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Abstract

Customer engagement measures in social media marketing are believed to be one of the most important measures for social media today. Little is known about which factors contribute customer engagement on Instagram brand posts within the make-up cosmetics industry. The goal of the study was to investigate customer engagement on Instagram brand pages in the make-up cosmetics industry. Content analyses of 750 brand posts in the make-up cosmetics industry were conducted where customer engagement on posts was measured through the number of likes and the number of comments. The results indicated that content that included image/video of products was positively related to customer engagement compared to other content. Highly vivid posts were positively related to the numbers of comments and negatively related to the numbers of likes. Question-based texts under images/videos were positively related to numbers of comments from customer. Share of positive comments by users under brand post were negatively related to the number of comments under posts. Content that was created by users received more likes than content created by the organization. This had not been tested before and therefore the research contributes to the social media and Instagram literature in the make-up cosmetics industry. The study demonstrates how Instagram usage can be measured effectively for the make-up cosmetics industry and shows that marketers in the make-up cosmetics industry can perhaps utilize this knowledge when designing marketing strategies for their brands.
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1 Introduction

The presence of social media in recent years has change the marketing environment of businesses tremendously, creating new opportunities for brands to promote their products and interact with customers (Gensler, Vöckner, Liu-Thompkins, & Wiertz, 2013). Felix, Rauschnabel, and Hinsch (2017), are responsible for the latest definition of social media marketing (SMM), defining it as “an interdisciplinary and cross-functional concept that uses social media (often in combination with other communication channels) to achieve organizational goals by creating value for stakeholders” (p.123).

In recent years some organizations have been struggling with measuring the effect of their social media. Many marketers have been using traditional marketing measures for their social media whereas the emphasis is generally on short term financial measures such as return on investment (ROI). That means that marketers have been focusing on reach and frequency measures when measuring their social media success (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). According to Haven (2007) marketers cannot rely solely on this approach for today’s marketing environment since customers do not trust traditional advertisements, the way they did before. Haven noted that the new key metrics for measuring SMM success was by measuring customer engagement, and added that, by measuring engagement, brands would get a more coherent image of customer actions, and realize that value comes from the action that people take when influencing others. This is in line with the study from Hoffman and Fodor (2010) which was mentioned above. Hoffman et al. (2010), like Haven (2007), recommended that instead of focusing on short term measures, marketers should focus on long term measure such as customer engagement. For example, how many customers comment and leave likes on the brand social media posts, and how much time do they spend on the brand social media. They also argued that returns from social media investment couldn’t entirely be measured financially and stated that customer behavior (i.e. customer investment) had to be taken into account. Further studies have also shown that measuring engagement on social media is considered one of the key success factors for good social media campaigns (Hanna, Rohm & Crittenden, 2011; Cvijikj & Michahelles, 2013; Cvijikj, Spiegler & Michahelles, 2013). One of the advantages of measuring customer engagement is that it is believed to help organizations to measure changes in awareness and changes in electronic word-of-mouth (e-WOM) (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). The verb “to engage”,
is defined by Oxford Living Dictionaries as: “to participate or become involved in” (“Engage,” n.d.). When customers engage with brands on social media, the engagement activity that takes place emerges through social media features, such as likes, comments and shares (Chauhan & Pillai, 2013). Those features will be referred to in this study as “customer engagement features”. A number of studies have shown that highly engaged customers are believed to be the most valuable for brands since they are more likely to share positive information about the brand with other people, or deliver positive WOM about the brand (Jahn & Kunz, 2012; Keller, 2009; Srinivasan, Anderson, & Ponnavolu, 2002). Further studies regarding customer engagement on brand content on social media, will be analyzed within the literature review chapter later on in this paper. Most of the studies (Cvijikj & Michahelles, 2013; de Vries, Gensler, & Leeflang, 2012; Jahn & Kunz, 2012; Wallace, Buil, & de Chernatony, 2014) focus on Facebook while only a few studies have looked into other social media platforms, such as Instagram.

Instagram was chosen as a matter of subject for this study in an attempt to fill in a gap in the literature of customer engagement, and also because Instagram is one of the fastest growing social media platforms and has one of the highest engagement levels, compared to other social media platforms (Phua, Jin, & Kim, 2017) which makes it an interesting platform to look at. It has also been shown that although users spend less time on Instagram, compared to other social media platforms, Instagram has a higher engagement level compared to other medias (Hu, Manikonda, & Kambhampati, 2014). The make-up cosmetics industry was chosen as a focus for this study as it is an industry where Instagram is widely used for marketing and was therefore considered a good match. Both the make-up cosmetics industry and Instagram have grown fast within the last few years. In 2014 the make-up cosmetics industry was valued at 57.4 billion U.S. dollars, by 2020 it is estimated that the industry will be valued at around 77.7 billion U.S. dollars in 2020 (Bergström & Bäckman, 2013; Chaffey, 2016; Hu et al., 2014)

1.1 Instagram as a Marketing Tool

Instagram is a photos/video-based application that allows its users only to share photo or video-based content. The content can be edited and users can add filters on their content that fit their own style, and put captions under their content, as well as hashtags and mentions (i.e. tagging others in their posts). Users are able to interact through comments and likes and they can also send private messages. Instagram has evolved significantly since its launch in 2010, and today Instagram has over 500 million
users. Brands are increasingly using Instagram as a marketing tool, and as a response Instagram designed specific business profiles which are similar to regular user profiles, the main difference is the insight that organizations can get into their data and the possibility to advertise their posts. The insight allows organizations to get to know their followers better and learn from them. Brands can get information about their followers demographic, an overview of the most popular posts and an overview of the most popular day and time for posting (“Instagram for Business,” 2016). One of the advantages of using Instagram, is that it ties other social media platforms together since Instagram allows its users to share their photos/videos directly to other social media platforms, at the same time as they are posted on Instagram (see appendix A). There are a few studies about what kind of content is popular on Instagram (Bakhshi, Shamma, & Gilbert, 2014; Erkan, 2015; Hu et al., 2014; Phua et al., 2017) but according to authors’ best knowledge, there are no studies about what kind of content is popular on Instagram in the make-up cosmetics industry

