

Measuring the consumer engagement related to social media: the case of franchising

Esther Calderón-Monge¹, José M. Ramírez-Hurtado²

¹Department of Economics and Business Administration, Faculty of Business, University of Burgos, Address: plaza de la Infanta D^a Elena, s/n, 09001, Burgos, Spain.

²Department of Economics, Quantitative Methods and Economic History, Faculty of Business, Pablo de Olavide University, Address: ctra. de Utrera, km.1, s/n, 41013, Seville, Spain

E-mails: ¹ecalderon@ubu.es; ²jmramhur@upo.es

Corresponding author: José M. Ramírez-Hurtado (jmramhur@upo.es)

Acknowledgements

This research has been partially financed by the Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad de España, Project ECO2017-89452-R.

Measuring the consumer engagement related to social media: the case of franchising

Abstract

The appearance of social media has fostered consumers chatting with each other, comparing and recommending products and services. In the case of franchising, social media take on a yet greater importance due to brands having to achieve the expansion of their chains selecting new franchisees. The aim of this paper is, on the one hand, to analyze the activity of franchise chains in social media -Facebook and Twitter- and, on the other hand, to measure the engagement which social media users show with franchise brands or chains. Quantitative data from Spanish franchisors (N=53 and N=46) was collected by means of the Fanpage Karma and Twitonomy tools. The PRGS model and statistical tests were used for the analysis of the data. The results show that the activity of the chains in social media is different according to the sector in which the chain is operating. Conclusions are also drawn regarding the characteristics of franchising chains.

Keywords: consumer engagement; franchising; social media; Facebook; Twitter.

1. Introduction

The online environment, and more specifically social media, is being the perfect tool [67] for interaction between organizations and consumers. The influence that social media has within the purchasing process is indisputable. Social media is being the perfect tool for interaction between organizations and consumers [67]. This is due to the ability of social media to establish conversations between people and firms and of involving them in the generation of content and value creation, and generating engagement. Engagement reflects the motivational state [66] of consumers when they have interactive experiences with a particular object or topic of the organization -a brand, the organization's activities or the organization itself- [31, 34]. The study of engagement has notably increased in recent years, both in the academic and in the business area [11, 20, 62, 65]. Focusing on the firm, in recent years, firms have begun to reflect on the effect of their customers' non-transactional behavior on business results [44]. Engagement is being used to measure clients' non-transactional behavior. This has two consequences [66]: financial and reputational. On the one hand, the financial consequences are due to customers

1 developing behaviors such as referrals, positive word-of-mouth or blogging, focused on
2 generating and disseminating information. This activity can influence other consumers'
3 purchasing decisions, later contributing to a larger sales figure for the firm. On the other
4 hand, positive comments and the recommendations of products and services attract new
5 consumers, so an increase in the firm's reputation takes place. These processes show the
6 utility of social media, as can be seen in Figure 1.
7

8
9
10 [INSERT HERE FIGURE 1]
11

12 Franchises are complex organizations having challenges in social media. Social media is
13 very important for franchising because franchisors not only need to reach current and
14 prospective customers but also attain current and prospective franchisees [47, 54]. The
15 addition of new franchisees is a key driver of growth for franchisors [16]. Thus, social
16 media is of great interest for the recruitment of new franchisees.
17

18 Compared with other communication channels, social media marketing is far less
19 expensive. Indeed, social media has the ability to target with more precision. It also gives
20 the franchisees the opportunity to foster relationships of trust with the franchisors.
21

22 Consumer engagement is crucial for the growth of the franchisor chain. It encourages
23 long-term loyalty between the partners. It is the proof that demonstrates the commitment
24 of current and prospective franchisees and customers to the franchisors. When consumer
25 engagement falls, a franchisee may decide not to renew the contract and instead become
26 an independent outlet.
27

28 Several researchers [18, 35, 58] hold that further research is needed to gain more
29 knowledge regarding consumer engagement. Specifically, in spite of the importance of
30 consumer engagement in franchising, surprisingly there is no research focused on this
31 topic. So, this study means to cover this gap.
32

33 Therefore, the aim of this work is to measure the activity in social media and analyze the
34 engagement of the franchising chains which operate in Spain. Specifically, it seeks to: a)
35 measure the activity of the brands of franchises in social media; b) measure the franchise
36 chains' level of engagement; c) perform a comparative study of the level of engagement
37 by sectors, and d) study if specific operational variables of the franchise influence the
38 franchisees' level of engagement. For this purpose, we are going to use variables widely
39 studied in franchising research, such as the total number of stores, the fee, the experience
40 in the franchising industry and the royalties.
41

42 The social media of Facebook and Twitter have been selected to carry out this work.
43 These two social media have been selected due to being the two social media most used
44 by firms in Spain [40]. Also, marketing efforts on social media, such as on Facebook, are
45 often spurious and inconsistent [32]. The study is applied to the franchise market in Spain
46 where franchising is strongly consolidated [55]. The data provided by the Spanish
47 Association of Franchisors [1] and the main consultants specialized in the topics testify
48 to this consolidation. Likewise, three sectors of traditional services which are
49 representative within franchising have been selected. These sectors gather the dynamism
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

existing in this form of business: the restaurant sector, the travel agency sector and the real estate agents sector.

This work is justified by the knowledge that it contributes to both the prospective franchisees and the franchisors. The results of this work allow to measure different levels of engagement by brands. Also, the level of engagement varies across the sectors in the franchising. In franchising systems would be very important to show economic indicators and other specific variables of franchisors in social media in order to get high levels of consumers engagement.

The work is structured as follows. After this introduction, Section 2 develops the theoretical framework where the theories and concepts of engagement in social media are reviewed and the hypotheses stemming from the relation of engagement with the franchise's main operational variables are described. Section 3 presents the methodology and Section 4 shows the results obtained. Finally, Sections 5 and 6 set out the conclusions and business implications along with the limitations and future research lines.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Engagement in social media

Social media are an excellent opportunity to increase the visibility of the image of a firm or a business and find out both prospective and non-prospective customers' desires and needs. This means a source of value creation for firms.

Traditionally, social media have stood as mere intermediaries between firms and customers. However, today they have become producers of the final information [2, 28, 31, 46]. Much of their success lies in their reduced cost in relation to the service that they offer [31]. Specifically, they favor the interaction between firms and users, allow integrating the different communication channels within the same network and offer information between firms and customers in a much quicker way than conventional means. Therefore, firms need to correctly define and manage communication strategies in social media, including an analysis of users' interactions with brand-generated posts [31] with a view to improving their positioning in the market.

Using the social media, organizations can build relationships with existing and new customers, and form communities which interactively collaborate to identify and understand problems and develop solutions for them. These interactions change the traditional roles of both the seller and the customer in the exchange relations. In fact, customers often aggregate value by generating content and even become passionate defenders of the seller's products and can influence the shopping decisions of others in the interactions between peers.

The literature has recognized customer engagement as a remarkable concept of social media marketing [12, 41]. The concept of engagement is upheld by two fundamental theories: Relational Marketing and the Theory of Reciprocity.

Within relational marketing, the term engagement is linked to a series of behaviors which go beyond the purchasing action [65], such as: taking part in blogs, writing reviews in social media about their own experience with a product or service, assessing, making

1 recommendations, or positive word-of-mouth. Social media engagement makes value for
2 the firms because they can get information about the tastes and trends of consumers.
3 These behaviors do not immediately generate revenues but have a very important
4 deferred effect [11], making engagement essential for a firm's profitability in the long run.

