marketers were exposed to a dimension never previously considered, the unconscious mind which Freud called the ID (Kassarjian 1971). This idea that consumers can be influenced by an unconscious force fascinated the marketers as it implied an enormous potential characterised by the ability to influence the consumer to buy the product of marketer's choice. Building on Freud ideas, the Neo-freudians (Alfred Adler, Carl Jung, Erik Erikson, and Karen Horney) made popular ideas of superiority, implying that

individuals want to feel better than the others by overcoming feelings of inferiority throughout life or adults trying to cope with child anxieties. Those created advertising intended to exploit "the striving for superiority and the needs for love, security, and escape from loneliness to sell toothpaste, deodorants, cigarettes, and even detergents" (Kassarjian 1971). Based on statistical observations, marketers started to develop techniques that allowed for a better understanding of the consumer, switching on the components of personality such as the individual's aggressiveness and trying to develop tools to gather knowledge regarding the unconscious mind of the consumer. As a result, "Gordon Personal Profile" which has been used by Kernan (1968) to empirically test the relationship between decision behavior and personality resulted in a correlation between the counterparts which resulted in the creation of multiple scales used to measure personality. As an example, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule which has been used to distinguish the Ford users of the Chevrolet ones by Evans (1959) by measuring the psychoanalytically-oriented needs or Thurstone Temperament Schedule and California Personality inventory which have been created with the objective of understanding the consumer. The same principle that has been used by marketers was used by psychologists when McCrae and Costa (1985) created the Big Five model which aimed at a better understanding of the personality facets.

Social Media

The global rise of social media attracted companies and with that, the digital advertising revenue raised to 3,374 million dollars in 2020 (UK). Furthermore, the development of tools that allow a better understanding of the individuals, creating a better association of the consumer with the advertised product. In an attempt to maximize the revenue, the social network sites adopted a way to make the advertising more appealing to the consumer and thus, it started to take advantage of the data points that are left behind, thus making the advertising personalized. Although, the effectiveness of those are surrounded by conflict, given that the

users feel that their privacy is violated (Schumann et al., 2014).

With the exponential growth of social media and given the adoption of it by a large proportion of the population (26.3%) (Internet World Stats, 2017), in concordance with the development of appropriate instruments, companies were able to target the consumer directly, transforming the marketing into a consumer-centric one (Schumann et al. 2014). With a better understanding of the consumer, companies have managed to use this information against the individuals and, as a result, two major events took place with the aid of Cambridge Analytica which harvested 50 million Facebook profiles in order to gain better insight towards Donald's Trump election and the Brexit campaign (News | The Guardian 2020).

With the rise of the internet, multiple web services became available for free by operating on a business model that allows them to extract revenue from the use of advertising. One of the central components of the World Wide Web is social media which consist of blogs, forums, business networks, photo-sharing platforms, social gaming, microblogs, chat apps, social networks. Furthermore, Social Network Sites became part of many lives, where individuals allocate an average of one hour and 57 minutes of their time each day. Additionally, since its creation, a solid uptrend of embracement characterises this and in 2020 (eMarketer. 2019), the number of active users reached the number of 3.08 billion users. The uptrend is projected to remain constant as countries with underdeveloped markets are embracing the phenomenon and a projected figure of 3.43 billion users is expected to

be reached by 2023. Out of the amalgam of Social Network Sites, Facebook represents the leader, reporting 2,449 million active users, followed by YouTube (2,000), WhatsApp (1,600), WeChat (1,151) and Instagram (1,000) (We Are Social, Hootsuite, DataReportal. 2020). Notably, 72,4% of North America's population is using Facebook, while in Europe the figure is 41.7% and worldwide 26.3% (Internet World Stats, Facebook, 2017). The time spent on Social Networking rose from 90 minutes per day (2012) to 144 minutes per day in 2019 (We Are Social, 2020). The activities that the individuals practice on social media can be seen in Table ,1 where the most practiced activities are related to social aspects (sharing content, entertainment, networking) but also tied to the commercial side of it (researching products) (GlobalWebIndex, We Are Social., 2019). As the consumers ultimately dictate the state of the market, companies adapted and as a result, they constructed their online presence.

In order to take advantage of the platforms used by consumers, brands increased the exposure to the SNSs. In 2019, 94% of the marketers became present on Facebook and 73% on Instagram while 54% were active through Youtube (Social Media Examiner., 2019). When asked why marketers used social media, 93% of respondents stated that it increased their exposure, while 58% reported using it for gathering market insight (Social Media Examiner., 2019). An interesting figure is represented by the number of respondents that never acquired any product on social media, which sits at 20.3%, resulting in 80% of respondents that purchased products through social media (iVend Retail., 2019). As a result, it can be observed why social media provides an attractive environment for brands.

Summing up the previously stated variables, personality and factors affecting the attitudes towards social network sites, this paper aims to explore the relationship between these variables, thus deepening the understanding of consumer perceptions. While it is clear that homo sapiens are complex beings, with multiple factors influencing their perception regarding their surroundings, such as culture (Hersen et al. 2006) and social groups (Terry and Hogg 1996), the following paper aims to

Table 1

Leading social media usage reasons worldwide 2018		
1.	To stay in touch with my friends	40%
2.	To find funny or entertaining content	37%
3.	To share photos or videos with others	33%
4.	To research/find products to buy	30%
5.	To share my opinion	29%
6.	To meet new people	27%
7.	To network for work	24%
8.	To make sure I don't miss out on anything	22%
9.	To share details of what I'm doing in my daily life	20%
10.	To follow celebrities/celebrity news	19%

GlobalWebIndex, & We Are Social. (June 28, 2019). Most popular reasons for internet users worldwide to use social media as of 4th quarter 2018 [Graph]. In Statista. Retrieved April 29, 2020, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/715449/social-media-usage-reasons-worldwide/>

bring the personality of the individuals into the awareness of both marketers and individuals and might serve as a pilot study for future research. The main objectives of the study are to describe the students through the facets of personality followed by the analysis of the relationship between the variables.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Network Advertising:

Social Network Sites (SNS) or Online Social Networks (OSN) are described as platforms that allow the free exchange of information between the participants of the platform. In order for an individual to participate in this electronic information exchange, a virtual profile is required. Social Network Advertising (SNA) is defined by Jung et al. (2015) as “ad formats that engage the social context of the user viewing the advertising”. Furthermore, SNAs are more complex than traditional marketing advertisements, as it not only targets people based on demographic and psychographic data, but also takes advantage of other types of information contained by the interaction of the participant within the SNS’s environment (profile data, social data, interaction data). The benefits of advertising in a SNS environment are cost (comparable to traditional media options) and the ability to specifically target consumers (Jung et al. 2015).

The first contour drawn upon general advertising in SNS was created by Kelly, Kerr, and Drennan (2010), which concerned the avoidance of advertising. Participants of the study showed that annoyance wasn’t high and a degree of benevolence towards use of advertising as a source of keeping a platform available at no cost was present. Furthermore, the study found a degree of irrelevancy between the user and the advertising and a lack of trust has been confirmed between individuals and advertising. Those findings were also supported by Sashittal et al. (2012) who described irrelevancy and untrustiness as the main factors which create negative attitudes within individuals. Following the lack of engagement, coupled with negative attitudes held by individuals towards advertising in the SNSs,

resulting in the avoidance of online advertising, has prompted researchers to seek the rationale and behaviours underlying attitudes towards Social Network Advertising.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE ATTITUDES

The main factors that have an impact on the attitudes towards SNA are divided into the factors that affect the attitudes positively (perceived advertised value, informativeness of the advertising and Peer Influence) and the inhibitors which diminish the positive ones and may create negative attitudes (Jung et al. 2015). The degree of information that the user perceives provided by the advertising has long been studied, showing positive relationships between its counterparts and positive attitudes towards the SNAs (Ducoffe 1996; Gao and Koufaris, 2006; Taylor et al. 2011; Saxena and Khanna 2013; Tan et al. 2013) but have also shown insignificant relations (Jung et al., 2015) thus, implying that other situational factors are subject to affect the way in which the variables interact. Furthermore, the positive attitude that was connected to informativeness and perceived advertising value was also correlated with a higher purchase intention (Jung et al., 2015).

At the other pole, inhibitors are composed of Invasiveness and Privacy Concern, having the potential to diminish se positive attitudes (Taylor et al. 2011, Korea Times 2011). Invasiveness represents the feeling that one’s personal space has been intruded and as a result, users are inclined to feel manipulated (Tucker, 2013), whilst privacy concern is related to how the advertisement gathered such data, which would translate more towards the platforms themselves. Jung et. al (2015) concluded that the informativeness and perceived advertising value of an SNA do not have a high impact on user attitude towards it, while Peers influence has been found to be the strongest predictor in positive attitudes and that Inhibitors (especially intrusiveness, has shown a great capacity to diminish positive attitudes.