1.2. The make-up cosmetics industry

Cosmetics have been used for beautifying purposes since the dawn of civilization. Ancient Egyptians are believed to have been pioneers in that aspect (Eldridge, 2015). The word cosmetics is defined in the dictionary as “a powder, lotion, lipstick, rouge, or other preparation for beautifying the face, skin, hair, nails, etc.” (Cosmetic, n.d.). The beauty/cosmetics industry as a whole is often divided into six categories: skincare, make-up, perfumes, haircare, toiletries and oral cosmetics. The industry is further more divided either into premium or mass production segments (i.e. high end brands vs. drug store brands) (Lopaciuk & Loboda, 2013). From early on the marketing of the make-up cosmetics industry has been driven by visual content. The first colored make-up advertisements in the 1920s. Color advertisements made it substantially easier for make-up brands to sell color cosmetics. The advertisements included women wearing particular looks, short make-up tutorials, and celebrities promoting make-up. TV advertisements started to appear later on as well (Eldridge, 2015). This marketing approach still applies today, however it has transferred over to the social media platforms, such as Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. This evolution started around 2000 and has developed fast since then (Edosomwan, Prakasan, Kouame, Watson, & Seymour, 2011). The main difference between traditional marketing approaches and the social media marketing approach is that social media allows two
way communications, meaning that brand and customers can interact (Chauhan & Pillai, 2013; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Instagram, with its focus on images and videos quickly became a popular and appropriate social media platform for the make-up cosmetics industry.

Five make-up cosmetics brands within the make-up cosmetics industry will be analyzed and measured: Mac, Nyx, Urban Decay, Too Faced and Anastasia Beverly Hills (ABH). Those brands are the top five most popular make-up cosmetics brands on Instagram at this point (“Instagram: Most-followed beauty brands 2016,” 2016). These brand were also all (expect for Anastasia) on the top 10 list of most mentioned brands on videos by vloggers (video bloggers) in 2015 (“Beauty”, 2015). The main social media platforms that make-up cosmetics brands use today are Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. Facebook is the largest, but Instagram is the fastest growing and has the highest customer engagement level (“Beauty Brands on Social Media - Statistics & Facts,” n.d.; Hu et al., 2014). The industry has grown fast since the web 2.0, and the social media revelation. Marketing through social media has become significantly more important as online sales are becoming more common, as buying online can often be more convenient for customers. What the brands analyzed in this study have in common is their reputation for having a well designed social media strategy. Their Instagram pages have been successful and, although these brands have different brand identities and emphasizes, they do similar Instagram marketing. Their Instagram content is similar and include images/videos of either products, faces or close-up faces, they rely heavily on social media influencers for their marketing, they all have high engagement levels on their Instagram, and they all reinforce users for sharing Instagram posts that are related to their brands by featuring the users on the brand Instagram (regram). Regramming refers to “reposting on Instagram” and means that the content that is used is a repost or a copy from someone else’s original photo (“Urban Dictionary: regram”, 2013 ). The brands analyzed in this research wil be introduced and described below.

Mac

Mac was founded by Frank Toskan, make-up artist and photographer, in 1984. Toskan believed there to be a lack of colored cosmetics in the make-up cosmetics market which inspired him to design a cosmetics line with more colors. His goal was to get more divers cosmetics colors for his photo shoots. Mac focuses on targeting make-up artists and other related professionals, such as models and photographers, and
develops its products based on their demand. Their goal is to provide quality make-up cosmetics for all races, ages and sexes. The brand is very artistic and their Instagram page reflects that. At this point, Mac has 12.6 million followers on Instagram and their total number of posts is 3,086 (“MAC Cosmetics - Our History,” n.d.). Mac gathers information about its customers from various sources for their marketing, such as its website and social media platforms, and when customers apply for membership in the Mac pro program. They also collect information about customers devices by using technologies such as cookies and web server logs. Mac uses that information to get to know their customers, in order to send promotional material, improve their service and brand, discover the demand from customers, develop new products, and more. Mac also uses third party analytics services, such as Google analytics, to measure their online success (“Privacy policy,” n.d.). Their high social media engagement level has been connected to their emphasis on posting images of products and also to their strategy of creating anticipation about upcoming products by posting images of them. Mac’s products are known for being colorful and their colorful images are believed to stand out in the customers’ Instagram feeds, which motivates them to engage with the brand (Duffy, 2016).

Nyx

Nyx, named after the Greek goddess, was founded by Toni Koi in 1999 but is presently owned by L’Oréal. Nyx’s goals are to provide customers with inexpensive quality products that include high pigments, and products that are seasonal, classic and trendy at the same time. At this point, Nyx has 9.3 million followers on Instagram and their total number of Instagram posts is 3,403 (“NYX Professional MakeUp”, n.d.). In 2016 Nyx opened a variety of digital stores, with scanners and screens located on the floor which connect products with the brand’s social media, its goal being to create an in-store experience. Customers can scan products and experience visual content on the screen. The screen will provide a user generated content that shows customers the material and the options that the product provides. Each product has its own hashtag that customers can look for on social media to get even further ideas on how to use the product and they can also share photo from themselves, using the hashtag. This will encourage customers to share photos of the products that they buy on social media, using the same hashtag, while giving them a change to be featured on Nyx’s Instagram (Milnes, 2016). Nyx relies heavily on social media influencers for their marketing and,
when opening a new store, they usually cooperate with Instagram influencers and give customers chance to meet them in their store (see Appendix E) (“NYX Gets Social Media Influencers To Develop Its New Store Concepts”, 2015). This technique is called “meet and greet” and is widely used by influencers and brands (Baysinger, 2015) (see Appendix E). On the Nyx cosmetics webpage, are listed specific terms and conditions for their Instagram where, among other things, it says that they have the right to use pictures that have hashtags created by Nyx (“NYX Cosmetics Terms and Conditions For Instagram,” 2015). They also have a specific button on their website called “looks” and by pressing it customers can share their Instagram images and look at images from other users that have used the Nyx hashtag (see Appendix G).