5
6 In many cases, firms are the ones that foster customers to carry out these behaviors via
7 diverse strategies in social media. Some examples of these actions which firms perform
8 are competitions, uploading creative and visual images, uploading videos, drawing on
9 current topics, teaching tricks and advice on topics of great interest, and offering rewards
10 for recommending a product or service to new customers. It is, then, a question of actions
11 which do not directly mean a sales transaction between the firm and the customer, but
12 which allow building the relation and creating an intangible asset of great value for the
13 future.
14
15

16
17 The Theory of Reciprocity [11, 53] is another of the theories which upholds the concept
18 of engagement. According to this theory, a firm's investments in a customer brings about
19 feelings of reciprocity which motivate the customer to construct relations of loyalty and
20 commitment. In these relations a feeling of gratitude towards the firm is produced in the
21 customer. This plays a fundamental role in the effectiveness of Relational Marketing.
22 Thus, a larger investment of the firm in customers will be perceived by them as a benefit,
23 as a result of which they will show a greater level of engagement.
24
25

26
27 The literature regarding consumer engagement and social media shows at least three
28 important concerns. First, there is no common definition of what engagement is and what
29 it measures. Second, the relationship between consumer engagement and loyalty toward
30 a brand still remains unclear. And third, further research is needed to establish highlights
31 on the relationship between engagement and social media effects.
32
33

34
35 The concept of engagement has always been linked with that of interaction, involvement
36 or relation. Following [33], [30], and [22], engagement can be viewed as a process with
37 three distinct dimensions: behavioral (time and effort invested by the individual in a
38 particular product or service), cognitive (interpreting and sharing information in social
39 media by users) and emotional (affective connection between the user and product or
40 service [10, 15].
41
42

43
44 Engagement is an emerging concept in the literature that is still being defined [14]. It has
45 been demonstrated its importance for brands because users can experience different levels
46 of behavior intensity or media use (e.g. readership, likes, shares, comments) [69]. In the
47 marketing literature, the term engagement has been used increasingly more and different
48 definitions have been proposed according to the context [8, 36]. In this discipline, the
49 study of engagement has been fundamentally centred on interactive experiences and on
50 shared value creation [5, 9, 52]. For example, [68] define it as the individuals' intensity
51 of participation with an organization's offers and activities.
52
53

54
55 From the point of view of social media, user engagement refers to the degree to which
56 people are willing to contribute to online conversations with other people [50]. From the
57 perspective of marketing, consumer engagement deals with an individual requesting
58 additional information about products and services, writing product reviews, and asking
59 product-related questions [33]. Both definitions are closely related to the
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 conceptualization of consumer engagement in this study. Consumer engagement can be
2 measured by means of public shares, likes or comments toward the activity of companies
3 in social media. Therefore, for companies is very important to increase the level of
4 consumer engagement because they can get valuable information and consumers' trends.
5 Followers of Facebook and Twitter express their opinions and needs concerning the
6 related content of products and services that is inserted in the pages. This study is focused
7 on people interacting by means of the number of likes, the number of shares, the number
8 of retweets, etc.
9

10
11 With the engagement process, a person can act as a consumer contributor or a creator of
12 a brand over time. Likewise, a user can choose to contribute to a brand, but only consume
13 content of another brand, or can consume one brand and create content for another. Hence,
14 the degree of users' interactions with different brands varies in relation to the
15 consumption, to the contribution and to the content creation in social media.
16
17

18 The involvement of the users of Facebook and Twitter with brands can be measured
19 through the PRGS model [37]. The P-Presence, R-Response, G-Generation and S-
20 Suggestion model is a first approach that IAB Spain has designed of a model to measure
21 brands' impacts in social media through public data of brands' profiles in the main social
22 media.
23
24

25 The metric to evaluate engagement in Facebook and Twitter should be based on
26 interactions. These interactions are related to the user participation with respect to the
27 offers and activities of a brand, a product or a firm [51]. The PRGS model takes into
28 consideration the actions of individuals which respond to the stimuli that are presented to
29 them. In the PRGS formula, these actions are related with the number of posts that are
30 published. Thus, the model provides a quantitative measurement of the interest that the
31 firm's posts generate on average [49].
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **2.2. Relation between engagement and operational variables in franchising**

39 Franchise companies spent a lot of time following what consumers say about their brands.
40 In franchise systems, franchisors seek to increase their sales attracting potential
41 franchisees and end consumers. However, there is scant research on social media in the
42 franchising sector; it mainly highlights the aspects of digital communication [13]. The
43 absence of specific research about consumer engagement in franchise brands and its
44 relation with specific franchising variables has led us to seek literature which justifies our
45 hypothesis in the existing research concerning consumer engagement and its influence on
46 firm brands. As well as this, it must be emphasized that, as was already mentioned, one
47 of the markets which the franchisor aims at is that of prospective franchisees. This
48 peculiarity of franchising -that is to say, the existence of the franchisee as an intermediary-
49 is a common thread between the franchisor and the final consumers of the product or
50 service. All this means that the use of social media has to be developed with special
51 attention toward this type of firms as the brand and the image are ceded to third parties,
52 thus decentralizing the franchise system [13].
53
54
55
56
57

58 Prospective franchisees who want to open a franchise chain store will choose the chain
59 that is the most profitable. To do so they will look for different information signals such
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 as consumer based brand equity or brand image, among others. The engagement of a
2 franchise brand can also be a signal that provides information to prospective franchisees
3 to choose between one brand or another to decide to open a store. So, franchise chains
4 with a high engagement will be chosen by prospective franchisees to open a store of theirs
5 because these franchisees deduce from the information transmitted by the chain's
6 engagement that it has a database of customers involved with the brand creating brand
7 image.
8

9
10 According to Simon et al. [61], a brand's active fans in Facebook spend around 43% more
11 money on it than non-fans. Also, these active consumers are a valuable source of
12 innovation for the firm [21, 24]. In fact, conversation has a significantly positive effect
13 on brand engagement [70]. This participation of the consumers is sought by the franchises
14 to construct deep relations which go beyond brand shopping. Therefore, these deep brand-
15 consumer relations created through social media such as Facebook and Twitter, the
16 innovation generated by these consumers and the higher spending of a brand's Facebook
17 fans are some of the reasons why a prospective franchisee will open a store of the brand
18 which has a greater engagement. In accordance with this, prospective franchisees will go
19 with the flow of the activity of the social media which franchise brands have in order to
20 decide to open a franchised store of one brand or another. This is because they understand
21 that a franchise brand with greater engagement has a larger number of consumers
22 involved with it. Therefore, we assume that franchise chains that have a high engagement
23 also have a high number of stores open because most of them could be franchised stores
24 where franchisees chose the chain for their high engagement.
25
26
27
28
29

30 As well as what has been mentioned before, a franchise brand which has many stores
31 spread out geographically will tend, on the one hand, to have more consumers who can
32 interact in social media, with respect to brands with fewer stores, and, consequently, have
33 a greater likelihood of consumer engagement. On the other hand, having many stores
34 makes a franchise brand more known by the market. This knowledge or visibility creates
35 an image or reputation which will influence engagement. So, the following hypothesis is
36 defined:
37
38
39

40 *H1: A positive relation exists between consumer engagement and a brand's total number*
41 *of stores.*
42

43 Van Doorn et al. [66] also considers that as well as the financial outcomes of the
44 customers' non-transactional behaviors, consequences of reputation appear. Understanding
45 corporate reputation as the collective set of beliefs concerning the capacity
46 and willingness to satisfy the interests of the different stakeholders [23], reputation not
47 only has to influence employee engagement [3], but also consumer engagement.
48 Reputation is not due to a sole event or a discreet experience but is accumulated through
49 a variety of symbolic interactions and of repeated behaviours of a firm's stakeholders
50 [71].
51
52
53

54 Therefore, the number of years which a franchise brand has been operating in the market
55 –experience- contributes to the reputation being accumulative and oriented over time
56 [48]. Positive comments as time goes by will help to improve the franchise's image and
57 to attract new consumers. In accordance with all this, a franchise brand which has been
58 operating in the market for many years will have a high reputation among both the current
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 and the prospective consumers. This reputation will influence the consumers' degree of
2 involvement –engagement. Based on this, we define the following hypothesis:

3 *H2: A positive relation exists between consumer engagement and a franchise brand's*
4 *experience in the market .*
5

6 When the prospective franchisees decide to open a store, they have to pay the franchisor
7 entry rights –a set and unique amount- for the value of the successfully proven business
8 concept. This will be higher the greater the recognition of its brand [60].
9

10 New technologies have developed the creation of multiple communities with the same
11 tastes, trends or opinions. Franchises which take into account this high degree of
12 interconnection between current and prospective customers are generating brand value
13 which will be reflected in the entry rights. Among these customers, some will become
14 opinion leaders or prescribers. Also, the user of Facebook and/or Twitter will, by taking
15 part in the control of the contents, end up becoming part of that content [59]. All this
16 means that the franchise will have a valuable goodwill, that is to say, consumers very
17 committed to the brand –engagement- and, therefore, any prospective franchisees who
18 wish to open their own store will have to pay high entry rights.
19