Advertising Value:

Ducoffe (1996), defined advertising value as being “subjective evaluation of the relative worth or utility of advertising to consumers”. The main dimensions on which the factor has been measured are represented in terms of informativeness and Perceived advertising value. Previous research suggests that the informativeness and the perceived value have a positive impact on attitudes towards advertising (Ha, Park, & Lee, 2014; Taylor et al., 2011) which furthermore implies a greater purchase intention (Jung et al., 2015).

Advertising Intrusiveness:

McCoy et al. (2008) defined intrusiveness as “a measure of how much an advertisement will cause an uninvited distraction or diversion from the user’s task at hand” and further described as the “mechanism by which ads evoke negative emotional reactions” (Li et al. 2002). With regards to online advertising, early research suggests that perceived intrusiveness develops negative attitudes (Li et al. 2002; Rettie, 2001). Furthermore, users perceived advertising as intrusive, irritating, and annoying (McCoy et al. 2008). In terms of feelings, words such as “violated” and “molested” have been used to describe such feelings (Wegert, 2002). For this reason, intrusiveness has been linked to the development of negative attitudes towards advertising (Lin and Kim, 2016; Wiese et al. 2020).

Privacy Concern:

As SNS’s allow advertisers to tailor adverts using consumer information, it creates a problem of low acceptance as it raises concerns related to the violation of the individual’s privacy (Schumann et al. 2014). Customized ads, although more effective than irrelevant ads, are prone to elicit negative effects due to the consumers reaction (Jung 2017) from which, avoidance and negative attitudes are common views (Baek and Morimoto, 2012; Smit et al., 2014; Phelps et al., 2001). As Jung (2017) found, customization of ads leads to a better attention regarding them, although an increased privacy concern elicits avoidance. Furthermore, age shares a positive

relationship with the privacy concern that the individual expresses (Li et al. 2015). Smit et al. (2014) argued that age has no relevance but of significance is the degree of knowledge. Interestingly, the study of E.G. Smit et al. (2013) found a relationship between the gender and the attitudes towards behavioral targeted advertising, showing that males are more prone to hold negative attitudes towards online behavior advertising. Additionally, van Noort et al. (2014), found that a low privacy concern implied a higher purchasing intention, followed by a willingness to forward the campaign. Costa and McCrae (2002) studied the variance of traits over time, showing that these traits slightly vary with age which, in conjunction with the previous contradictory studies, might imply that these traits are the basis of differences in attitudes.

Peer Influence (Electronic Word of Mouth - eWOM):

Peer influence is characterised by the electronic word of mouth (eWOM) and can be identified through opinions that individuals share through Social Network Sites. These impressions take the form of comments, likes, and following actions (such as sharing electronic content already posted by other users). At the basis of Social Network Sites stays the Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM) that is created through the exchange of information between the participants. This makes the eWOM appear as a more reliable environment (Chu and Kim 2011). Jung et al. (2015) highlighted the positive relationship between content recommended by peers and attitudinal reaction, which is further sustained by Iyengar et al. (2009), who concluded that the influence of friends on social media leads to purchasing behavior. Chu and Kim (2011), examined eWOM in three aspects: *opinion seeking*, *opinion giving* and *opinion passing*. The first two dimensions (opinion giving and opinion seeking) have been previously studied (Flynn et al., 1996; Feick and Price, 1987) although they focused on the physical WOM, whereas Chu and Kim (2011) projected it into the electronic environment. A person scoring high on the opinion giving scale is considered to be an opinion leader, which is prone to exert a higher degree of influence on other individual attitudes

(Feick and Price 1987). SNSs serves as a bridge where opinion seekers and opinion givers can interact with each other. The opinion passing represents the willingness to facilitate the flow of information (Norman & Russell 2006; Sun et al. 2006). The interpersonal influence, denoted by the normative and informational influences (Bearden et al. 1989), represent the tendency to conform to the expectations of others and tendency to accept the information from others respectively. Other dimensions studied by Chu and Kim (2011) are Trust, Tie Strength, and Homophily, although they do not represent important factors for the current study. Furthermore, the work of Liu-Thompkins (2012) and Watts and Dodds (2007) shows that a specific individual offers the best alternative in the diffusion of information, although the analysis does not concern individual personal traits. Okazaki et al. (2013) found that people who are part of large social networks are more willing to transfer information within the environment.

PERSONALITY:

Trait and Factor theory:

Trait and Factor theories view personality as a composition of traits and factors which allowed the measurement of personality through bivariate scales. Traits represent the differences in personality variables that distinguish the individual and which show a consistent pattern of thoughts, feelings and actions. Factor represents the technique used to group traits into manageable clusters (McCrae and Costa, 2008). This type of analysis has enabled researchers to group traits such as calm and stable on the scale of Neuroticism or sociable and outgoing under the extroverted term. The birth of the Five-Factor Theory came as a result through a series of longitudinal studies concerned with the personality of the participants (Block, 1977; Costa & McCrae, 1978; Douglas & Arenberg, 1978) which concretised that the traits that account for personality as being stable over time with little variation from its mean. The stability of the traits (Basic Tendencies) distinguishes them from the other factors such as attitudes, values and beliefs (Characteristic Adaptations) which can be altered. As

traits are seen as fairly stable (Block, 1977; Costa & McCrae, 1978; Douglas & Arenberg, 1978) due to their biological bases (Ebstein et al. 1998; Williams et al., 2003), they provide the core foundation of an individual personality. Within the Characteristic Adaptation relies the center of person (Self-concept). The alteration of Characteristic Adaptation raises from the response towards basic tendencies and the external influences through dynamic processes. In other terms, the personality traits in combination with the external environment creates, destroys or alters habits, attitudes, skills and roles. Given the overall stability of traits and their causal impact on the Characteristic Adaptation, they can be good predictors of behavioural patterns (McCrae and Costa, 2003), although they may fail as a predictor of individual behavior. In other words, the traits have an impact in the formation of attitudes. Personality implies a biological phenomenon regarding the communication of genes accounting for 50% of variance in personality (Loehlin 1992) which implies that an understanding of how different personalities form are related to different attitudes should serve as a pillar for consumer behavior.

Five Factor Model:

The Five Factor model of the personality which is also referred to as "Big Five" uses a hierarchical model of traits within the five bi-variate scales of personality. To exemplify, the extraversion dimension is an umbrella term that covers traits such as social, outgoing and talkative (Gosling, Rentfrow and Swann, 2003). The factors contained by the model are: Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. These are described as factors under which other traits may be found, which leads to the well known name of Big Five which largely describes the factors (traits) that cover all of the other traits. Furthermore, the Big Five factors are described by the following traits (Markey, Markey and Tinsley, 2004; Clark and Çalli, 2014):

Extraversion:

This facet encompasses traits such as talkative and sociable while on the opposite side, introversion

contours a shy and quiet personality. The difference on the scale of extraversion appears in how the individual experiences the external environment. Eysenck (1967) stresses this differentiation through the different levels of cortical arousal thus, separating introverts which are experiencing a higher level of cortical arousal from the extroverts which experience a lower level of cortical arousal. This difference implies that while an introverted individual would require a lower level of arousal in order to have a reaction, the same individual might respond negatively towards an advertisement that they perceive to be too loud. This difference is further emphasised by Orth et al. (2010) who highlighted a difference in attitudes based on the extraversion factor. Furthermore, extroverts attempt to alter their peers' perceptions (Watson and Clark 1997) which might translate into a positive relation between extraversion and eWOM. The older comparison of the positivism vs negativism is further explained by the difference in the scale of extraversion (Styśko-Kunkowska and Borecka 2010). In congruence with the previous studies, Baer et al. (2014) correlated the introversion dimension of the scale with more negative impacts and therefore are more inclined to develop negative attitudes towards SNA. Hughes et al. (2013) categorised extroverts as being positive, implying that the extroverts are more likely to have positive ratings. On the contrary, introverts are expected to be more protective about their intimacy, showing a higher score in privacy concern. From the previous arguments, it can be derived that the extraversion would have an impact on the social interaction of individuals, influencing the willingness to transmit the information. Furthermore, extroverted persons have been attributed opinion leadership skills given their communicativeness thus can be a passage for information diffusion (Gnambs and Batinic 2012). The individuals that are part of this category are prone to accept the information given by their peers and pass it forward.