Too Faced

Too Faced was founded by Jerrod Blandino and Jeremy Johnson in 1998. Their products were inspired by the power of cosmetics, their love for Paris and feminine (“Our story,” n.d.). The idea is to allow women to be free to express themselves with make-up and to give them a confidence boost. At this point, Too Faced has 7.4 million followers and their total number of Instagram posts is 2.790. Too Faced regularly collaborates with social media influencers when designing new products (see Appendix F) since they know how effective it is for marketing and to create buzz. Too Faced has a similar feature to Nyx’s on their website, that allows customers to look at Instagram photos from other customers and upload their own Instagram image directly (see Appendix G) (“Our story,” n.d.)

Urban Decay

Urban Decay was founded by Sandy Lerner in 1996. The idea behind Urban Decay products was to create unique innovative products for women who want to be different. Urban Decay believes that their success can partly be traced to the online reviews about their products. Urban Decay relies on online conversations with its consumers. At this point, Urban Decay has 6.9 million followers and their total number of Instagram posts is 2.004 (“About Us” n.d.). Like Nyx, Urban Decay has a specific list of terms and conditions for Instagram, where they state that when users use the Urban Decay hashtag, they are giving the brand permission to use their photos. Instagram is their biggest social media platform. On Urban Decay’s website there is gallery of Instagram photos created by users and influencers. By clicking on the images,
customers can see which exact products were used to create the look on the Instagram photo and shop directly from there (Milnes, 2016). Urban Decay is considered strong in creating positive word of mouth as well as a buzz about their products, by engaging with their customers and encouraging them to share Urban Decay’s products on their social media (“Urban Decay Cosmetics,” n.d.)

Anastasia Beverly Hills (ABH)
ABH was founded by Anastasia Soare, in 1997. In the beginning the brand mainly focused on beautifying looks by creating the perfect brows, but in 2014 they expanded their make-up line from being a brow brand to being a brand with divers make-up products, providing products such as lipsticks, highlighters and concealers. The brand is known for its pronounced success on Instagram. ABH uses the reposting (regramming) technique frequently for their marketing and collaborates with influencers as well. At this point, ABH has 12 million followers on Instagram and their total number of Instagram posts is 8.619. The brand was one of the early adopters of Instagram and one of the most successful brands of all make-up cosmetics on that platform. Anastasia shares posts on Instagram approximately every three hours during the day and works with over 600 Instagram influencers. The influencers receive the new products around three weeks before their launch and ABH does not control the influencers posts, rather they choose their photos based on what they like (Brown, 2015). Anastasia does not pay their influencers for posting Instagram images of its products, rather it sends them products and lets them choose how and if they want to share images of them (Wischhover, 2016).

Table 1 below summarizes the characteristics of each leading brand in the industry at this point. The background information about the brands in the study emphasizes the importance for this investigation, since the brands within the industry are advance users in Instagram marketing.
The purpose of this study is to investigate customer engagement on social media brand pages, more specifically on Instagram brand pages. The aim was to deliver new valuable knowledge for the literature of customer engagement and help brands develop a successful social media strategy for their businesses as well. Instagram posts from the five make-up brands mentioned earlier will be analyzed, five brands were chosen to get diversity and to be better able to predict and reflect the industry as a whole. In light of the information above, the author seeks to answer the following question:

*Is there a difference in the level of customer engagement on content created by brands on Instagram versus content that is created by users ("regrammed" content) and used on brand pages?*

To answer the question, the Instagram posts will be measured through an extended and modified framework that was originally designed by de Vries et al. (2012) for Facebook. For this study the framework was modified for Instagram, the model will be explained in further detail in the conceptual framework chapter. The model was used...
as a basis for measuring customer engagement on Instagram. However, other factors that specifically apply to Instagram and the make-up cosmetics industry were added as well. The factors added were based on previous studies and information gathered from practice, from Instagram and the make-up cosmetics industry, otherwise the factors stayed the same.
1.3 Structure of the thesis

This thesis is divided into five chapters. The first chapter consists of an introduction to the material, a brief introduction on social media, a measure of Instagram, and an introduction to the aim and purpose of the study. The research question is displayed as well. The second chapter is a literature review where the previous studies about customer engagement and brand generated content on social media are discussed, as well as studies from the make-up cosmetics industry and electronic word-of-mouth. Lastly a conceptual framework for measuring customer engagement on brand posts is explained, as well as a modified version of that model. Hypotheses are stated as well. Chapter three describes the methodology used in the study, that is, how the data was gathered, categorized and analysed and in chapter four the results are displayed. In the last chapter the material is discussed and conclusions are stated.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Customer Engagement and Brand Generated Content on Social Media

A few definitions have been used to explain the customer engagement term. Doorn et al. (2010) defined customer engagement as a collection of behaviors, such as word-of-mouth, recommendations, reviews, blogging and helping behavior. Hollebeek (2011) also defined customer engagement in her study but in a broader perspective, as “the level of customers cognitive, emotional and behavioral investment in specific brand interactions” (p. 565). Studies have shown that one of the main reasons customers engage with brands is if they are rewarded in one way or another, that is, when customers engage with brands they either gain something from it or they get their needs satisfied (Hellberg, 2015; Hong, 2011; Johanna, Veronica, Emil, & Pihlström, 2012). Laroche, Habibi, Richard, and Sankaranarayanan (2012) found out that customers who engage with social media brand communities were more likely to be loyal customers. Their study was an empirical survey with 441 participants. A recent study conducted by Hellberg (2015) on customer engagement on Instagram, revealed that if a brand post engaged or rewarded the customers personally, they were much more likely to engage with the brand and become loyal customers. Studies have furthermore shown that loyal customers are considered among the most valuable for brands since they are more likely to influence other customers and deliver positive word of mouth about the brand (Kassim & Asiah Abdullah, 2010; Singh, 2006).