20 *H3: A positive relation exists between consumer engagement and a brand's entry rights.*
21

22 In franchising, royalties are a percentage of the sales that the franchisor sets its franchisees
23 as compensation for the training and technical and business support which they receive
24 while the relation lasts. Consumers' activity in social media influences the franchise's
25 sales in a double sense. On the one hand, according to Van Doorn et al. [66], the
26 consequences of the customers' non-transactional behaviors can be financial. That is to
27 say, those customer actions oriented toward generating and disseminating information in
28 social media such as Facebook or Twitter can influence other customers' purchasing
29 decisions. This will be later reflected in a larger sales figure for the firm. Also, it has been
30 demonstrated that consumer engagement leads to the growth of sales by obtaining a
31 competitive advantage and by attaining a high profitability [6, 25].
32

33 On the other hand, and as has been mentioned before, the consumers most active in
34 Facebook or Twitter are those who spend more on the brand. So, a franchise which has a
35 high engagement indicates that it has consumers who participate a lot in the brand, and
36 who will buy the brand more. Therefore, if the consumer engagement means a growth of
37 the sales for the franchisees of a franchise brand, it will also mean an increase of the
38 revenues for the franchisor who attains these through the royalties set for its franchisees.
39 Now, when the sales figure increases due to a high consumer engagement, the franchisor
40 can decide to maintain or increase the royalty. Based on all this, we define the following
41 hypothesis:
42

43 *H4: A positive relation exists between consumer engagement and a brand's royalties.*
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **3. Methodology**

53 To attain the previously proposed aims, we analyze the consumer engagement from brand
54 pages or platforms dedicated to a brand and moderated by it to communicate or interact
55 with their customers in social media [17, 63]. These brand pages enable the brands to
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 achieve an unlimited number of followers and publish brand messages [45]. This brand-
2 generated content –known formally as brand posts- is the first mechanism through which
3 brands connect with consumers in social media [4]. Consumers can interact with brand
4 posts in real time using integrated response options such as “likes” and “comments” [43].
5 This willingness of the consumer to respond and interact with brands in social media
6 constitutes the concept of consumer engagement [36]. Specifically, the brand pages of
7 the market of Spanish franchises are analyzed in the levels, already commented on, of
8 users’ contribution and content creation. The number of brand pages was 53 and 46,
9 respectively, for Facebook and Twitter, due to not all the brands having brand pages in
10 both platforms.
11
12

13 **3.1. Sample**

14 The franchise market in Spain in 2018 was 1,376 brands, 2% more than in 2017, 82.1%
15 being of national origin and 17.9% coming from 26 countries, among which France, Italy,
16 the United States, Germany and the United Kingdom stand out [1]. According to AEF
17 data [1], the number of operational stores at the end of 2018 was 77,397 – 4% more than
18 in 2017- 20,644 of which were owned by the franchisor and 56,753 of which were
19 franchisees.
20
21
22
23

24 The analysis of the Spanish franchises’ brand pages has been applied to three sectors –
25 restaurants, travel agencies and real estate agents¹– and to two social media –Facebook
26 and Twitter. The choice of these three sectors is justified by their being three traditional
27 sectors in which a strong competition exists and that to a great extent capture the
28 dynamism existing in franchising [7, 55, 56]. These three sectors represent an important
29 share of the Spanish economy. In 2018, the restaurant sector contributed around 6.33
30 percent to the Spain’s GDP , 0.33 percent came from the travel agency sectors and 11.55
31 percent from the real estate agents sector. These three sectors therefore represent almost
32 18.5 percent of Spain’s GDP, with the services sector representing 72.92 percent of GDP.
33 According to the last AEF data [1], at the end of 2018 there were 16 franchise chains in
34 the travel agency sector, 40 in the real estate agents sector and 196 in the restaurant sector.
35 The number of own stores in each of these sectors was 1,237, 162 and 1,997, respectively.
36 As to the number of franchisee stores, the data were 2,306, 2,033 and 7,117, respectively.
37 Nonetheless, the figures offered by consultants and associations vary slightly due to the
38 criteria established for the consideration of franchising.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The choice of Facebook and Twitter is because of their being the two social media most
46 used by firms in Spain [39]. Also, with these social media the firms have large and varied
47 possibilities to impact users or convey to them contents of value, apart from carrying out
48 a strategy of differentiation from the competition. Instagram is the third most used
49 platform among the firms of this study, especially in the restaurant sector. However,
50 Instagram has not been considered in this study because it is very biased to younger users.
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 ¹ In this paper, real estate agent refers to a person or business that arranges the selling, renting or
58 management of properties and buildings. There is a high competitiveness in the Spanish property market.
59 Spain is a popular destination for many tourists looking for holiday homes in the sun. Also, many people
60 try to buy a property in the coastal areas.
61

1 Anyway, this difference in audience provides an excellent opportunity for companies
2 trying to reach a younger demographic.

3 In accordance with this, the characteristics of the sample used in the work are reflected in
4 Table 1. The sample size of Facebook and that of Twitter do not coincide as there are
5 some franchising chains which do not operate simultaneously in the two platforms. The
6 percentages of brands using both social networks are 68.42, 80.00 and 72.22 percent,
7 respectively. Regarding the analysis period, we used a broad reference period in which
8 the distinct brands could have time to disseminate activities and messages, and enough
9 data could be thus obtained. The number of posts (tweets) displayed by each firm was
10 high. The overall number of posts (tweets) by each sector is shown in Tables 3 and 4.
11 Thus, we consider that the selected period can capture the intention of the study.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 [INSERT HERE TABLE 1]
19
20
21

22 **3.2. Instrument**

23 To use these two social media we have employed two web analysis tools which provide
24 useful and clear information in a simple manner, Fanpage Karma and Twitonomy.
25 Fanpage Karma is an online tool that analyzes and monitors social media. It provides
26 valuable information about publication strategies and profile performance in social media
27 such as Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. Fanpage Karma was founded by Nicolas Graf
28 von Kanitz and Stephan Eyl in 2012. It enables analyzing one's social media interactions
29 and those of the competitors. Reports can be exported to Excel. In this way, the
30 publications themselves can also be analyzed and improved, the fans known and trends
31 detected in real time. Twitonomy is an online platform to get to know the statistics of a
32 Twitter account. It belongs to the company Diginomy Pty Ltd. This application allows
33 obtaining data and graphs concerning any Twitter account. Specifically, it permits
34 acquiring tweets, retweets, replies, mentions, etc. It also offers information about the
35 users who most respond to the account, those who are most mentioned and the most used
36 hashtags. There exists a free basic version and a more complete payment premium
37 version.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The pages of Facebook and the profiles of Twitter are used by firms and organizations to
45 attract new users and customers and to make the existing ones more loyal. In this work,
46 we have selected a series of variables which are usually employed in Facebook and in
47 Twitter to study their influence on these users. Specifically, the following variables have
48 been used in Facebook:
49
50

- 51 - Number of posts: a count of the publications done by the page's owner or the
52 user's profile.
 - 53 - Number of likes: a positive expression of the users in relation with a publication
54 done by the page's owner of the user's profile.
 - 55 - Number of comments: comments made by the users of a publication done by the
56 page's owner of the user's profile.
- 57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Number of shares: a count of the times that a content published has been shared by the users.

For their part, the variables selected in Twitter were the following:

- Number of Tweets: a count of the number of messages sent from a profile.
- Favourites: the characteristics which enable users to highlight the tweets which they most like.
- Mentions: when a user includes your user name in the tweet.
- Retweets: this happens when other users share one of your tweets with their followers.

For the calculation of consumer engagement, the formulas proposed by Oviedo-García et al. [51] and by Herrera-Torres et al. [31] have been used. These are defined as follows:

$$\text{Consumer engagement in Facebook} = \frac{\text{Likes} + \text{Comments} + \text{Shares}}{\text{Number of Posts}}$$

$$\text{Consumer engagement in Twitter} = \frac{\text{Favourites} + \text{Mentions} + \text{Retweets}}{\text{Number of Tweets}}$$

The actions of the formulas generate the level of consumer engagement. The higher the value of the ratio, the higher the efficiency of the posting strategies used by the company.