H1a: $p > 0$ Extraversion is positively correlated with advertising informativeness.

H1b: $p > 0$ Extraversion is positively correlated with perceived advertising value.

H1c: $p < 0$ Extraversion is inversely correlated with intrusiveness.

H1d: $p < 0$ Extraversion is inversely correlated with privacy concern.

H1e: Extraversion is correlated with Normative Influence.

H1f: Extraversion is correlated with Informational Influence.

H1g: $p > 0$ Extraversion is correlated with Opinion Seeking.

H1h: $p > 0$ Extraversion is correlated with Opinion Giving.

H1i: $p > 0$ Extraversion is correlated with Opinion passing.

Agreeableness:

A person with high levels of agreeableness would be characterised as being friendly and warm, whilst a low level would characterise a reserved, distant personality. The agreeableness scale is mostly associated with the interpersonal relationship and as a result it might be positively associated with the eWOM (positive relationship with opinion giving, seeking and passing). Additionally, due to the nature of their personality, they are subject to be more influenced by their peers. Furthermore, agreeableness has been associated with trust which is related to the privacy concern and intrusiveness (Phillips et al. 2006) implying that an agreeable person would show a negative relationship with privacy concern and intrusiveness:

H2a: Agreeableness is correlated with advertising informativeness.

H2b: Agreeableness is correlated with advertising informativeness.

H2c: Agreeableness is correlated with intrusiveness.

H2d: Agreeableness is correlated with privacy concern.

H2e: $p > 0$ Agreeableness is positively correlated with Normative Influence.

H2f: $p > 0$ Agreeableness is positively correlated with Informational Influence.

H2g: $p > 0$ Agreeableness is correlated with Opinion Seeking.

H2h: $p > 0$ Agreeableness is correlated with Opinion Giving.

H2i: $p > 0$ Agreeableness is correlated with Opinion passing.

Conscientiousness:

Under this factor, towards the higher part of the scale, traits such as organised, careful and reliable describe the individual while the lower scale indicates a distracted and disorganised personality. Furthermore, a conscious person tends to rationalise before behaving thus it is expected that the individuals who score high on this scale would show a positive relationship with the inhibitors (advertising intrusiveness and privacy control). Clark and Çallı (2014) discovered that conscientious individuals expressed a reticence in participation in the eWOM characterised through a lack of sharing and expressing opinions on SNS therefore, conscientious individuals are expected to show negative relationships with the flow of information (opinion giving, opinion seeking and opinion passing).

H3a: Conscientiousness is correlated with advertising informativeness.

H3b: Conscientiousness is positively correlated with advertising informativeness.

H3c: $p > 0$ Conscientiousness is positively correlated with intrusiveness.

H3d: $p > 0$ Conscientiousness is positively correlated with privacy concern.

H3e: Conscientiousness is correlated with Normative Influence.

H3f: Conscientiousness is correlated with Informational Influence.

H3g: $p < 0$ Conscientiousness is correlated with Opinion Seeking.

H3h: $p < 0$ Conscientiousness is correlated with Opinion Giving.

H3i: $p < 0$ Conscientiousness is correlated with Opinion passing.

Neuroticism:

This facet encompasses, on the higher spectrums, traits such as nervousness and sensitivity, whilst at the lower end of the scale, opposite traits such as emotional stability would be present. Furthermore, a high score on the neuroticism scale implies negative feelings towards both the intrinsic and extrinsic environment of an individual (Larsen and Ketelaar 1991; Watson et al. 1992) As a high score on this scale implies sensitivity, individuals may feel their personal space is being intruded by the advertising, which implies a defensive response. The individuals that are represented by this category also show increased vulnerability which might be further aggravated by personal targeted advertising. Additionally, research suggests that neurotic people are more likely to disclose personal information (Shen et al., 2015; Vinitzky, 2010) which implies a reduced privacy concern, although the relation between this has been contradicted (Ross et al. 2009)

H4a: Neuroticism is correlated with advertising informativeness.

H4b: Neuroticism is correlated with advertising informativeness.

H4c: $p < 0$ Neuroticism is inversely correlated with intrusiveness.

H4d: $p < 0$ Neuroticism is inversely correlated with privacy concern.

H4e: Neuroticism is correlated with Normative Influence.

H4f: Neuroticism is correlated with Informational Influence.

H4g: Neuroticism is correlated with Opinion Seeking.

H4h: Neuroticism is correlated with Opinion Giving.

H4i: Neuroticism is correlated with Opinion passing.

Openness to experience:

Describes the inclination of a person to be curious, imaginative and original or, by contrast, , radical (rejecting new experiences). This factor represents the most contested factor as it “does not correlate systematically to expected patterns of behavior” and is fairly dynamic with age (Hersen et

al. 2006). Additionally, this factor was linked to the usage of social networking sites resulting in a positive relationship between the two. The more an individual scores on this scale, the more prone they are to using social network sites. Individuals that score high within this scale are expected to show a greater involvement in the eWOM and might be prone to being influenced easier than its opposite counterpart.

H5a: Openness to experience is correlated with advertising informativeness.

H1b: Openness to experience is correlated with advertising informativeness.

H5c: Openness to experience is correlated with intrusiveness.

H5d: Openness to experience is correlated with privacy concern.

H5e: $p > 0$ Openness to experience is positively correlated with Normative Influence.

H5f: $p > 0$ Openness to experience is positively correlated with Informational Influence.

H5g: $p > 0$ Openness to experience is positively correlated with Opinion Seeking.

H5h: $p > 0$ Openness to experience is positively correlated with Opinion Giving.

H5i: $p > 0$ Openness to experience is positively correlated with Opinion passing.

Big Five:

Different tools have been used in order to measure personality (Gordon Personal Profile, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, Thurstone Temperament Schedule) in order to understand the role it implies in creating a certain behaviour, although the marketing research focused more on the characteristic adaptation of the model trying to assess the person's attitudes and beliefs. The factors measure aspects such as needs (Jackson, 1984), psychological types (Jung, 1971), temperaments (Buss and Plomin, 1975) and traits (John, Donahue and Kentle, 1991). The Big Five was created in the 1980's, under John, Donahue and Kentle (1991) has been a widely used framework. The instrument consists of 44 short-phrase items which measure the personality in report to the 5 bi-variate scales of the Five Factor Model. The 44 questions instrument may

seem as a relatively short tool when compared with its bigger versions - such as the short form of NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) - which is comprised of 60 questions or the full version, which consists of 240 items (Costa and McCrae, 2008). The demand for shorter versions has been raised (due to the limited time to research) which has produced, versions such as: the single-item self-esteem scale; single-item ability ratings; 30 item measure of the Big Five Inventory (BFI); the 15 item BFI (Soto and John, 2017), and the 10 item BFI (Gosling, Rentfrow and Swann, 2003). While the reliability of a short version of the BFI falls short in comparison to the full version, it can serve as a valid tool when the data collection is limited. Another benefit of a short BFI represents the diminishment of redundancy between survey participants which can increase as the boredom accumulates while answering a large amount of questions.

METHODOLOGY

Research Philosophy:

The study has been conducted through a positivistic philosophy, relying on the stability of reality that can be observed. This leads to a quantitative approach to the study aiming to analyse the data in an objective manner thus providing meaningful data. As a result, hypotheses were developed in order to be tested through quantitative methods by having a neutral point of view. In addition to the philosophy of the research, the analysis has been conducted on a cross sectional timeline (due to the time limit of the study).

Sample selection and data collection:

In order to gather the data required, an online questionnaire has been designed and distributed through Facebook groups and contacts. In order to diminish the coverage error and to represent the population as accurately as possible, the sample has been randomly distributed, providing potential participants an equal chance of participating. This has been assured by having the survey open for any individual that wanted to participate. Each contact has been asked to distribute the survey further. In

order to screen the individuals, two questions have been placed at the beginning of the survey. The first question asked the individual for the agreement with the participation in the survey required by the ethical considerations.. The participants who did not agree were screened out of the survey. The second question asked if the respondent was a student and if the respondent identified as not being a student, the responses were excluded from the analysis. The questionnaire has been designed using closed questions in an attempt to reduce the chances of bad entries, missing values, and to aid the quantitative analysis of the survey.