2.1.2 Drivers for customer engagement

Muntinga, Moorman, and Smit (2011) investigated the drivers, or motives, for customer engagement on social media, and found that customers engaged with brands to receive informations, for entertainment and for remuneration. However, this study was quantitative and based on self reports from participants, and can therefore be seen as limited. Since self reports are based on people’s memories which can be unreliable. Keller et al. (2012) likewise studied the motivations for engagement on social media pages and they argued that, in order to receive high engagement on brand posts, customers had to be provided with interesting, entertaining and innovative content. They developed a framework on how brands could turn their customers into fans. The goal of their study was to find out what motivated customers to participate in brand
generated content. Their model was based on theories such as the gratification theory, and customer engagement and the involvement theory. In the model they described how “fan page behavior” appeared and might influence brand loyalty. They divided the process into three categories: gratification, participation, and customer-brand relationship. The main limitation of this study was that the results might not apply to all industries, as the role of brand pages might be different for different industries, depending on the culture and norms. Furthermore, there might be differences in norms and culture between social media platforms as well and the study only focused on Facebook (Smith, Fischer, & Yongjian, 2012). Therefore, it might be dubious to apply its findings to social media in. De Vries et al. (2012) also investigated a similar concept in their study, however they were more focused on the engagement part. They designed a framework for measuring engagement (i.e. brand post popularity) and found that there were a few factors associated with customer engagement. According to their study, top positioned posts (content that appeared at the top of the brand page) were related to higher number of likes and comments; highly vivid and interactive posts were positively related to the number of likes; and share of both positive and negative comments on content were related to higher numbers of comments. Furthermore, they found that entertaining and informative posts were not associated with higher customer engagement, as they had predicted, which is inconsistent with the results of Jahn and Kunz (2012) study which showed that entertaining content was associated with higher engagement. De Vries et al. (2012) only looked at six different industries in their study, which is a rather small sample when predicting customer engagement in general, while Jahn and Kunz (2012) looked at 40 different industries. However, the amount of data in the study of de Vries et al. (2012) was considered efficient to predict customer engagement. Their designed framework was intended for Facebook (as the study from Jahn and Kunz (2012) which can also be seen as limiting, since the framework is intended to predict customer engagement of fan pages in general. Their framework is also limited in that it is build up from the literature of banner ads and word-of-mouth. However, their study was the first to investigate customer engagement on brand posts in that manner and hardly any previous studies existed.

A year later Cvijikj and Michahelles (2013) also investigated customer engagement on fan pages, and as in the studies mentioned above, on Facebook. They investigated which factors drove the highest engagement, and found unlike de Vries et al. (2012), that entertaining content was related to higher engagement, compared to
other posts. Furthermore, they found that brand posts that were informative and low vivid (posts that included a photo instead of a video) were also associated with higher engagement. Wallace et al. (2014) likewise studied the motives for customer engagement on Facebook. However, their study focused on exploring the attitudes of customers who like brand posts on Facebook. Their study indicated that one of the reasons customers “like” brand posts on social media is that they want to associate themselves with the characteristics of the brand, for example glamour or style. However, their study was an exploratory study, which can be seen as a limitation since they are sometimes more biased compared to some other methodologies (Aaker, Kumar, & Day, 2008)

2.1.3 Customer Engagement and Brand Generated Content on Instagram

Instagram studies conducted on customer engagement have had various focuses and been aimed at different directions. These studies will be discussed below.

Bakhshi et al. (2014) did a content analysis of one million Instagram posts on user profiles, and found that images that included faces drove more engagement compared to other content. However, this study focused on user profiles, not brand profiles. The same result might not apply to brand profiles. Another study regarding customer engagement was performed by Jang, Han, Shih, and Lee (2015). Their study focused on comparing teens to adults to see if there was a difference in their engagement on Instagram posts. Results indicated that teens were more likely to interact on Instagram through likes and comments, compared to adults, and that teens were also more likely to use Instagram in general, compared to adults.

In a study by Erkan (2015), where engagement levels on brand posts on Instagram were compared to different industries, he found that customer engagement on brand posts was affected by industries. For example, brands in the beverage industry got more likes on their posts than brands in the luxury appeal industry, and brands in the electronic industry got more comments on their posts compared to brands in the apparel industry (customers were less likely to comment under posts in the apparel industry). Few studies have looked at the motives for Instagram use, but Sheldon and Bryant (2016) did a study where they found that the main motives for Instagram use is to feel a sense of coolness and creativity and to gain knowledge about others. The knowledge-gaining factor is in line with some of the previous Facebook studies, for example the study from Muntinga et al. (2011). Phua et al. (2017) also did a similar study as Sheldon
and Bryant (2016), however they studied the motives for using different social media platforms related to brands. They found that the purposes behind their uses were different. Instagram users were, for example, more motivated to engage with brands, more motivated to interact, and more committed to brands, compared to other platforms, such as Facebook or Twitter; and that Instagram users were more motivated to follow fashion brands (such as cosmetics) compared to other platforms.

2.1.4 Customer Engagement Within the Make-up Cosmetics Industry

As previously mentioned, Instagram is widely used within the industry of make-up cosmetics. However little is known about what is important, in order for this industry to succeed on Instagram, since there are, to author’s best knowledge, no studies about it. Since no studies exist, previous studies on social media in general related to the make-up cosmetics industry, will be discussed. These studies might give clues to how the situation is on Instagram, regarding this industry. These studies did however not look at the make-up cosmetics industry in the manner that the present study does.