With the aim of studying the franchises' activity in the social media, we have followed the PRGS model recommended by IAB Spain [38]. This organization, dedicated to digital studies, proposes the need to standardize an effective measurement model of campaigns in social media. To do so, the PRGS model has been used for various years. This aims to study the activity of Social Media Brands. This model is based on the following concepts:

- Presence: this is defined by the number of fans or followers –the community- and the number of publications –the activity- which the brand produces on the page. Its measurement is therefore related with the brand's activity.

- Response: this is given by the number of likes that the users generate to do with the brand's publication, so it establishes the users' reaction to the brand's presence. Hence, its measurement is related with the user's activity.

- Generation: this involves the creation of contents by the users in the social media where the brand is present. It is given by the number of comments that these contents generate concerning the brand's publications, so its measurement is related with the user's activity.

- Suggestion: this is given by the number of shares or recommendations that the users generate about the brand's publications. Therefore, its measurement is related with the user's activity.

Table 2 shows how each of the variables which are gathered in the PRGS model is calculated:

[INSERT HERE TABLE 2]

1 The variable “Presence” is measured in absolute terms, as the activity that the brand
2 carries out in its page will be irrespective of the number of fans or followers which it has.
3 On the contrary, the other three variables (“Response”, “Generation” and “Suggestion”)
4 are measured in relative terms due to the user’s activity in the page already being
5 conditioned by the number of fans or followers [26]. The higher the value of the ratio, the
6 higher the efficiency of the posting strategies used by the company.
7
8
9

10 11 **4. Results**

12
13 In Table 3 we note the data referring to the sample of firms which use Facebook grouped
14 by sectors. In relation to the measurements of Facebook, we see that more posts have
15 been published in the travel agency sector, followed by the real estate agent sector and by
16 the restaurant sector. However, in spite of the travel agency sector being the one in which
17 most posts have been published, it does not have the most in the rest of the measurements
18 of Facebook. Hence, the restaurant sector has achieved the most likes, comments and
19 shares. In the opposite extreme, the real estate agents sector has the fewest in these last
20 three measurements.
21
22
23

24
25 [INSERT HERE TABLE 3]
26

27 As to the franchise’s own variables, the travel agency sector has more stores, both
28 franchisees and own. The average number of years which the brands have been operating
29 is very similar in the three sectors. For their part, the restaurant sector chains demand a
30 larger entry fee, while the real estate agents sector requires a higher level of royalties.
31
32

33 [INSERT HERE TABLE 4]
34

35 Table 4 describes the main descriptive statistics for the sample of brands which use
36 Twitter, grouped by sectors. We note that the restaurant sector has more followers,
37 followed at a great distance by the travel agency sector and, at an even greater distance,
38 by the real estate agents sector. Unlike Facebook, where the travel agency sector stands
39 out in the number of posts, in Twitter the restaurant sector publishes more tweets. In the
40 rest of the variables, except in the chain’s experience, the restaurant sector is also
41 highlighted, the real estate agents sector having the lowest levels.
42
43

44 As to the franchise’s own variables, the data are very similar to those of the Facebook
45 sample, as the samples of chains which use Facebook and Twitter are made up of almost
46 the same brands.
47
48

49 The PRGS model has been applied as a supplement to the previous comments and to
50 measure which sector carries out more activity in social media. The results are shown in
51 Table 5.
52

53 [INSERT HERE TABLE 5]
54
55

56 Looking at the results of the PRGS model applied to Facebook, we see that the travel
57 agency sector chains have more activity in this social media. For their part, the users’
58 activity tends to be very similar as to the response and the generation of contents. A higher
59
60
61

1 value of suggestion is noted in the real estate agents sector. This means that the wish to
2 share is greater in this sector than in the rest. However, analyzing the results of the PRGS
3 model applied to Twitter we see that the restaurant sector has more activity. In spite of
4 this, the users of the real estate agents sector generate more responses to the tweets of the
5 companies, create more contents and share more information in this social media.
6

7 Another aspect to stress is that comparing the two social media, the activity of the
8 franchise brands in Twitter is much higher than in Facebook. This may be due to the
9 distinct philosophy of the two social media. Twitter uses an instantaneous microblogging
10 characterized by its simplicity. It offers a simple and easy to understand interface. By
11 limiting the number of characters of the content of its messages, it is easier to use and to
12 visualize in mobile devices. Twitter is fast and more direct than Facebook on this level.
13 This may explain that the number of publications of the franchise brands in Twitter is
14 much higher than in Facebook.
15

16 To summarize, the activity of the chains in social media is different according to the sector
17 in which the chain is operating, as well as the social media in which it operates.
18

19 Table 6 presents the calculation of the rate of engagement disaggregated for each of the
20 franchise chains analyzed, applied to Facebook and Twitter, respectively.
21

22 [INSERT HERE TABLE 6]
23
24
25
26
27

28 Firstly, we emphasize that it is not appropriate to perform a comparative analysis between
29 the engagement obtained by Facebook and by Twitter. The spirit which underlines the
30 definition of engagement for Facebook and for Twitter is the same; that is to say, to
31 measure the involvement of the users. However, the definition itself of the engagement
32 rate for each social media is configured by different indicators which makes the figures
33 obtained for the two networks different.
34
35

36 Centering on Facebook, we see that the average rate of engagement for the restaurant
37 sector is higher than that of the other sectors, though its standard deviation is very high.
38 To check if there exist statistically significant differences, we have applied the Kruskal-
39 Wallis test (Table 8), given that the data do not present normality (Table 7). We test that
40 all the sectors have the same value of engagement. To identify the differences existing
41 between the sectors, we have applied the Mann-Whitney U test. The results show that
42 differences of the restaurant sector exist when comparing it with each of the other two
43 sectors, but a significant difference does not exist between the travel agency sector and
44 the real estate agents sector, with a confidence level of 95%. This is because both the real
45 estate agents and the travel agency sectors have more direct competition through the real
46 estate agents' web sites and the electronic channels of the firms which operate directly
47 with purchasers who are planning a trip.
48
49
50
51
52

53 [INSERT HERE TABLE 7]
54

55 [INSERT HERE TABLE 8]
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Observing the results obtained in Twitter, we note that the restaurant sector continues
2 having the highest average of engagement, followed by the real estate agents sector and,
3 in third place, by the travel agency sector. To statistically compare if there are significant
4 differences between the sectors, it is necessary to previously apply the normality test of
5 the data. The results show that the data of the restaurant sector and of the real estate agents
6 sector follow a normal distribution, but the data of the travel agency sector do not (Table
7 7). Therefore, this information must be borne in mind to apply both the t-Student test and
8 the Mann-Whitney U test. Applying the Kruskal-Wallis test, we obtain the results which
9 appear in Table 8. We see that the p-value of the Kruskal-Wallis test is less than 0.05, so
10 some differences exist in the level of engagement between sectors. To identify those
11 differences, we have applied, as has been commented before, the t-Student and the Mann-
12 Whitney U tests. We observe that significant differences exist between the restaurant
13 sector and the other two sectors, with a confidence level of 95%. However, significant
14 differences do not exist between the travel agency sector and the real estate agents sector.
15 To sum up, the conclusions of the comparisons for the engagement rate by sectors are
16 practically similar in each social media.
17
18
19
20

21 The correlation between the engagement rate and diverse operational variables frequently
22 used in the analysis of the franchise has been measured to verify the hypotheses proposed
23 (Table 9). Specifically, the correlation between engagement and the variables the number
24 of stores of the chain, the entry fee demanded from the franchisees by the franchisor, the
25 experience of the franchise (measured as the number of years the franchise chain has
26 existed) and the royalty (measured as a monthly percentage of the sales) have been
27 measured. The correlation has been measured both for Facebook and for Twitter.
28
29
30

31 [INSERT HERE TABLE 9]
32

33 The results show that both in Facebook and in Twitter the two variables which have a
34 significant and positive correlation with the engagement rate are the entry fee and the
35 royalty. This means that a larger entry fee also involves a greater engagement rate, while
36 a higher royalty implies a higher engagement rate too. Hence, the involvement which
37 users show concerning those franchise chains in which a larger entry fee and higher
38 royalties are demanded is higher than that which they show concerning the franchise
39 chains which require lower values in these variables.
40
41

42 On the other hand, the results show that a significant correlation does not exist between
43 engagement and the total number of stores and the experience of the franchise. Hence, we
44 observe that this study's hypotheses 3 and 4 are verified but not 1 and 2.
45
46
47

48 **5. Discussion**

49 The high growth of users in social media in recent years has encouraged firms to improve
50 their communication strategy. The main reasons for doing so stem from social media
51 enabling them to find new customers, improve their satisfaction, make them loyal,
52 increase the firm's sales levels and revenues and construct a good reputation for their
53 brand image [29]. In spite of the growth of users in social media, much more research is
54 still required in the field of franchising. This work aims to contribute more knowledge in
55 this research field.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The aim of this work has been, on the one hand, to analyze the activity of franchise chains
2 in social media and, on the other hand, to measure the engagement which social media
3 users show with franchise brands or chains. Though this objective is very important in
4 any business sector, the very structure of the franchise system makes its importance yet
5 greater. It has to be kept in mind that franchisors have to establish relations, direct or
6 indirect, with their franchisees, with prospective franchisees and with the end customers.