Measurement:

As a tool of measuring the attitudes of the individuals, Likert scales have been used. Likert (1939) developed the scale to measure the attitudes towards an object. The Likert scale is composed of fixed choice variables in order to measure agreement, frequency, importance and likelihood. In the present study, the participants were asked to choose the level of agreement within a 7 point Likert Scale, measuring agreement ("Strongly Agree", "Moderately Agree", "Agree a little") and disagreement ("Disagree a little", "Moderately Disagree", "Strongly Disagree") with the statements

within the questionnaire providing a neutral response of either "Neither agree nor disagree". The scale has been chosen for the study as it offers the advantage of a more diversified data, by allowing the user to have a variety of options, as opposed to binary responses ("yes", "no"), which aids the analysis of correlation. Furthermore, the scale ensures the anonymity of the respondent and reduces the social pressure and social desirability bias which refers to how an individual might alternate his choice of answer in order to be perceived in a positive way (Paulhus, 1984). The Likert scales can be combined to create a Likert scale index which transforms the way the data can be treated. The scales used have been adopted from Ducoffe (1995,1996), Taylor et al. (2011) and Chu and Kim (2011). Furthermore, the criteria for selecting the scales, besides the relevancy for the study, was based on the Cronbach alpha, where the scale had to achieve a cronbach's alpha greater than 0.700. The advertising value scale has been created by Ducoffe (1995, 1996) with the dimensions of informativeness and perceived advertising value. In order to re-assess the internal reliability of the scales they have been retested for Cornbach's Alpha using SPSS which showed the following results. The informativeness scale has a Cornbach's Alpha of $\alpha = .896$, while advertising value dimension is composed from three items with an Alpha of $\alpha = .823$. The inhibitors, intrusiveness and privacy concern were adapted from Taylor et al. (2011) and are constructed from five items and three items respectively with Alpha's of $\alpha = 0.846$ and $\alpha = 0.892$. The other dimensions, Opinion Seeking, Opinion Giving, Opinion Passing and Normative and Informational Influence are constructed by Chu and Kim (2011) each of them having three items with alphas of $\alpha = 0.859$, $\alpha = 0.818$, $\alpha = 0.941$, $\alpha = 0.933$ and $\alpha = 0.908$. The values presented can be seen in Table 2. The traits measurement scale was developed by (Gosling et al. 2003) using 10 constructs where five were treated in reverse. Additionally, categorical data has been gathered using closed questions that asked the participant for gender and average usage of Social Network Sites (weekly spending time and experience expressed in time).

Nanna and Sawilowsky (1998) suggested that a Likert scale which contains ordinal data should be

Table 2

<i>Scales used</i>			
	N	Alpha	Source
Informativeness	7	0.896	Ducoffe (1995;1996)
Value	3	0.823	Ducoffe (1995;1996)
Intrusiveness	6	0.846	Taylor et al. (2011)
Privacy Concern	3	0.892	Taylor et al. (2011)
Normative Influence	3	0.859	Chu and Kim (2011)
Informational Influence	3	0.818	Chu and Kim (2011)
Opinion seeking	3	0.941	Chu and Kim (2011)
Opinion giving	3	0.933	Chu and Kim (2011)
Opinion passing	3	0.908	Chu and Kim (2011)

Note. N = 100

Table 3.

Frequencies		
Age	18-22	79%
	23-29	21%
Gender	Male	34%
	Female	66%
Site Used	Facebook	88%
	Youtube	93%
	WeChat	6%
	Instagram	91%
	Other	46%
Usage (hours/week)	0-6	19%
	7-12	21%
	13-18	22%
	19-24	16%
	25-30	11%
	31+	11%
Experience (years)	1-2	1%
	3-4	3%
	4-5	8%
	5-6	12%
	>6	76%

Note. $N = 100$

analysed by non-parametric tests, while others suggest that parametric testing is capable of overcoming the violation of the assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity. For the purpose of this study, the data was tested for the assumptions of normality and would be treated in accordance to the results. After the data has been gathered, a missing value analysis has been conducted which showed variables missing under several scales which have been addressed by the removal of the individual from the dataset in order to not influence and preserve the sample. As the sample showed itself to be non-normal, a replacement with a mean value would have affected the results. Furthermore, Cohen (1992), within the behavioral sciences, recommended the description of None/Trivial for correlation coefficients of $p = 0$, Weak/Small between $.0 < p < .1$,

Moderate/Medium between $.1 < p < .3$, Strong/Large for $.3 < p < .5$ and perfect for $.5 < p$. The correlation coefficient would be described in Cohen's (1992) terms.

Ethical Considerations:

The ethical requirements have been respected at all times. Participants were completing the questionnaire anonymously which didn't contain personal information about them. Furthermore, the data of the individuals was treated in a secure manner. Additionally, each participant received a unique identification number upon the completion of the questionnaire in order to offer the respondents the opportunity to have their responses deleted from the survey. The study hasn't encountered any ethical issues.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Descriptives:

In terms of demographics 79% were in the age group of 18 - 22 years old, while 21% were between 23 and 29 years old. With regards to gender, 34% were male while 66% were female. All of the participants were using Social Network Sites and most of them (76%) were experienced users by being active on SNS's for more than six years and 96% of the users had more than four years experience on SNS's. In relation to the specific Social Network Sites which the participants were using, YouTube situated itself at the top with 93%, followed by Instagram at 91% and Facebook at 88% while WeChat was used only by 6% of the respondents and 46% of the respondents used other Social Network Sites which were not mentioned. The sample was slightly extraverted ($M = 4.025$, $SD = 1.503$), where the individuals were more agreeable ($M = 4.550$, $SD = 1.048$), conscientious ($M = 5.225$, $SD = 1.093$) neurotic ($M = 4.430$, $SD = 1.411$) and open to experiences ($M = 5.225$, $SD = 1.184$). Furthermore, the individuals in the study showed a higher perceived informational value ($M = 4.269$, $SD = 1.316$) and advertising value ($M = 3.940$, $SD = 1.461$) while the inhibitor intrusiveness was higher ($M = 5.132$, $SD = 1.162$). Privacy concern was lower ($M =$

Table 4.***Skewness and Kurtosis***

		Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness			Kurtosis		
						Statistic	Std. Error	Z-Score	Statistic	Std. Error	Z-Score
1.	Extraversion	1.000	7.000	4.025	1.503	-0.090	0.241	-0.373	-0.606	0.478	-1.268
2.	Agreeableness	1.500	7.000	4.550	1.048	0.395	0.241	1.639	0.478	0.478	1.000
3.	Conscientiousness	2.500	7.000	5.225	1.093	-0.239	0.241	-0.992	-0.714	0.478	-1.494
4.	Neuroticism	1.000	7.000	4.430	1.411	-0.273	0.241	-1.133	-0.548	0.478	-1.146
5.	Openness to Experiences	1.500	7.000	5.225	1.184	-0.410	0.241	-1.701	-0.232	0.478	-0.485
6.	Informational Value	1.000	7.000	4.269	1.316	-0.281	0.241	-1.166	-0.138	0.478	-0.289
7.	Advertising Value	1.000	7.000	3.940	1.461	-0.094	0.241	-0.390	-0.434	0.478	-0.908
8.	Intrusiveness	2.330	7.000	5.132	1.162	-0.472	0.241	-1.959	-0.389	0.478	-0.814
9.	Privacy Concern	1.000	7.000	3.117	1.619	0.526	0.241	2.183	-0.500	0.478	-1.046
10.	Normative Influence	1.000	7.000	2.882	1.607	0.717	0.241	2.975	-0.399	0.478	-0.835
11.	Informational Influence	1.000	7.000	5.170	1.308	-1.204	0.241	-4.996	1.616	0.478	3.381
12.	Information Seeking	1.000	7.000	3.053	1.762	0.498	0.241	2.066	-0.685	0.478	-1.433
13.	Information Giving	1.000	7.000	2.553	1.612	0.695	0.241	2.884	-0.594	0.478	-1.243
14.	Information Passing	1.000	6.670	3.360	1.637	-0.019	0.241	-0.079	-1.108	0.478	-2.318

Note. N = 100

3.117, SD = 1.619), which implies that the sampled individuals are seeing information of the SNAs as informative and valuable. Additionally, the participants in the study perceived advertising as being more intrusive while they expressed moderate concerns for their privacy. The normative influence was slightly lower (M = 2.882, SD = 1.607), while Information influence was higher (M = 5.170, SD = 1.308) than the midpoint, which implied that the sampled individuals were perceiving themselves as less influenced by the norms, although more influenced by information. Additionally, the sampled individuals showed lower levels in the eWOM scales, information seeking (M = 3.053, SD = 1.762), information giving (M = 2.553, SD = 1.612) and information passing (M = 3.360, SD = 1.637), which suggests that the sample surveyed is less likely to participate into the eWOM. The descriptive values for frequencies can be observed in Table 3, while the mean and standard deviation can be observed in Table 4.