Shen and Bissel (2013) did a content analysis on Facebook brand posts in the make-up cosmetics industry, among six make-up cosmetics brands. They investigated what kind of content make-up cosmetics brands posted on their Facebook pages and looked at the engagement based on that. Their study did however only focus on what kind of content the brands themselves post. The results showed that brands tended to share posts that allowed the customers to engage with the brand (such as asking questions), as well as promotional posts well. A year later Hu et al. (2014) did a content analysis on Instagram in their study, however their study did not focus on investigating brands but investigating Instagram posts among regular users. They found that posts could be categorized into eight different categories. One of the categories was fashion related content, which included make-up. Other categories found in the study were ”selfies”, “food”, “friends”, “gadget”, “caption photo”, “pet”, and “activity”. This study supports that, among other content, users/customers are motivated to look at make-up related content on Instagram. Therefore, natural extension would be to dig deeper into each category.
2.2 Summary of Engagement Chapter

As shown in this chapter, most studies regarding customer engagement on social media have focused on Facebook. But still there are a few studies that have investigated Instagram in regard to customer engagement on social media. The reason for there being so few studies about Instagram might be that Instagram is a rather new platform, compared for example to Facebook. Instagram was launched in 2010 (Instagram, 2016), but Facebook was launched in 2004 (“Facebook,” 2016). Therefore, the literature on Facebook might perhaps be more coherent compared to the literature on Instagram. Today thousands of different social media platforms exist, all varying from one another to some extent. Therefore researchers have to bear in mind that because of different content, different platforms might yield different results. Smith, Fischer and Yongjian (2012) investigated if content posted by brands would differ across platforms. Their study focused on Facebook, YouTube and Twitter. The results indicate that some social media platforms should be measured differently, whereas other can be measured similarly. Content on Facebook and YouTube is for example similar to some extent because both platforms are categorized as self-promoting platforms. As Instagram like Facebook and YouTube, is also considered a self-promoting platform, the author concluded that the conceptual model from de Vries et al. (2012) for Facebook could be used to measure customer engagement on Instagram. De Vries et al. (2012) themselves stated that their conceptual framework for measuring customer engagement on a Facebook brand content could be used for measuring other social media platforms as well. Although most studies on customer engagement, regarding brand related content, focus on Facebook, they do provide valuable information for the literature, while at the same time point out a gap in the literature of customer engagement on social media, showing that there is a need for further investigations. Author appreciates that the literature is at an early stage, that in order to talk about customer engagement on social media, more platforms are needed, meaning that more platforms need to be investigated regarding customer engagement on brand posts. The present study seeks to add to the literature by investigating customer engagement on Instagram.
2.3 Word-Of-Mouth (WOM) on Social Media

Since social media made its debut the term “word-of-mouth” has been extended to now include the WOM activity that takes place electronically, called electronic word-of-mouth or e-WOM (Mangold & Faulds, 2009). Since the make-up cosmetics industry has been moving from traditional platforms to social media platforms such as Instagram, the importance of WOM has grown, increasing the pressure on organizations to do well, both in general and on social media. Customers are now in a better position to share all kinds of e-WOM about organizations with a large group of people, leaving organizations with greater interests to protect since they are now more vulnerable to the public (Heinonen, 2011). Mangold and Faulds (2009) showed that customers trust information from social media (or e-WOM) about products, brands and services better than traditional information (WOM), like from television, radio or newspaper advertisements. In a response to the increased importance of e-WOM, make-up brands, as well as other brands, have increasingly been collaborating with social media influencers in order to manage positive WOM about their brand (Gensler et al., 2013). A social media influencer is a person that influences other users/customers on social media and affects their attitude and beliefs towards brands and products (Freberg, Graham, McGaughey, & Freberg, 2011). The collaboration that takes place between the brand and influencer is often in the manner that the influencer is given products and/or wages for sharing photos of themselves wearing the product or recommending the product (Goswami et al., 2013). This activity is beneficial for both parties. Another technique that brands often use for managing their e-WOM is to reinforce their followers that share brand related photos by reposting/gramming their photos on their social media brand page. The popularity of social media influencer marketing has even changed the way brands choose models for their campaigns. Before the presence of social media brands generally chose a “regular” model or used celebrities for their campaigns, but nowadays they increasingly choose to use social media influencers as models, because of the added benefits. Influencer marketing agencies have even started to open up (Saul, 2016). The advantage of choosing a social media influencer is obvious because influencers help the brands deliver the “message” in a more efficient and trustworthy way compared to the traditional method. Social media influencers most often have large numbers of followers and high engagement rate on their social media. An example of Instagram influencers profiles and how brands collaborate with them can be seen in Appendix C.
2.4 Regramming

As mentioned, regramming refers to “reposting on Instagram”. The condition for using regram is that the original creator to the posts is mentioned (using the mentioning feature “@”, followed by the user name). This feature creates a link to the original creator’s Instagram profile (see Appendix B for example of mentioning). If a brand regrams photos from its users without mentioning the user, it is classified as theft of content. Users generally feel motivated to post make-up brand related content (and mention the brand in the text), because they want a chance to be featured on the brand’s Instagram page, since it can create opportunities for them. Brands are also motivated to regram content from their users/influencers in order to manage their e-WOM and market their brand (Bergström & Bäckman, 2013). Hashtags are often used along with regrams as well (Simms, n.d.).

2.5 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework, previously mentioned, was used as a basis for this study. De Vries et al. (2012) designed the framework for measuring brand post popularity (customer engagement) on Facebook brand posts. The model included possible factors for brand post popularity, measured via likes and comments. The model was based on the literature from the banner, ads and WOM. The factors that they developed for the model were “vividness”, “interactivity”, “informational content” and “entertaining content”, “position of brand post” and “valence of comments”. They investigated 11 brands from six different industries.

The author chose this model, believing it would suit Instagram as well since, as mentioned earlier, Facebook and Instagram are both considered self-promoting platforms and have similar features, although Facebook has a broader use than Instagram. Instagram posts only photos/videos, while they are only two of the Facebook’s many features. Facebook and Instagram also have similar engagement features, that is likes and comments, but Facebook additionally has a “share” feature. The choice of framework was furthermore based on the recommendation from de Vries et al. (2012), that their study should be extended and used for other social media platforms as well. Being in agreement, the author decided to use this model for measuring customer engagement on Instagram. The vividness and interactivity factors
were measured on levels from low to high wears, low vividness referred to posts that included a photo, and high vividness referred to posts that included a video. Low interactivity referred to posts that only included text, and high interactivity referred to posts that included either a question or a quiz.