7 This work has analyzed two of the social media most used by firms to develop their
8 communication strategies, Facebook and Twitter. A first important conclusion is that the
9 results show distinct levels of activity of the firms, according to the sector and the social
10 media used. Thus, the results of Facebook show that the travel agency sector chains have
11 more activity. This may be explained by the trends in travel consumption being highly
12 influenced by conversations which have begun in Facebook. Furthermore, many
13 companies tend to repeat the same content in social media. However, the travel agency
14 sector is more susceptible to maintaining the audience updated with the latest news, due
15 to the offers and prices generally being more changeable in this sector than in the
16 restaurant or real estate agents sector. The greater versatility which Facebook has to
17 upload videos of travel experiences is another factor which can corroborate this result.
18 The visual content is momentous for a travel agency: people expect to see a photo or a
19 video of a place and immediately want to be there. Another reason why travel agency
20 brands are more active in Facebook is that this social media can increase the customer's
21 lifetime value [49]. This result is because trips are products which are not frequently
22 bought and travel agencies have to maintain the relation begun with a trip over time until
23 the next one, and so on.

24 On the contrary, centering on Twitter, the restaurant sector chains have more activity in
25 this social media. This fact may be due to the dynamism of Twitter through short
26 messages, which has meant that many of the restaurant sector firms can share, with a short
27 text, contents referring to dishes, schedules, offers highlighted on the menu, information
28 about events, shows, wine tastings, etc. Moreover, firms use Twitter to promote their
29 products and customer services [49] and this aim is better applied in the restaurant sector
30 than in the other two sectors whose products are more complex and whose consumption
31 is not so frequent.

32 Analyzing the users' activity through these chains' social media, especially in Twitter,
33 the real estate agents sector strongly stands out, both referring to the interaction with the
34 brands' publications, the comments generated, and the comments shared by the users.

35 Another of the aims proposed in this work has been to measure the level of engagement
36 of the users of these two social media with the brands used in this study. Unlike the static
37 web sites which existed in the first days of the Internet, in recent years the interactive
38 nature of social media has modified consumers' commitment with brands [57]. Currently,
39 when they use social media consumers are in contact with many brands and products,
40 reading, writing, seeing, commenting and sharing information. In the case of this study,
41 the consumer engagement rate was measured for three different sectors which operate in
42 franchising.

43 The results indicate that significant differences of engagement exist by sectors. Centering
44 on Facebook, there is a greater engagement rate in the restaurant sector. This means that
45 the restaurant sector brands create more solid and lasting relations with their customers,
46 establishing a strong link between the brand and the consumers. The brands which have
47 a higher engagement rate are Chocolaterías Valor, Ginos, VIPS, La Tagliatella, Häagen-
48 Dazs and Telepizza. These companies' customers are more committed with and are

1 stronger defenders of the brand, as well as being more receptive to the brand's messages.
2 On the other hand, there are no differences in the engagement ratio between the travel
3 agency and the real estate agent sectors.

4 Centering on Twitter, the results by sectors are similar to those found on Facebook. The
5 restaurant sector has a greater engagement rate, while there are not significant differences
6 between the travel agency and the real estate agents sectors.
7

8 Focusing on common variables of franchising studies, the total number of stores does not
9 influence the brand's engagement rate. On the other hand, the engagement rate is
10 influenced by the entre fee and the royalties.
11

12 Engagement is not related with a brand's number of stores. That is to say, the brand
13 having more consumers as they have more stores compared to another brand with fewer
14 stores does not lead to a higher involvement of the consumers. Franchises are interested
15 in detecting those consumers who, being leaders of opinion or prescribers, are more
16 involved with the brand through these social media.
17
18

19 On the other hand, the brands with more engagement have a higher entry fee. We hence
20 conclude that the chains which demand a larger entry fee have a greater value for the
21 franchisees and the prospective franchisees, as they are chains with a high rate of
22 engagement. This means that through Facebook and/or Twitter the consumers have more
23 involvement in them than in those which demand a lower entry fee.
24

25 In accordance with this, a business concept successfully tested by brands and also valued
26 by consumers will be defined in more sales for the franchisee stores and, consequently,
27 more revenues for the franchisor through the royalties. Then, it is understood that the
28 brands with greater engagement demand higher royalties.
29
30

31 Finally, engagement is not related with the experience or the number of years that brands
32 have been operating in the market. This may be due to the brand having been operating
33 for few years in social media and, as a result, enough time has not passed for these social
34 media to have contributed to the brand's reputation.
35

36 To sum up, we conclude that engagement is an indicator of the success of the commitment
37 relation which users show toward a brand via the activity of both of them in social media.
38
39
40
41

42 **6. Theoretical and managerial implications**

43 The literature of engagement and social media in franchising is very limited and is
44 advancing very slowly. This study contributes to the knowledge of engagement in
45 franchising because it provides several considerations for companies. This research
46 shows that brands have different levels of consumer engagement. It supposes that
47 franchisors must increase the use of social media in order to gain more consumer
48 engagement. For this purpose, they must increase their activities in social media.
49
50

51 This work shows the importance of knowing how to properly manage the social media
52 used for brands to increase the engagement rate and in this way attain a greater user
53 involvement. The findings hold some useful theoretical and managerial implications. The
54 theoretical implications could be built upon to further develop the knowledge of consumer
55 engagement in franchising.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Unfortunately, most brands use social media to spray their promotional messages instead
2 of connecting with their prospects or customer. A suitable strategy is needed for the
3 successful implementation of social media in complex structures [27, 42, 70]. Franchises
4 are complex structures. The results of this study show different levels of engagement by
5 brands. Thus, the use of social media in franchising might not be utilized in the correct
6 way. The social media adoption depends on the ability to create a systematic process of
7 activities in the right context.
8

9
10 This work extends the generalizability of previous studies because it includes three
11 sectors and more than fifty brands, while past studies usually analyzed one or a few brands
12 [18]. The present work also provides theoretical knowledge to Relational Marketing and
13 Collaborative Marketing. Specifically, this study shows the digital consumption habits of
14 consumers by social network and brand.
15

16
17 The intensity of consumer engagement varies among the different brands. Firms must
18 ensure high levels of engagement in order to generate greater loyalty to the brand [19].
19 As proposed [64], it should be interesting the study of social media based on its
20 relationship with other brand variables. In this case, we have analyzed the relationship
21 between consumer engagement and operational variables in franchising.
22
23