Skewness and Kurtosis:

The peakedness of the distribution has been assessed by the Kurtosis value. The Agreeableness and Informational Influence have been identified as having leptokurtic distributions while the rest of the distributions, by having a negative Kurtosis, have been assessed as platykurtic distributions. Furthermore, based on the skewness, it can be observed that most of the distributions are horizontally asymmetrical. Afterwards, the calculation of the z-score has been used by computing the division of the kurtosis and skewness by their standard error, which can be observed in Table 4.

$$Z_K = \frac{K-0}{SE_k}$$

$$Z_{S_K} = \frac{S_K-0}{SE_{S_K}}$$

Using an $\alpha = 0.05$, the values that failed to achieve the normality assumption were: Information giving; information seeking, informational influence, normative influence, privacy concern, and intrusiveness, whilst the rest accomplished the assumption of normality. The Kurtosis z-score failed to achieve the normality assumption using an

$\alpha = 0.05$ on the Information passing and informational influence, the rest falling between the -1.96 and 1.96 interval. As the criteria for normality asks for congruence between both z-scores for skewness and kurtosis, only the following scales have passed normality assumption: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness to experience, Informational value and Advertising value.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov:

H_0 : There is no difference between the observed distribution of the survey scores and a normally distributed empirical sample.

H_A : There is a difference between the observed distribution of the survey scores and a normally distributed empirical sample.

In order to compare the sample against a normally distributed empirical sample the Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test has been performed using SPSS. The results show that only the Informational and Advertising Value have achieved a significance $p > .05$ with ($p = .059$ and $p = .067$) having the most extreme differences of $D_{(100)} = 0.087$ and $D_{(100)} = 0.086$ and a Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z-test statistic of $Z = 0.07$ and $Z = 0.086$. Based on the results, the null Hypothesis is rejected in all cases as the p - value exceeds the level of risk associated with the Null Hypothesis ($p < .05$) besides Informational value and Advertising value where the Null Hypothesis is accepted, in which case the distribution is approximately normal.

Based on the results from both, the Skewness and Kurtosis z-scores and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample test, only Advertising value and Informational Value can be assumed normal while the others are non-normal, which implies that a parametric test cannot be performed due to the assumption of normality that has been violated as implied by the previous tests. Therefore, the study would continue by using a non-parametric test. The results of the test can be seen in Table 5.

Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation:

Spearman's rank-order correlation analyses the relationship between two variables on at least an ordinal scale with the condition that the sample size is $N \geq 4$. As the non-parametric test studies the correlation between two variables given that the variables are at least ordinal, the Spearman's ρ can be considered a good alternative to Pearson product-moment correlation. Furthermore, based on the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient, the following results were gathered where the Null Hypothesis ($H_0: \rho = 0$) indicates that no relationship is present between the scales while the alternative Hypothesis represents the previously stated hypotheses. The summary of the rejected and accepted hypotheses can be found in Table 7.

Extraversion:

The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was not significant for Extraversion X Informational Value ($r_{S(98)} = .162$, $\rho = .108$), Extraversion X Advertising Value ($r_{S(98)} = 0.168$, $\rho = .095$), Extraversion X Normative Influence ($r_{S(98)} = 0.134$, $\rho = .184$), Extraversion X Informational Influence ($r_{S(98)} = -0.005$, $\rho = .961$) and Extraversion X Information Passing ($r_{S(98)} = 0.08$, $\rho = .430$) therefore, the Null Hypothesis is accepted. However, the correlation coefficient was significant ($r_{S(98)} = -.242$, $\rho = .015$) for Extraversion X Intrusiveness, showing an inverse relationship, while Extraversion X Privacy Concern ($r_{S(98)} = .207$, $\rho = .039$), Extraversion X Information Seeking ($r_{S(98)} = .203$, $\rho = .043$), Extraversion X Information Giving ($r_{S(98)} = .224$, $\rho = .025$) showed a weak positive correlation with a significance of $p < .05$. Due to this, the Null Hypothesis is rejected.

$H_0: \rho = 0$ Extraversion X Informational Value - accepted

$H_0: \rho = 0$ Extraversion X Advertising Value - accepted

$H_0: \rho = 0$ Extraversion X Intrusiveness - rejected

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Extraversion X Privacy Concern - rejected*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Extraversion X Normative Influence - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Extraversion X Informational Influence - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Extraversion X Information Seeking - rejected*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Extraversion X Information Giving - rejected*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Extraversion X Information Passing - accepted*

Agreeableness:

The correlation coefficient was not significant for Agreeableness X Informational Value ($r_{S(98)} = .051$, $\rho = .612$), Agreeableness X Advertising Value ($r_{S(98)} = .070$, $\rho = .486$), Agreeableness X Intrusiveness ($r_{S(98)} = -0.060$, $\rho = .550$), Agreeableness X Privacy Concern ($r_{S(98)} = .180$, $\rho = .073$), Agreeableness X Informational Influence ($r_{S(98)} = .100$, $\rho = .323$), Agreeableness X Information Seeking ($r_{S(100)} = .024$, $\rho = .812$), Agreeableness X Information Giving ($r_{S(98)} = -.016$, $\rho = .875$), Agreeableness X Information Passing ($r_{S(98)} = -.011$, $\rho = .910$). While the previous relationships showed no significant correlation coefficients, the following showed a significant ($r_{S(98)} = .245$, $\rho = .014$) relationship between Agreeableness and Normative influence. The Null Hypothesis is rejected in the case of Agreeableness X Normative Influence, where a positive weak relationship was present, therefore the Alternative Hypothesis was accepted. In the rest of the cases, the Null Hypothesis was accepted. The results can further be observed in Table 5.

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Informational Value - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Advertising Value - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Intrusiveness - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Privacy Concern - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Normative Influence - rejected*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Informational Influence - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Information Seeking - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Information Giving - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Agreeableness X Information Passing - accepted*

Conscientiousness:

In relation to the conscientiousness, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was not significant for Conscientiousness X Informational Value ($r_{S(98)} = .036$, $p = .725$), Conscientiousness X Advertising Value ($r_{S(98)} = -.011$, $p = .913$), Conscientiousness X Intrusiveness ($r_{S(98)} = -.035$, $p = .728$), Conscientiousness X Privacy Concern ($r_{S(98)} = -.093$, $p = .359$), Conscientiousness X Informational Influence ($r_{S(98)} = -.093$, $p = .358$), Conscientiousness X Normative Influence ($r_{S(98)} = -.092$, $p = .361$), Conscientiousness X Information Giving ($r_{S(98)} = -.135$, $p = .181$), Conscientiousness X Information Passing ($r_{S(98)} = -.185$, $p = .066$), thus the Null Hypothesis is rejected. However, it showed a significant ($r_{S(98)} = -0.200$, $p = .046$) relationship with Information Seeking where an inverse weak relationship is present and therefore, the Null Hypothesis was rejected.

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Informational Value - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Advertising Value - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Intrusiveness - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Privacy Concern - accepted*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Normative Influence - rejected*

$H_0: \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Informational Influence - accepted*

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Information Seeking - rejected*

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Information Giving - accepted*

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ *Conscientiousness X Information Passing - accepted*

an inverse relationship with Informational influence where the Null Hypothesis is rejected .

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ *Neuroticism X Informational Value - accepted*

Neuroticism:

Based on the results from SPSS, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was not significant for Conscientiousness X Informational Value ($r_{S(98)} = -.042, p = .677$), Neuroticism X Advertising Value ($r_{S(98)} = .021, p = .832$), Neuroticism X Intrusiveness ($r_{S(98)} = .008, p = .934$), Neuroticism X Normative Influence ($r_{S(98)} = -.047, p = .643$), Neuroticism X Information Seeking ($r_{S(98)} = -.113, p = .262$), Neuroticism X Information Giving ($r_{S(98)} = -.0135, p = .180$) and Neuroticism X Information Passing ($r_{S(98)} = -.098, p = .331$). Given the results, the Null Hypotheses were accepted. Furthermore, there is significant correlation coefficient with Privacy Concern ($r_{S(98)} = .199, p = .048$) with a positive weak relationship and a significant correlation coefficient ($r_{S(98)} = -.199, p = .048$) where Neuroticism showed

Table 5.