The content factors were either informational or entertaining. Informational content/posts included information about the brand/products/service, and entertaining content included jokes. The position of the brand posts referred to if the position of the post would matter for engagement and the latest factor was “valence of comments”, which referred to the types of comments posted (positive, negative, neutral).
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**Figure 1.** Conceptual framework on brand post popularity on Facebook brand pages, by de Vries et al., (2012). *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 26, p. 84

De Vries et al. (2012) also used three control variables for measuring the effects of the factors on customer engagement. The control variables were “day of the week”, “messages length of brand post”, and “product category”.

2.6 Modified Framework for Instagram & Hypothesis

For this study the model from de Vries et al., (2012) was adjusted to fit Instagram and the make-up cosmetics industry. The original model was not used because some of the factors in the model did not match with Instagram or the make-up cosmetics industry. Therefore, the model was adjusted so it would fit Instagram and the industry. The goal is to find what matters for Instagram’s customer engagement. The adjusted model can be seen in Figure 2 below. The factors in the model are possible drivers for customer engagement on social media brand posts, based on the literature of customer engagement on Instagram brand posts and information from the practice. Hypotheses, explanations and arguments for each factor can be seen below.

![Modified framework on brand post popularity on Instagram pages](image)

*Figure 2. Modified framework on brand post popularity on Instagram pages*

**Hypotheses**

**Vividness**

Vividness refers to the degree of media richness of content and is typically divided into sensory breadth and depth, where sensory breadth refers to the stimulation of different senses and depth refers to the quality of content. Therefore, vividness is
often measured on levels, based on the quality of the content and the stimulation of different senses, where low vividness would, for example, only be stimulation of sight (photo) and high vividness would be stimulation of both sight and hearing (video) (Steuer, 1992). As mentioned, de Vries et al., (2012) analyzed Facebook brand posts from 11 brands in six different industries. They found that highly vivid brand posts were related to higher customer engagement, more specifically higher numbers of likes.

As mentioned earlier in the text, Hellberg (2015) did a qualitative study on customer engagement regarding Instagram posts, which looked at various factors related to customer engagement on brand posts including factors similar to vividness, and found that video posts were related higher to customer engagement. Based on results from previous studies, author believes that highly vivid brand posts are related to higher engagement and therefore states the following hypothesis:

**H1: High vivid posts have higher impact on customer engagement than neutral posts**

**Text**

This factor was developed based on previous studies about interactivity on brand posts on social media platforms. Studies about interactivity on Facebook brand posts have shown that posts that include informational text or a question are more likely to drive engagement compared to posts that include neutral text (Al-Mu’ani, Saydam, & Calicioglu, 2014; de Vries et al., 2012; Shen & Bissell, 2013). According to Simms (n.d.) a practical guide for using Instagram for driving engagement, it is also recommended to use informative or question-based text on Instagram in order to be effective Since there are no academic studies on this in regard to Instagram, the author chose to use “text” instead of “interactivity”, as she believes it applies better to Instagram since Instagram does not have all of the same interactive features as Facebook does, such as links to a website, a voting feature or a quiz feature. Therefore, the variable was named “text”. Based on information above, author states the following hypothesis:

**H2: Question based text has a higher impact on customer engagement compared to neutral text.**
Content

In the model from de Vries et al. (2012) entertaining content and informational content were considered possible drivers for customer engagement, based on the literature. Informational content is often used within the make-up cosmetics industry in the form of text under the photos/videos posted; therefore, it was used as one of the categories but under the text variable in this model. Entertaining content is rarely used in the make-up cosmetics industry; therefore, that variable was excluded for this study. The main content used within the make-up cosmetics industry is either photos or videos of products, faces, face close-ups (such as lips), or face and product at the same time (see Appendix D). Author decided to name the variable “content”. Studies regarding Instagram have further showed that face content and brand related content is popular on Instagram. Bakhshi et al. (2014) investigated the engagement on Instagram content of one million Instagram images and found that images with faces received higher engagement on posts. Results indicated that photos with faces, received about 38% more likes and about 32% more comments compared with other photos. Based on the information above, author states the following hypothesis:

**H3: Instagram posts that include faces have higher impact on customer engagement compared to posts without faces**

Creator

This factor was created by author and is based on how content is delivered by professionals in the make-up cosmetics industry. Content on Instagram make-up brand pages is either created by the organization itself or by other users, the latter activity is as previously mentioned, called “regramming” and entails that brands copy content posted by other users and post it on their brand page. Regramming is commonly used in the make-up cosmetics industry (see Appendix C). Therefore author states the following hypothesis:

**H4: Content created by users has more impact on customer engagement than content created by organizations.**
Valence of comments

Comments from customers on social media can be divided into three categories: positive, negative or neutral comments. The motivation for posting comments is generally either to start a conversation with other users, to show support and loyalty to particular brand, or to complain about products or service (Bronner & Hoog, 2010; Bruhn, Schoenmueller, & Schäfer, 2012). Author states the two following hypotheses:

\( H5a: \) Positive comments on posts are related to higher level of customer engagement

\( H5b: \) Negative comments on posts are related to lower level of customer engagement

This study seeks to investigate the make-up category further by looking at engagement among make-up brands in the industry. Although no academic studies on make-up cosmetics on Instagram exist (to author best knowledge), it is, as mentioned, widely used by professionals in the industry (“Instagram for Business,” 2016). The major make-up brands have around 9.2 million followers on average and according to the marketing directors of major make-up brands, Instagram is extremely effective for this industry (Haven, 2007). Author concludes that a gap exists within the literature in the industry. The present study is the first study to look at customer engagement within the industry in this manners, there are for example no previous studies that have looked at the “regramming” factor, or compared the effects of content created by the brand with content created by users. There is a need for further investigation regarding this industry and Instagram. The industry is growing fast and Instagram is among the fastest growing platforms on social media and is constantly developing.
3. Methodology

3.1 Data

The data in the study consisted of Instagram posts from five make-up cosmetics organizations within the make-up cosmetics industry, 750 posts were analysed (150 posts per brand), between January 1st 2016 and October 14th 2016. Two dependent variables were used to predict customer engagement on Instagram: “number of likes” and “number of comment”. The five independent variables in the study were “content”, “vividness”, “text”, “creator”, and “valence of comments”. The independent variables were categorized into three categories: Content categorization, Feature categorization and Valence of comments categorization. Each category will be described below.