24 This work also includes the following implications for management: 1) the franchisors
25 should give greater importance to engagement as a tool to obtain information that can
26 help them in their decision making; 2) in relation to the prospective franchisees of a brand,
27 its franchisors, especially in the restaurant sector, should show their engagement rate
28 along with other economic indicators, such as royalties or entry fees, to prospective
29 franchisees who are looking for information on a franchise brand to open a franchise
30 store. To consider the engagement rate as a measure of brand value would turn out to be
31 an information signal for prospective franchisees that they have greater guarantees of
32 success opening a franchised store; and 3) in relation to the customers, the franchisor must
33 analyze its brand's engagement to detect the consumers who are more involved with its
34 products and seek to create their image through them. Taking into account the increasing
35 importance of social media and of the distinct digital platforms which operate in the
36 sector, and customers giving increasingly more importance to other users' opinions, it is
37 important to understand how to manage these channels, how to gain presence in them and
38 to integrate them as a fundamental point of contact with consumers. To do so, it would
39 be advisable for firms to incorporate professionals specialized in social media and include
40 a sentiment analysis of each site used. This is even more important when firms anticipate
41 that these social media will continue being the most relevant media of communication
42 with customers in the coming years.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 If we consider each of the sectors analyzed, in order not to decrease the high engagement
51 rate of firms in the restaurant sector, it would be advisable for these firms to adapt their
52 social media marketing strategy to the changes that are taking place in consumer habits
53 and in technology. The change in customers' consumption habits, an increasingly greater
54 use of technology, as well as the transformation of this technology into processes and into
55 complete value chains makes it imperative for restaurant firms to focus on digital
56 transformation processes. The travel agency sector is another sector in which the
57 digitalization process is important. Today, one of the main challenges of travel agencies
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 is to make the management and sales process become an experience. Finally, technology
2 is also significantly affecting the real estate agents sector. Real estate agents publish their
3 property-for-sale portfolios and also pay for positions in the first pages with the aim of
4 attracting more interested people than the rest of the announcements. Therefore, they try
5 to seek a greater commitment of the users with the brand; that is to say, a greater
6 engagement.
7

8 Like many other works, this study has some limitations. A first limitation refers to the
9 sample selected. Though these three sectors are representative in franchising, the use of
10 more sectors could have contributed different results and have enriched the study. In any
11 case, this aspect can be used as a future research line. On the other hand, the time period
12 which has been considered in this work spans a year and a half, specifically from January
13 2018 until May 2019. The results could have been altered if another time period had been
14 chosen or even if this time period had been analyzed over less time. This aspect can also
15 be considered a future research line. Also, future research should consider the design of
16 the study analysing the three target audiences of franchise chains, such as the prospective
17 franchisees, the current franchisees and the end consumers. Finally, it would also have
18 been interesting to dispose of the year in which the brands began to use the likes analyzed
19 in order to take this information into account when doing the study.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Acknowledgment**

28 The authors would like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for their valuable
29 comments and suggestions to improve the quality of the paper.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **References**