		Correlation Matrix												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	Extraversion													
2	Agreeableness	-.113												
3	Conscientiousness	-.014	.074											
4	Neuroticism	.035	.215*	.337**										
5	Openness to Experiences	.259**	-.043	.055	.103									
6	Informational Value	.162	.051	.036	-.042	.075								
7	Advertising Value	.168	.070	-.011	.021	.055	.508**							
8	Intrusiveness	-.242*	-.060	-.035	.008	.094	-.249*	-.367**						
9	Privacy Concern	.207*	.180	-.093	.199*	-.046	.270**	.243*	-.313**					
10	Normative Influence	.134	.245*	-.092	-.047	-.183	.348**	.232*	-.207*	.391**				
11	Informational Influence	-.005	.10	-.093	-.199*	.157	.113	.135	.134	.03	.215*			
12	Information Seeking	.203*	.024	-.200*	-.113	.021	.218*	.257**	-.152	.399**	.442**	.321**		
13	Information Giving	.224*	-.016	-.135	-.135	-.016	.276**	.228*	-.178	.336**	.437**	.165	.745**	
14	Information Passing	.080	-.011	-.185	-.098	-.109	.145	.087	.057	.257**	.200*	.122	.496**	.544**

Note. $N = 100$, * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 6.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test															
		Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experiences	Informational Value	Advertising Value	Intrusiveness	Privacy Concern	Normative Influence	Informational Influence	Information Seeking	Information Giving	Information Passing
Normal Parameters	Mean	4.025	4.550	5.225	4.430	5.225	4.269	3.940	5.132	3.117	2.882	5.170	3.053	2.553	3.360
	Std. Deviation	1.503	1.048	1.093	1.411	1.184	1.316	1.481	1.162	1.619	1.607	1.308	1.762	1.612	1.637
Most Extreme Differences		Absolute	0.093	0.179	0.151	0.100	0.122	0.087	0.086	0.107	0.136	0.138	0.148	0.128	0.194
Test Statistic			0.093	0.179	0.151	0.100	0.122	0.087	0.086	0.107	0.136	0.138	0.148	0.128	0.194
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)			.032c	.000c	.000c	.015c	.001c	.058c	.067c	.006c	.000c	.000c	.000c	.000c	.000c

a Test distribution is Normal.

b Calculated from data.

c Lilliefors Significance Correction.

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Advertising Value -
accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Intrusiveness -
accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Privacy Concern -
accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Normative
Influence - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Informational
Influence - rejected

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Information
Seeking - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Information Giving
- accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Neuroticism X Information
Passing - accepted

Openness to Experience:

The Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was not significant for Openness to Experiences X Informational Value ($r_{S(98)} = .075$, $p = .458$), Openness to Experiences X Advertising Value ($r_{S(98)} = .055$, $p = .589$), Openness to Experiences X Intrusiveness ($r_{S(98)} = .094$, $p = .352$), Openness to Experiences X Privacy Concern ($r_{S(98)} = -.046$, $p = .653$), Openness to Experiences X Normative Influence ($r_{S(98)} = -.183$, $p = .068$), Openness to Experiences X Informational Influence ($r_{S(98)} = .157$, $p = .120$), Openness to Experiences X Information Seeking ($r_{S(98)} = .021$, $p = .833$), Openness to Experiences X Information Giving ($r_{S(98)} = -.016$, $p = 0.875$), Openness to Experiences X Information Passing ($r_{S(98)} = -.109$, $p = .279$). The Null Hypothesis is accepted in all cases.

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Informational Value - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Advertising Value - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Intrusiveness - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Privacy Concern - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Normative Influence - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Informational Influence - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Information Seeking - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Information Giving - accepted

$H_0 : \rho = 0$ Openness to experience X
Information Passing - accepted

Discussion of the Results:

The extroversion scale has an inverse relationship with the intrusiveness which implies that an individual who scores high on the extroversion scale might perceive the advertising as less intrusive than the introverted counterpart. Furthermore, extraversion showed a positive relationship with privacy concern which implies that introverts are less concerned with privacy. Additionally, the results are coherent with the stipulated hypothesis in relation to the intrusiveness while are in opposition to the privacy concern. The positive relationship between extroversion and

Table 7**Summary of the Tested Hypotheses**

Extraversion		Agreeableness		Conscientiousness		Neuroticism		Openness to experience	
Hypothesis	Result	Hypothesis	Result	Hypothesis	Result	Hypothesis	Result	Hypothesis	Result
H1a	rejected	H2a	rejected	H3a	rejected	H4a	rejected	H5a	rejected
H1b	rejected	H2b	rejected	H3b	rejected	H4b	rejected	H5b	rejected
H1c	accepted	H2c	rejected	H3c	rejected	H4c	rejected	H5c	rejected
H1d	rejected	H2d	rejected	H3d	rejected	H4d	accepted	H5d	rejected
H1e	rejected	H2e	accepted	H3e	rejected	H4e	rejected	H5e	rejected
H1f	rejected	H2f	rejected	H3f	rejected	H4f	rejected	H5f	rejected
H1g	accepted	H2g	rejected	H3g	accepted	H4g	rejected	H5g	rejected
H1h	accepted	H2h	rejected	H3h	rejected	H4h	rejected	H5h	rejected
H1i	rejected	H2i	rejected	H3i	rejected	H4i	rejected	H5i	rejected

privacy concern implies an inverse relationship between introversion and privacy concern which could be explained through the introverted tendency to be more extroverted on SNS's (Shen et al. 2015). Furthermore, the positive correlation of information seeking and information giving was expected, given the social traits that extroverts possess (McCrae and John 1992). Due to these factors, the extroverts might be a better choice for targeting in the SNAs as they are prone to transfer the information, aiding in the process of diffusion. Furthermore, by perceiving Advertising on SNSs as less intrusive, they are prone to show more positive attitudes towards SNAs.

The positive relationship of agreeableness with the normative influence, which implies that the more agreeable persons are subject to be more influenced by the norms enforced by the other peers, shows that the individuals that can be identified as agreeable are prone to be influenced by their peers. This result is congruent with the findings of DeYoung et al. (2002), which showed that agreeable individuals tend to conform to the norms. Interestingly, conscientiousness showed an inverse relationship with the information seeking. This might imply that a direct strategy marketing for those individuals might seem more appropriate as they are not prone to search for information on SNSs but might rather use alternative sources.

The relationship between neuroticism and privacy concern shows that people with a predisposition to experience negative effects, such as anxiety, anger and depression (Hersen et al., 2006) are more likely to be concerned about their privacy which implies that the individuals are prone to

develop negative attitudes towards SNAs. Furthermore, those individuals show an inverse relationship with informational influence which might be due the same reason of guarding their privacy.

Openness to experiences showed no significant relationship. Those individuals are more likely to be curious and seek information which could be related to the eWOM variables of information seeking, information giving and information passing which doesn't. Markey et al. (2004) described that this factor shows the least correlation to expected patterns, which is congruent with the results of this study.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study brings into awareness the personality in correlation to the attitudes towards SNAs. This paper may aid marketers to better understand their consumers and allocate the resources in a strategic manner. Focusing on extroverts might present an optimal strategy, as opposed to individuals that scored high on the neuroticism scale.

The survey might suffer from a nonresponse error as it cannot be stipulated that all respondents that answered are representing the individuals that did not answer. Furthermore, all samples are subject to a margin of error. As the number of respondents is particularly low (N = 100), the survey is subject to a greater margin of error. Additionally, the survey requires the individual to assess their attitudes, either expressed as attitudes towards Social

Network Advertising or, subsequently, attitudes towards their own persona or expression of their Self-Concept, which inevitably implies a higher degree of subjectivity. This subjectivity can be translated into the measurement error, which the paper is potentially exposed to. Additionally, the Likert scale assumes that the strength or intensity of experience is expressed in a linear form and that attitudes can be measured. The usage of a Likert scale implies that the respondent might suffer from the Acquiesce bias which refers to the tendency to show agreement towards a statement rather than disagreement (Toner, 1987), which might further reflect Type II errors. Additionally, the traits have been measured using the BFI-10 which is a relative short assessment of personality and is not as reliable as its comprehensive counterparts.

Following this pilot study, it is recommended that the study is replicated, using a larger sample size and a test for comparison between groups. As a recommendation, the creation of reversed bivariate scales to measure the factors affecting attitudes that measure the facet in both directions, should be included followed by the separation of individuals on negative and positive responses. Furthermore it is recommended that a bigger inventory of personality should be used in order to assess the personality with greater reliability. Additionally, the cultural dimensions can be isolated, as it accounts for the shaping of personality (Hersen et al. 2006), thus isolating the personality and the factors.