3.2 Content categorization

Content on Instagram make-up brands was divided into four categories: “face”, “product”, “close-up face”, and “face and products”. Those categories were developed from the literature of customer engagement and from the practice of the make-up cosmetics industry.

The first category was “face”, this category included images/videos of faces. Bakhshi et al. (2014) showed in their study (as mentioned previously) that users show higher engagement towards face posts compared to other posts.

The next category was “products”, it included images/videos of products from the organizations. Phua et al. (2017) showed that social media users are more motivated to engage with brand material such as products on Instagram compared to other social media platforms such as Facebook and Snapchat. This category was used as a baseline in the regression analysis.

The third category, “close-up face”, was similar to the face category, but included images of close-up face parts such as eye or lips. This category is widely used by professionals in the industry (see Appendix D).

The last category was “face and products” and included images/videos of both faces and products at the same time. It is also often used by professionals in the industry (see Appendix D).
Instagram profiles from the brands in the study can be seen in Appendix D. The profiles show the content/images of the brands posts. In Table 2 below, Instagram content categorization is displayed.

Table 2

*Instagram content categorization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>Instagram posts that include pictures/videos of face/s</td>
<td>Selfie of a model wearing make-up from particular brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Instagram posts that include pictures/videos of particular product/s</td>
<td>Picture of new launched products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-up face</td>
<td>Instagram posts that include close-up images of particular face parts</td>
<td>Close-up picture of lips/lipstick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face and products</td>
<td>Instagram posts that include both face and product in the post</td>
<td>Selfie of a model holding a lipstick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Feature categorization

Instagram features were divided into the three following categories: “vividness”, “text”, and “creator”. These categories were created based on the literature of customer engagement and from the practice of the make-up cosmetics industry.

Vividness was measured on two levels, neutral or high. Instagram only allows its users to post photos or video (not posts with just text or links), therefore neutral vividness was categorized as a photo, since photos only stimulate sight, while high vividness was categorized as a video, since videos stimulates both hearing and sight.
The next category, “text”, was similar to the original variable in the de Vries et al. (2012) model. In their study, this variable was called “interactivity”. Author believed that the name “text” would suit better for this study, because Instagram has fewer interactive features than Facebook. Instagram only allows users to post photos or videos and add text under. The text was divided into “neutral text”, “informational text”, “question based text” and “question and informational text”, after the kind of text posted. Neutral text was used as a baseline for the regression analysis.

The last category was “creator”. The creator variable was divided into “content created by organization” and “content created by users”. This variable has not been investigated before, whether on brands pages in general or in the make-up cosmetics industry, although professionals in the industry frequently use both content created by themselves and by users on their Instagram brand page.

The Instagram feature categorization is displayed in Table 3 below.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Text unrelated to the brand</td>
<td>Informational text about products/service</td>
<td>Question-based text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Content created by organization</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Content created by users</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Valence of comments categorization

This category was the same as from the de Vries et al. (2012) model. The valence of comments category was divided into the three following categories: “negative comments”, “neutral comments”, and “positive comments”, dependent on the nature of the comments on the posts. Negative comments were negative statements
related to the organization, neutral comments were neutral statements, and positive comment were positive statements. The 10 most recent comments on each post were analysed. That was done to save time, since the mean number of comments on each post was 610 (SD= 879). Table 4 below shows the definitions of the comments and examples.

Table 4

*Instagram Comments Categorization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments types</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments</td>
<td>Negative comments related to the brand or brand content. Negative text or negative emojis.</td>
<td>Complain about shipping of products, comments about that the brand does animal testing or sad/angry emoji symbols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral comments</td>
<td>Neutral comments related or unrelated to the brand or the brand content. Neutral text or neutral emojis.</td>
<td>Tagging other friends in comments, comments like “That’s what I meant” or neutral emoji symbols such as rose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td>Positive comments related to the brand or the brand content. Positive text or emojis.</td>
<td>Compliments about the brand or the content such as “I need this”, or emoji symbols such as hearts or smile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Inter-coder reliability test

In order to check for inter reliability of categories, Cohen's kappa test was performed as well as Cronbach’s alpha test. This was performed in order to determine whether there was an agreement between the two assessors of categories that required subjective evaluation. The kappa measure of agreement value is .863, with a significance of p < .000. (this test was for the category “text”). Cronbach’s alpha test was used to measure the category “valence of comments” (positive, negative & neutral comments). The results were: for positive comments, Cronbach’s alpha = .99, for negative comments, Cronbach’s alpha= 1.0, and for neutral comments, Cronbach’s alpha=.99. The results from the tests indicates that there was good match between the assessors (Field, 2013). The instructions that both assessors used can be seen Tables 3 and 4 above.
3.6 Procedure

The dependent variables in the study for customer engagement were likes and comments. Likes are expressed as \( y_1 \) and comments are expressed as \( y_2 \). The model can be express as:

\[
y_{ij} = \alpha + \sum_{r=1}^{3} \beta_r \text{content}_{rj} + \beta_v \text{vividness}_{vj} + \sum_{t=1}^{3} \beta_t \text{text}_{tj} + \beta_c \text{creator}_{cj} + \beta_h \text{posi_comments}_{pj} + \beta_e \text{nega_comments}_{ej} + \sum_{w=1}^{6} \beta_w \text{dayofweek}_{wj} + \beta_v \text{number_posts}_{vj} + \beta_k \text{followers}_{kj} + \epsilon_{ij}
\]

Table 5 below explains the variables in the model. The dependent variables are count variables and also the control variables, “number of posts”, and “followers”. The third control variable in the study, day of week, was a dummy variable. The independent variables were all dummy except for the variable valence of comments, which was proportion.
Table 5