- 37 1. AEF (2019). Asociación Española de Franquiciadores. www.franquiciadores.com
- 38 2. Achen, R. (2016). Examining the influence of Facebook fans, content, and
39 engagement on business outcomes in the National Basketball Association.
40 *Journal of Social Media for Organizations*, 3(1), 1-15.
- 41 3. Ali I., Khan, SUR., & Rehman, IU (2013). How corporate social responsibility
42 and corporate reputation influence employee engagement? *Transformations in*
43 *Business & Economics*, 12(1A), 354-364.
- 44 4. Ashley, Chr., & Tuten, T (2015). Creative Strategies in Social Media Marketing:
45 An Exploratory Study of Branded Social Content and Consumer Engagement.
46 *Psychology and Marketing*, 32(1), 15–27.
- 47 5. Barger, V. A., & Labrecque, L. (2013). An Integrated Marketing Communications
48 Perspective on Social Media Metrics. *International Journal of Integrated*
49 *Marketing Communications*, Spring 2013. Available at SSRN:
50 <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2280132>.
- 51 6. Bijmolt, T. H. A., Leeflang, P. S. H., Block, F., Eisenbeiss, M., Hardie, B. G. S.,
52 Lemmens, A., & Saffert, P. (2010). Analytics for customer engagement. *Journal*
53 *of Service Research*, 13(3), 341–356.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 7. Blancas-Peral, F.J., Contreras, I., & Ramírez-Hurtado, J.M. (2014). Choosing a
2 travel agency franchise by mean of a global composite indicator: an application
3 in Spain. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 15(1), 153-173.
- 4 8. Bowden, J. L. (2009). The Process of Customer Engagement: A Conceptual
5 Framework. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 17(1), 63–74.
- 6 9. Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Jurić, B., & Ilić, A. (2011). Customer Engagement.
7 *Journal of Service Research*, 14(3), 252–271.
- 8 10. Brodie, R. J., Roderick J., Ilic, A., Juric, B., & Hollebeek, L. D. (2013). Consumer
9 Engagement in a Virtual Brand Community: An Exploratory Analysis. *Journal of*
10 *Business Research*, 66(1), 105–114.
- 11 11. Cambra, J., Melero, I., & Sese, F.J. (2012). Aproximación al concepto de
12 engagement: Un estudio exploratorio en el sector de la telefonía móvil. *Universia*
13 *Business Review*, 1(33), 84-103.
- 14 12. Cambra, J., Melero, I. Sese, F.J (2016). Can complaint-handling efforts promote
15 customer engagement? *Service Business*, 10, 847–866.
- 16 13. Castelló Martínez, A., & Monserrat-Gauchí, J. (2012). La comunicación digital
17 de la empresa de franquicia: uso y presencia en los medios sociales. *AdComunica*,
18 3, 105-124.
- 19 14. Chan-Olmsted, S., Wolter, L.-C., & Wang, R. (2017). *Toward a Multidimensional*
20 *Framework of Media Engagement: Conceptualizing Consumer Experience and*
21 *Connection with Media Content in a Digital Environment. Media Engagement*
22 *Framework*. Conference paper of the Emma 2017.
- 23 15. Dahlgren, P. (2006). Civic participation and practices: Beyond “deliberative
24 democracy.” In N. Carpentier (Ed.), *Researching media, democracy and*
25 *participation* (23–34). Tartu University Press.
- 26 16. Dant, R.P., Manish K, Anne T. C., & Jamie, E. (2007). *A Cointegration Analysis*
27 *of the Correlates of Performance in Franchised Channels*, 169-189, in Economics
28 and management of networks: Franchising, strategic alliances, and cooperatives.
29 Gérard Cliquet, George Hendrikse, Mika Tuunanen and Josef Windsperger (ed).
30 Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag HD.
- 31 17. De Vries, L., Gensler, S., & Leeflang, P.S.H. (2012). Popularity of brand posts on
32 brand fan pages: an investigation of the effects of social media marketing. *Journal*
33 *of Interactive Marketing*, 26, 83-91.
- 34 18. Dessart, L. (2017). Social media engagement: a model of antecedents and
35 relational outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 33(5-6), 375-399.
- 36 19. Dessart, L., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2015). Consumer
37 engagement in online brand communities: a social media perspective. *Journal of*
38 *Product & Brand Management*, 24(1), 28-42.
- 39 20. Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J., & Goodman, S. (2015). Social media engagement
40 behaviour: a uses and gratifications perspective. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*,
41 24(3–4), 261–277.
- 42 21. Fernandes, T., & Remelhe, P. (2015). How to engage customers in co-creation:
43 customers’ motivations for collaborative innovation. *Journal of Strategic*
44 *Marketing*, 24(3/4), 311-326.
- 45 22. Flaherty, S.J., McCarthy, M.B., Collins, A.M., & McAuliffe, F.M. (2019). A
46 different perspective on consumer engagement: exploring the experience of using
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- health apps to support healthier food purchasing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 35(3-4), 310-337.
23. Fombrun, C. (1996). *Reputation*, USA, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
24. Füller, J., Matzler, K., & Hoppe, M. (2008). Brand community members as a source of innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 25(6), 608-619.
25. Gambetti, R., & Graffigna, G. (2010). The concept of engagement. *International Journal of Market Research*, 52(6), 801-826.
26. Giraldo Cardona, C., & Martínez María-Dolores, S. (2016). Análisis de la actividad y presencia en Facebook y otras redes sociales de las principales cadenas hoteleras españolas. *Revista de Ocio y Turismo*, 11, 35-49.
27. Guesalaga, R. (2016). The use of social media in sales: Individual and organizational antecedents, and the role of customer engagement in social media. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 54, 71-79.
28. Gurau, C. (2008). Integrated online marketing communication: implementation and management. *Journal of Communication Management*, 12, 169-184.
29. He, W., Zha, S., & Li, L. (2013). Social media competitive analysis and text mining: A case study in the pizza industry. *International Journal of Information Management*, 3(3), 464-472.
30. Herrando, C., Jiménez-Martínez, J. & Martín-De Hoyos, M.J. (2017). Passion at first sight: how to engage users in social commerce contexts. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 17, 701-720.
31. Herrera-Torres, L., Pérez-Tur, F., García-Fernández, J., & Fernández-Gavira, J. (2017). El uso de las redes sociales y el engagement de los clubes de la Liga Endesa ACB. *Cuadernos de Psicología del Deporte*, 17(3), 175-182.
32. Hodis, M.A., Sriramachandramurthy, R., & Sashittal, H.C. (2015). Interact with me on my terms: a four segment Facebook engagement framework for marketers. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31(11-12), 1255-1284.
33. Hollebeek, L. D. (2011a). Exploring customer brand engagement: Definition and themes. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19(7), 555-573.
34. Hollebeek, L. D. (2011b). Demystifying Customer Engagement: Exploring the Loyalty Nexus, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27(7-8), 785-807.
35. Hollebeek, L. D., Conduit, J., & Brodie, R. J. (2016). Strategic drivers, anticipated and unanticipated outcomes of customer engagement. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32(5-6), 393-398.
36. Hollebeek, L. D., Glynn, M. S., & Brodie, R. J. (2014). Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 28(2), 149-165. DOI: 10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002.
37. IAB (2015) PRGS: El modelo para estudiar la Actividad de las marcas en los medios sociales [https://www.reasonwhy.es/reportaje/prgs-el-modelo-para-estudiar-la-actividad-de-las-marcas-en-medios-sociales] Accessed: 30.09.2019.
38. IAB (2016). *Estudio anual de redes sociales*. Interactive Advertising Bureau. Spain.
39. IAB (2018). *Observatorio de marcas en redes sociales*. Interactive Advertising Bureau. Spain.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
40. IAB (2019). Estudio anual de redes sociales. [https://iabspain.es/wp-content/uploads/estudio-anual-redes-sociales-iab-spain-2019_vreducida.pdf]. Accessed 20.10.2019.
 41. Jung, W., Yang, S. & Kim, H. (2020). Design of sweepstakes-based social media marketing for online customer engagement. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 20, 119-146.
 42. Jussila, J. J., Kärkkäinen, H., & Aramo-Immonen, H. (2014). Social media utilization in business-to-business relationships of technology industry firms. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 30, 606–613.
 43. Kabadayi, S., & Price, K. (2014). Consumer – brand engagement on Facebook: liking and commenting behaviors, *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 8(3), 203-223.
 44. Kumar, V., Aksoy, L., Donkers, B., Venkatesan, R., Wiesel, T., & Tillmanns, S. (2010). Undervalued or Overvalued Customers: Capturing Total Customer Engagement Value. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 297-310.
 45. Lipsman, A., Mudd, G., Rich, M., & Bruich, S. (2012). The power of like: how brands reach (and influence) fans through social-media marketing. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 52(1), 40-52.
 46. Malthouse, E., & Hofacker, Ch. (2010). Looking Back and Looking Forward with Interactive Marketing. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 24(3), 181–184.
 47. Mohr, J.J., Fisher, R.J., & Nevin, J.R. (1996). Collaborative communication in interfirm relationships: Moderating effects of integration and control. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(3), 103–115.
 48. Murphy, P. (2010). The intractability of reputation: Media coverage as a complex system in the case of Martha Stewart. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22(2), 209–237.
 49. Oh, Ch., Roumani, Y., Nwankpa, J.K., & Hu, H-F. (2017). Beyond likes and tweets: Consumer engagement behavior and movie box office in social media. *Information & Management*, 54, 25-37.
 50. Oliveira, M. J., Huertas, M. K. Z., & Lin, Z. (2016). Factors driving young users' engagement with Facebook: Evidence from Brazil. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 54, 54-61.
 51. Oviedo-García, M.A., Muñoz-Expósito, M., Castellanos-Verdugo, M., & Sancho-Mejías, M. (2014). Metric proposal for customer engagement in Facebook. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 8(4), 327-344.
 52. Paine, K. D. (2011). *Measure What Matters: Online Tools For Understanding Customers, Social Media, Engagement, And Key Relationships*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
 53. Palmatier, R. W., Jarvis, C. B., Bechhoff, J. R., & Kardes, F. R. (2009). The role of customer gratitude in relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(September), 1-18.
 54. Perrigot, R., Hussain, D., & Windsperger, J. (2015). An investigation into independent small business owners' perception of franchisee relationships. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 43(8), 693-711.
 55. Ramírez-Hurtado, J.M., & Contreras, I. (2017). Efficiency of travel agency franchises: a study in Spain. *Service Business*, 11(4), 717-739.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
56. Safón, V., & Escribá, A. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of external risk perception in franchising: evidence from the hospitality industry. *Service Business*, 5, 237-257.
 57. Schivinski, B., Christodoulides, G., & Dabrowski, D. (2016). Measuring Consumers' Engagement With Brand-Related Social-Media Content. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 56(1), 64-80.
 58. Schreiner, M., Fischer, T. & Riedl, R. (2019). Impact of content characteristics and emotion on behavioral engagement in social media: literature review and research agenda. *Electronic Commerce Research*.
 59. Scolari, C. A. (2008). Hacia la hipertelevisión. Los primeros síntomas de una nueva configuración del dispositivo televisivo. *Diálogos de la comunicación*, 77, 1-9. Available at <http://dialogosfelafacs.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/77/77-revista-dialogos-hacia-la-hipertelevisión.pdf>.
 60. Shane, S., Shankar, V., & Aravindakshan, A. (2006). The effects of new franchisor partnering strategies on franchise system size. *Management Science*, 5, 773-787.
 61. Simon, S., Brexendorf, T.O., & Fassnacht, M. (2016). The impact of external social and internal personal forces on consumers' brand community engagement on Facebook. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25/5, 409–423.
 62. Sobaci, M. Z., & Hatipoğlu, I. (2017). Measuring the engagement level of political parties with public on Facebook: The case of Turkey. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference for E-Democracy and Open Government, CeDEM 2017*, 209–216.
 63. Tafesse, W. (2015). Content strategies and audience response on Facebook brand pages. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 33(6), 927-943.
 64. Tafesse, W. (2016). An experiential model of consumer engagement in social media. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 25(5), 424-434.
 65. Triantafillidou, A., Lappas, G., Yannas, P., & Kleftodimos, A. (2015). Facebook Engagement and Greek Local Municipal Governments. In P. Parycek and N. Edelman (Eds.), *CeDEM15 Conference for E-Democracy and Open Government* (39–52). Edition Donau-Universität Krems.
 66. Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. (2010). Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research Directions. *Journal of Service Research*, 13, 253-266.
 67. Vivek, Sh. D. (2009). *A Scale of Consumer Engagement*, Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, Department of Management &Marketing, Graduate School–The University of Alabama, UMI.
 68. Vivek, S. D., Beatty, S. E., & Morgan, R. M. (2012). Customer Engagement: Exploring Customer Relationships Beyond Purchase. *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 20(2), 122–146.
 69. Voorveld, H.A.M., Van Noort, G., Muntinga, D.G., & Bronner, F. (2018). Engagement with Social Media and Social Media Advertising: The Differentiating Role of Platform Type. *Journal of Advertising*, 47(1), 38-54.
 70. Wiersema, F. (2013). The B2B agenda: The current state of B2B marketing and a look ahead. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(4), 470–488.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
71. Yang, S., Lin, S., Carlson, J.R., & Ross, W.T.Jr. (2016). Brand engagement on social media: will firms' social media efforts influence search engine advertising effectiveness? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32(5-6), 526-557.
72. Yi Grace Ji, Cong Li, North, M., & Jiangmeng Liu (2017). Staking reputation on stakeholders: How does stakeholders' Facebook engagement help or ruin a company's reputation? *Public Relations Review*, 43, 201–210.

Table 1. Sample information

Sector	Sample size (Facebook)	Sample size (Twitter)
Restaurants	17	15
Travel agencies	20	16
Real Estate agents	16	15
TOTAL:	53	46
Platform	<i>Fanpage Karma</i>	<i>Twitonomy</i>
Analysis period	<i>From 1st January 2018 to 31st May 2019</i>	

Source: own elaboration.

Table 2. Variables of the PRGS model.