REFERENCES

1. Allen, I.E. & Seaman, C.A. 2007, Likert Scales and Data Analyses, American Society for Quality, Milwaukee.
2. Amichai-Hamburger, Y. and Vinitzky, G. (2010) "Social Network Use And Personality". *Computers In Human Behavior* 26 (6), 1289-1295
3. Baek, T. and Morimoto, M. (2012) "Stay Away From Me". *Journal Of Advertising* 41 (1), 59-76
4. Baer, S., Jenkins, J. and Barber, L. (2014) "Home Is Private...Do Not Enter! Introversion And Sensitivity To Work-Home Conflict". *Stress And Health* 32 (4), 441-445
5. Bearden, W., Netemeyer, R. and Teel, J. (1989) "Measurement Of Consumer Susceptibility To Interpersonal Influence". *Journal Of Consumer Research* 15 (4), 473
6. Bleier, A. and Eisenbeiss, M. (2015) "The Importance Of Trust For Personalized Online Advertising". *Journal Of Retailing* 91 (3), 390-409
7. Chu, S. and Kim, Y. (2011) "Determinants Of Consumer Engagement In Electronic Word-Of-Mouth (Ewom) In Social Networking Sites". *International Journal Of Advertising* 30 (1), 47-75
8. Chu, S. and Kim, Y. (2011) "Determinants Of Consumer Engagement In Electronic Word-Of-Mouth (Ewom) In Social Networking Sites". *International Journal Of Advertising* 30 (1), 47-75
9. Clark, L. and Çalli, L. (2014). Personality types and Facebook advertising: An exploratory study. *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice*, 15(4), pp.327-336.
10. Clark, L. and Çalli, L. (2014) "Personality Types And Facebook Advertising: An Exploratory Study". *Journal Of Direct, Data And Digital Marketing Practice* 15 (4), 327-336
11. Cohen, J. (1992) "Statistical Power Analysis". *Current Directions In Psychological Science* 1 (3), 98-101
12. Corder, G.W. & Foreman, Dale I., author, 2014. *Nonparametric statistics : a step-by-step approach* 2nd ed.,
13. Correa, T., Hinsley, A. and de Zúñiga, H. (2010) "Who Interacts On The Web?: The Intersection Of Users' Personality And Social Media Use". *Computers In Human Behavior* 26 (2), 247-253
14. Costa, P. and McCrae, R. (2008). *The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). The SAGE Handbook of Personality Theory and Assessment: Volume 2 — Personality Measurement and Testing*, pp.179-198.
15. Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (2002). Looking backward: Changes in the mean levels of personality traits from 80 to 12. In D. Cervone & W. Mischel (Eds.), *Advances in personality science* (p. 219-237). Guilford Press
16. DeYoung, C., Peterson, J. and Higgins, D. (2002) "Higher-Order Factors Of The Big Five Predict Conformity: Are There Neuroses Of Health?". *Personality And Individual Differences* 33 (4), 533-552
17. Ducoffe, R. (1996) "ADVERTISING VALUE AND ADVERTISING THE WEB.". *Journal Of Advertising Research* 36 (5), 21-35
18. eMarketer. (2019). Number of social network users worldwide from 2010 to 2023 (in billions). Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 21, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/278414/number-of-worldwide-social-network-use-rs/>
19. eMarketer. (2019). Number of social network users worldwide from 2010 to 2023 (in billions). Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 22, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/278414/number-of-worldwide-social-network-use-rs/>
20. Evans, F. (1959) "Psychological And Objective Factors In The Prediction Of Brand Choice Ford Versus Chevrolet". *The Journal Of Business* 32 (4), 340

21. Eysenck, H. (2006) *The Biological Basis Of Personality*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers
22. Feick, L. and Price, L. (1987) "The Market Maven: A Diffuser Of Marketplace Information". *Journal Of Marketing* 51 (1), 83
23. Flynn, L., Goldsmith, R. and Eastman, J. (1996) "Opinion Leaders And Opinion Seekers: Two New Measurement Scales". *Journal Of The Academy Of Marketing Science* 24 (2), 137-147
24. Fully Cited
25. Gao, Y. and Koufaris, M. (2006) "Perceptual Antecedents Of User Attitude In Electronic Commerce". *ACM SIGMIS Database* 37 (2-3), 42
26. Gergen, K., Gulerce, A., Lock, A. and Misra, G. (1996) "Psychological Science In Cultural Context.". *American Psychologist* 51 (5), 496-503
27. GlobalWebIndex, We Are Social. (2019). Most popular reasons for internet users worldwide to use social media as of 4th quarter 2018. Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 23, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/715449/social-media-usage-reasons-worldwide/>
28. Gnambs, T. and Batinic, B. (2012) "A Personality-Competence Model Of Opinion Leadership". *Psychology And Marketing* 29 (8), 606-621
29. Gosling, S., Rentfrow, P. and Swann, W. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), pp.504-528.
30. Gosling, S., Rentfrow, P. and Swann, W. (2003) "A Very Brief Measure Of The Big-Five Personality Domains". *Journal Of Research In Personality* 37 (6), 504-528
31. Hersen, M., Thomas, J., Andrasik, F. and Ammerman, R. (2006) *Comprehensive Handbook Of Personality And Psychopathology*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons
32. Hughes, D., Furnham, A. and Batey, M. (2013) "The Structure And Personality Predictors Of Self-Rated Creativity". *Thinking Skills And Creativity* 9, 76-84
33. Internet World Stats, Facebook. (2017). Percentage of global population using Facebook as of June 2017, by region. Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 22, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/241552/share-of-global-population-using-facebook-by-region/>
34. iVend Retail. (2019). Frequency of online consumers who have made a purchase based on online or social media advertisements as of January 2019. Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 23, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/303726/social-media-targeting-effectiveness/>
35. Iyengar, R., Han, S. and Gupta, S. (2009) "Do Friends Influence Purchases In A Social Network?". *SSRN Electronic Journal*
36. John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The "Big Five" Inventory & Versions 4a and 54*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
37. Jung, A. (2017) "The Influence Of Perceived Ad Relevance On Social Media Advertising: An Empirical Examination Of A Mediating Role Of Privacy Concern". *Computers In Human Behavior* 70, 303-309
38. Jung, J., Shim, S., Jin, H. and Khang, H. (2015) "Factors Affecting Attitudes And Behavioural Intention Towards Social Networking Advertising: A Case Of Facebook Users In South Korea". *International Journal Of Advertising* 35 (2), 248-265
39. Kassarian, H. (1971) "Personality And Consumer Behavior: A Review". *Journal Of Marketing Research* 8 (4), 409-418
40. Kelly, L., Kerr, G. and Drennan, J. (2010) "Avoidance Of Advertising In Social Networking Sites". *Journal Of Interactive Advertising* 10 (2), 16-27
41. Kelly, L., Kerr, G. and Drennan, J. (2010) "Avoidance Of Advertising In Social

- Networking Sites". *Journal Of Interactive Advertising* 10 (2), 16-27
42. Kernan, J. (1968) "Choice Criteria, Decision Behavior, And Personality". *Journal Of Marketing Research* 5 (2), 155
 43. Larsen, R. and Ketelaar, T. (1991) "Personality And Susceptibility To Positive And Negative Emotional States.". *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology* 61 (1), 132-140
 44. Li, H., Edwards, S. and Lee, J. (2002) "Measuring The Intrusiveness Of Advertisements: Scale Development And Validation". *Journal Of Advertising* 31 (2), 37-47
 45. Li, K., Lin, Z. and Wang, X. (2015) "An Empirical Analysis Of Users' Privacy Disclosure Behaviors On Social Network Sites". *Information & Management* 52 (7), 882-891
 46. Likert, R. (1939) "A Technique For The Measurement Of Attitudes". *Archives Of Psychology* 22, 5-55
 47. Lin, C. and Kim, T. (2016) "Predicting User Response To Sponsored Advertising On Social Media Via The Technology Acceptance Model". *Computers In Human Behavior* 64, 710-718
 48. Lin, C. and Kim, T. (2016) "Predicting User Response To Sponsored Advertising On Social Media Via The Technology Acceptance Model". *Computers In Human Behavior* 64, 710-718
 49. Liu-Thompkins, Y. (2012) "Seeding Viral Content". *Journal Of Advertising Research* 52 (4), 465-478
 50. Loehlin, J. C. (1992). *Sage series on individual differences and development*, Vol. 2. Genes and environment in personality development. Sage Publications, Inc.
 51. Luna-Nevarez, C. and Torres, I. (2015) "Consumer Attitudes Toward Social Network Advertising". *Journal Of Current Issues & Research In Advertising* 36 (1), 1-19
 52. Markey, P., 2004. Children's behavioral manifestations of the five-factor model of personality. *Personality & social psychology bulletin : journal of the society for personality and social psychology*, 30 (4), p.423.
 53. Markey, P., Markey, C. and Tinsley, B. (2004). Children's Behavioral Manifestations of the Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(4), pp.423-432.
 54. McCoy, S., Everard, A., Polak, P. and Galletta, D. (2008) "An Experimental Study Of Antecedents And Consequences Of Online Ad Intrusiveness". *International Journal Of Human-Computer Interaction* 24 (7), 672-699
 55. McCrae, R. and Costa, P. (1985) "Updating Norman's "Adequacy Taxonomy": Intelligence And Personality Dimensions In Natural Language And In Questionnaires.". *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology* 49 (3), 710-721
 56. McCrae, R. and John, O. (1992) "An Introduction To The Five-Factor Model And Its Applications". *Journal Of Personality* 60 (2), 175-215
 57. Murray, J. (2013) "Likert Data: What To Use, Parametric Or Non-Parametric?". *International Journal Of Business And Social Science* 4 (11)
 58. Nanna, M. and Sawilowsky, S. (1998) "Analysis Of Likert Scale Data In Disability And Medical Rehabilitation Research.". *Psychological Methods* 3 (1), 55-67
 59. News | The Guardian (2020) available from <<https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/all>> [22 April 2020]
 60. Norman, A. and Russell, C. (2006) "The Pass-Along Effect: Investigating Word-Of-Mouth Effects On Online Survey Procedures". *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication* 11 (4), 1085-1103
 61. Okazaki, S., Rubio, N. and Campo, S. (2013) "Do Online Gossipers Promote Brands?". *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, And Social Networking* 16 (2), 100-107
 62. Orth, U., Malkewitz, K. and Bee, C. (2010) "Gender And Personality Drivers Of