		Facebook		Twitter	
BRAND	Presence	Fans	$P = n^{\circ} \text{ posts}$	Followers	$P = n^{\circ} \text{ tweets} + \text{retweets of the brand}$
		Post		Tweets and retweets of the brand	
USER	Response	Like	$R = \frac{\text{Like}}{n^{\circ} \text{ fans}}$	Like	$R = \frac{\text{Favourites}}{n^{\circ} \text{ followers}}$
	Generation	Comments	$G = \frac{\text{Comments}}{n^{\circ} \text{ fans}}$	Comments	$G = \frac{\text{Mentions}}{n^{\circ} \text{ followers}}$
	Suggestion	Content shared	$S = \frac{\text{Share}}{n^{\circ} \text{ fans}}$	Retweets of the users	$S = \frac{\text{Retweets of the users}}{n^{\circ} \text{ followers}}$

Source: own elaboration.

Table 3. Descriptive data of the sample for Facebook^a.

Sector	N° posts	N° likes	N° comments	N° shares	N° total of stores	Experience of the chain (years)	Entry fee	Royalty
Restaurants	5,113	995,363	307,215	126,491	101.47	15	22,205.88	3.71
Travel agencies	8,209	323,881	66,475	116,904	226.05	15	7,758.90	1.73
Real Estate agents	5,643	47,441	4,453	26,059	58.56	14	10,075.00	3.91

^aIn the table, the total number for the posts, likes, comments and shares has been calculated, while for the rest of the variables the arithmetic mean has been calculated.

Source: own elaboration.

Table 4. Descriptive data of the sample for Twitter^b

Sector	N° Followers	N° of Tweets	Favourites	Mentions	Retweets	N° total of stores	Experience of the chain (years)	Entry fee	Royalty
Restaurants	523,884	241,395	121,265	196,058	80,822	109.07	18	27,366.67	4.21
Travel agencies	108,476	132,688	21,452	56,842	6,240	246.31	14	8,742.38	1.94
Real Estate agents	21,175	46,855	9,368	11,506	3,883	55.07	16	11,620.00	3.77

^bIn the table, the total number for the followers, tweets, favourites, mentions and retweets has been calculated, while for the rest of the variables the arithmetic mean has been calculated.

Source: own elaboration.

Table 5. PRGS model applied to the sectors^c.

Sector	Variable	Facebook	Twitter
Restaurants	<i>Presence</i>	3,536	242,216
	<i>Response</i>	0.12	0.23
	<i>Generation</i>	0.04	0.37
	<i>Suggestion</i>	0.01	0.15
Travel agencies	<i>Presence</i>	5,000	134,488
	<i>Response</i>	0.47	0.20
	<i>Generation</i>	0.10	0.52
	<i>Suggestion</i>	0.16	0.06
Real Estate agents	<i>Presence</i>	3,241	47,434
	<i>Response</i>	0.54	0.44
	<i>Generation</i>	0.06	0.54
	<i>Suggestion</i>	0.32	0.18

^c Some chains which do have the number of fans available have not been taken into account for the calculation of the PRGS model in Facebook.

Source: own elaboration.

Table 6. Engagement rate applied to Facebook and Twitter.

FACEBOOK					
Restaurant sector		Travel agency sector		Real Estate agent sector	
Chocolaterías Valor	1,422.35	Eroski Viajes	319.00	Inmobiliaria Sevilla 2000 Real Estate	45.26
Ginos	1,085.68	B the travel brand	110.07	Century 21	44.71
VIPS	944.18	Check in Travel	74.19	Re/Max España	24.57
La Tagliatella	693.36	Nautalia	72.38	Comprarcasa Servicios Inmobiliarios	16.47
Häagen-Dazs	648.43	Clickviaja.com	49.59	Look & Find	16.08
Telepizza	593.62	Zafiro Tours	37.87	Donpiso	12.87
The Good Burger	209.85	Dit Gestion	36.53	Coldwell Banker Spain	8.93
Llaollao	119.85	Viajes Carrefour	31.65	LemonKey	7.78
Cervecería La Sureña	109.82	Nuba	31.18	Alquiventas	5.17
Pans & Company	98.94	Carlson Wagonlit Travel	17.62	Inmuebles En Exclusiva	4.68
Pannus	64.94	Viajes University	11.00	RH Properties	4.47
Yogurtería Danone	31.97	Almeida Viajes	10.17	Grupo Expofincas	4.30
Dehesa Santamaría	27.26	Grupo By_Tour	9.67	Ginmo Gestoría Inmobiliaria	1.91
Panchito	23.44	Anlusur	7.06	Outlet de Viviendas	1.84
La Mafia se sienta a la mesa	18.29	Viajes Ecuador	6.15	InmoHappy.com	1.38
La Gitana Loca	6.99	Innovatur	3.09	Grupassa	0.00
Ingredients	5.50	Línea Tours	2.97		
		Costasur	2.42		
		Costa Este	1.95		
		GRN Vacaciones	0.03		
Average of the sector	359.09		41.73		12.53
Standard deviation	436.70		69.91		13.86
TWITTER					
Restaurant sector		Travel agency sector		Real Estate agent sector	
Telepizza	3.03	B The Travel Brand	1.61	Lemonkey	2.12
La Mafia se sienta a la mesa	2.68	Eroski Viajes	1.20	Century 21	1.71
La Tagliatella	2.38	Nuba	0.92	Inmobiliaria Sevilla 2000 Real Estate	1.35
The Good Burger	1.88	Click Viaja	0.79	Re/Max España	1.01
Ginos	1.84	Nautalia	0.78	Look & Find	0.85
Chocolaterías Valor	1.65	Dit Gestión	0.54	Donpiso	0.72
VIPS	1.53	Costasur	0.40	Comprarcasa Servicios Inmobiliarios	0.57
Häagen-Dazs	0.94	Viajes Carrefour	0.37	Grupassa	0.56
Pans & Company	0.88	Grupo By_Tour	0.31	Grupo Expofincas	0.54
Cervecería La Sureña	0.68	Anlusur	0.20	Outlet de viviendas	0.28
Dehesa Santamaría	0.65	Carlson Wagonlit Travel	0.16	Coldwell Banker Spain	0.20
Tony Roma's	0.60	Viajes Ecuador	0.13	Solo alquileres	0.09
RIBS	0.53	Zafiro Tours	0.11	Ginmo Gestoría Inmobiliaria	0.04
Llaollao	0.37	Línea Tours	0.05	RH Properties	0.04
Ingredients	0.06	Almeida Viajes	0.01	Grupo Ecofincas	0.03
		Check in Travel	0.00		
Average of the sector	1.31		0.47		0.67
Standard deviation	0.87		0.46		0.62

Source: own elaboration.

Table 7. Shapiro-Wilk normality test (Facebook and Twitter)

Sector	Shapiro-Wilk (Facebook)			Shapiro-Wilk (Twitter)		
	Statistic	d.f.	p-value	Statistic	d.f.	p-value
Restaurants	0.783	17	0.001	0.933	15	0.301
Travel agencies	0.571	20	0.000	0.877	16	0.035
Real Estate agents	0.767	16	0.001	0.885	15	0.057

Source: own elaboration.

Table 8. Kruskal-Wallis^a test and comparison by sectors (Facebook and Twitter)

	Engagement (Facebook)	Comparisons (Mann-Whitney U test)	p-value
Chi-squared	17.870	Restaurants vs Travel agencies	0.003
d.f.	2	Restaurants vs Real Estate agents	0.000
Asymptotic Sig.	0.000	Travel agencies vs Real Estate agents	0.098
	Engagement (Twitter)	Comparisons (T-Student and Mann-Whitney U)	p-value
Chi-squared	8.913	Restaurants vs Travel agencies ^b	0.004
d.f.	2	Restaurants vs Real Estate agents ^c	0.034
Asymptotic Sig.	0.012	Travel agencies vs Real Estate agents ^b	0.429

^aGrouping variable: sector^bMann-Whitney U test^cT-Student test

Source: own elaboration.

Table 9. Correlations between engagement and operational variables in the franchise.

Social network		Total n° of establishments	Fee	Experience	Royalty
Facebook	Pearson correlation	0.039	0.449*	0,228	0.240**
	p-value	0.782	0.001	0,100	0.083
	N	53	53	53	53
Twitter	Pearson correlation	0.157	0.475*	0.095	0.420*
	p-value	0.298	0.001	0.530	0.004
	N	46	46	46	46

*The correlation is significant at the level of 1%

**The correlation is significant at the level of 10%

Source: own elaboration.

Fig. 1. Utility of social media.