- Consumer Mixed Emotional Response To Advertising". *Journal Of Current Issues & Research In Advertising* 32 (1), 69-80
63. Phelps, J., D'Souza, G. and Nowak, G. (2001) "Antecedents And Consequences Of Consumer Privacy Concerns: An Empirical Investigation". *Journal Of Interactive Marketing* 15 (4), 2-17
 64. Phillips, J., Butt, S. and Blaszczyński, A. (2006) "Personality And Self-Reported Use Of Mobile Phones For Games". *Cyberpsychology & Behavior* 9 (6), 753-758
 65. Ravasan, A., Rouhani, S. and Asgary, S. (2013) "A Review For The Online Social Networks Literature (2005-2011)". *European Journal Of Business And Management* 6 (4)
 66. Rettie, R. (2001) "An Exploration Of Flow During Internet Use". *Internet Research* 11 (2), 103-113
 67. Ross, C., Orr, E., Sisic, M., Arseneault, J., Simmering, M. and Orr, R. (2009) "Personality And Motivations Associated With Facebook Use". *Computers In Human Behavior* 25 (2), 578-586
 68. Ross, C., Orr, E., Sisic, M., Arseneault, J., Simmering, M. and Orr, R. (2009) "Personality And Motivations Associated With Facebook Use". *Computers In Human Behavior* 25 (2), 578-586
 69. Sashittal, H., Sriramachandramurthy, R. and Hodis, M. (2012) "Targeting College Students On Facebook? How To Stop Wasting Your Money". *Business Horizons* 55 (5), 495-507
 70. Saxena, A. and Khanna, U. (2013) "Advertising On Social Network Sites: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach". *Vision: The Journal Of Business Perspective* 17 (1), 17-25
 71. Schumann, J., von Wangenheim, F. and Groene, N. (2014) "Targeted Online Advertising: Using Reciprocity Appeals To Increase Acceptance Among Users Of Free Web Services". *Journal Of Marketing* 78 (1), 59-75
 72. Shen, J., Brdiczka, O. and Liu, J. (2015) "A Study Of Facebook Behavior: What Does It Tell About Your Neuroticism And Extraversion?". *Computers In Human Behavior* 45, 32-38
 73. Smit, E., Van Noort, G. and Voorveld, H. (2014) "Understanding Online Behavioural Advertising: User Knowledge, Privacy Concerns And Online Coping Behaviour In Europe". *Computers In Human Behavior* 32, 15-22
 74. Social Media Examiner. (2019). Leading benefits of using social media for marketing purposes worldwide as of January 2019. Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 23, 2020.
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/188447/influence-of-global-social-media-marketing-usage-on-businesses/>
 75. Social Media Examiner. (2019). Leading social media platforms used by marketers worldwide as of January 2019. Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 23, 2020.
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/259379/social-media-platforms-used-by-marketers-worldwide/>
 76. Soto, C. and John, O. (2017). Short and extra-short forms of the Big Five Inventory-2: The BFI-2-S and BFI-2-XS. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 68, pp.69-81.
 77. Styśko-Kunkowska, M. and Borecka, D. (2010) "Extraversion And Evaluation Of Humorous Advertisements". *Psychological Reports* 106 (1), 44-48
 78. Sun, T., Youn, S., Wu, G. and Kuntaraporn, M. (2006) "Online Word-Of-Mouth (Or Mouse): An Exploration Of Its Antecedents And Consequences". *Journal Of Computer-Mediated Communication* 11 (4), 1104-1127
 79. Tan, W., Kwek, C. and Li, Z. (2013) "The Antecedents Of Effectiveness Interactive Advertising In The Social Media". *International Business Research* 6 (3)
 80. Taylor, D., Lewin, J. and Strutton, D. (2011) "Friends, Fans, And Followers: Do Ads Work On Social Networks?". *Journal Of Advertising Research* 51 (1), 258-275

81. Toner, B. (1987) "The Impact Of Agreement Bias On The Ranking Of Questionnaire Response". *The Journal Of Social Psychology* 127 (2), 221-222
82. Tucker, C. (2013) "Social Networks, Personalized Advertising, And Privacy Controls". *Journal Of Marketing Research* 51 (5), 546-562
83. Tucker, W. and Painter, J. (1961) "Personality And Product Use.". *Journal Of Applied Psychology* 45 (5), 325-329
84. Turow, J., King, J., Hoofnagle, C., Bleakley, A. and Hennessy, M. (2009) "Americans Reject Tailored Advertising And Three Activities That Enable It". *SSRN Electronic Journal*
85. van Noort, G., Antheunis, M. and Verlegh, P. (2014) "Enhancing The Effects Of Social Network Site Marketing Campaigns". *International Journal Of Advertising* 33 (2), 235-252
86. Watson, D., Clark, L., McIntyre, C. and Hamaker, S. (1992) "Affect, Personality, And Social Activity.". *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology* 63 (6), 1011-1025
87. Watson, D. and Clark, L. (1997) "Extraversion And Its Positive Emotional Core". *Handbook Of Personality Psychology* 767-793
88. Watts, D. and Dodds, P. (2007) "Influentials, Networks, And Public Opinion Formation". *Journal Of Consumer Research* 34 (4), 441-458
89. We Are Social, & DataReportal, & Hootsuite. (January 30, 2020). Daily time spent on social networking by internet users worldwide from 2012 to 2019 (in minutes) [Graph]. In Statista. Retrieved April 22, 2020, from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/433871/daily-social-media-usage-worldwide/>
90. We Are Social, Hootsuite, DataReportal. (2020). Most popular social networks worldwide as of January 2020, ranked by number of active users (in millions). Statista. Statista Inc.. Accessed: April 22, 2020. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>
91. Wegert, T. (2002). Pop-up ads, Part 1: Good? Bad? Ugly? http://www.clickz.com/experts/media/media_buy/article.php/991121 (Accessed: 9 July 2004). [Google Scholar]
92. Wiese, M., Martínez-Climent, C. and Botella-Carrubi, D. (2020) "A Framework For Facebook Advertising Effectiveness: A Behavioral Perspective". *Journal Of Business Research* 109, 76-87
93. Zerbe, W. and Paulhus, D. (1987) "Socially Desirable Responding In Organizational Behavior: A Reconceptation". *The Academy Of Management Review* 12 (2), 250
94. Terry, D. and Hogg, M. (1996) "Group Norms And The Attitude-Behavior Relationship: A Role For Group Identification". *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin* 22 (8), 776-793

APPENDIX



Certificate of Ethical Approval

Applicant:
Tudor Jianu

Project Title:
An examination of the role personality has in forming attitudes towards social media advertising and its implications for social media marketing.

This is to certify that the above named applicant has completed the Coventry University Ethical Approval process and their project has been confirmed and approved as Medium Risk

Date of approval:
14 February 2020

Project Reference Number:
P101137

Fig. 1