*Model Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$y_{ij}$</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Refers to the number of likes or comments per brand post $j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vividness$_j$</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>Refers to whether the brand post $j$ is vivid or not (baseline is neutral vividness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text$_{ij}$</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>Refers to whether the text characteristic $t$ exists or not in a brand post $j$ (baseline is neutral text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creator$_j$</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>Refers to whether brand post $j$ is created by user or not (baseline is organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content$_{ij}$</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>Refers to whether the content characteristics $f$ exists or not in brand post (base category is product)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valence of comments $\text{posi}_j$</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>Refers to whether brand post $j$ is positive or not (baseline is neutral comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence of comments $\text{nega}_j$</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>Refers to whether brand post $j$ is negative or not (baseline is neutral comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of posts$_j$</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Refers to the number of posts of each brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers$_j$</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Refers to the number of followers of each brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of week$<em>{w</em>{ij}}$</td>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>Refers to whether brand post $j$ is present on other days than Mondays (baseline is monday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_{ij}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Normally distributed error terms for dependent variable $y_{ij}$ or $y_{2ij}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Results

4.1 Descriptive statistics

The frequency and percentage of customer engagement by Instagram content type is displayed in Table 6. The images/videos posted on the pages were either of products or faces. Around 40.1% of the posts were products images and around 21.2% were face images. Images that included both face and products accounted for 24% and close-up face images accounted for 14.7%.

Table 6
*Frequency and Percentage of Customer Engagement Features Divided by Instagram content*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instagram posts</th>
<th>Relative frequency</th>
<th>Relative percent</th>
<th>Customer engagement features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Likes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>21,727,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>9,494,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-up face</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>8,272,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face &amp; product</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>9,494,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean and standard deviation of the customer engagement by Instagram content type can be seen in Table 7 below. The average number of likes for product images/videos was 72.185 (SD=30.963) and the average number of comments was 805 (SD=1156), product content scored highest in the comments variable. The average number of likes for face images was 59.715 (SD=26.712) and the average number of comments was 365 (SD=521). Likes on close-up face content scored highest on customer engagement on average, but lowest on comments. Face & products images combined scored lowest on average for likes, 52,746 (SD=23.408), but second highest for comments, the average number of comments was 669 (SD=726).
Table 7

Mean and Standard Deviation of Customer Engagement Features Divided by Instagram content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>72.185</td>
<td>30.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>59.715</td>
<td>26.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-up face</td>
<td>75.206</td>
<td>31.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face &amp; products</td>
<td>52.746</td>
<td>23.408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 below shows the frequency and percentage of customer engagement by Instagram feature type. As can be seen, most of the posts, or about 64.5%, were neutral in vividness, and 33.5% of posts were highly vivid. Likes on neutral vivid posts accounted for 72.1% and likes on highly vivid posts accounted for 27.9%. The comments on neutral and high vivid posts were rather similar, comments on neutral vivid posts accounted for 54.5% and comments for highly vivid post accounted for 45.5%.

The text under content was either neutral, informational or contained a question. Most of the post texts, or 63.2%, included information, and least of the posts, or only 5.7%, included a question. Customer engagement on informational post scored highest, on both likes and comments.

Likes on informational posts were 63.1% and comments on informational posts were 61.9%. The lowest engagement was on post that included both a question and information in the same post. Likes on “question and informational” posts were 5.2% and comments were also 5.2%.

Regarding the creator of content posted on the Instagram brand pages, content that was created by the organization accounted for 40.1% and content created by users (regrammed content) accounted for 59.9%. Regrammed content scored higher than content created by organization. Likes on regrammed content were 65.4% of the total and comments on regrammed content were 55% of the total.
Table 8

*Frequency and Percentage of Customer Engagement Features by Instagram Feature*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vividness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>(Picture)</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>32,323,795</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>(Video)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>13,665,597</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>12,520,468</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>474</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>30,913,296</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2,988,847</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question &amp;</td>
<td>info.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2,566,781</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>created by</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>16,930,653</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>205,840</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>created by</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>32,058,739</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>251,916</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 below, shows mean and standard deviation of customer engagement by Instagram feature type. The average number of likes on neutral vivid posts (photos) was 72.983 (SD=29.764) and the average number of comments on neutral vivid posts was 516 (SD=775). The average number on likes under highly vivid posts (videos) was 51.374 (SD=24.370) and the average number of comments on highly vivid posts was 266 (SD=1022).

Regarding the type of text posted under content, results indicated that different types of text under content resulted in rather similar numbers of likes and little differences in comments. Likes on neutral texts were 66.598 (SD=29.052) on average, on informational texts 65.218 (SD=30.361), on question based text 69.508 (SD=26.219) and on “question & informational” posts 57.040 (SD=29.611) on average. The highest number of comments on average was on question based posts, or 900 on average.
(SD=1561) and the lowest number of comments on average was on “question and information” text combined, or 526 on average (SD=634).

Regarding the creator of the content, the content created by the brands received lower likes on average compared to content created by users, or regrammed content. The average number of likes on content created by organizations was 56.249 (SD=26.187). However, the average number of comments on content created by users was higher compared to the average number of comments under the content created by organizations. The average number of comments on brand owned content was 684 (SD=1.117) and the average number of comments on regrammed content was 561 (SD=671).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td>Neutral (Picture)</td>
<td>72.983</td>
<td>29.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High (Video)</td>
<td>51.374</td>
<td>24.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>66.598</td>
<td>29.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>65.218</td>
<td>30.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>69.508</td>
<td>26.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question &amp; Info</td>
<td>57.040</td>
<td>29.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Created by organization</td>
<td>56.249</td>
<td>26.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Created by user</td>
<td>71.400</td>
<td>30.558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 below displays the frequency and percentage of customer engagement divided by the nature of the comment. As can be seen, customers seldom posted negative comments on posts, 72.9% of the posts had no negative comments and only 0.3% of the posts had all negative comments.
Table 10

*Frequency and Percentage of Customer Engagement Divided by Nature of Instagram Post Comments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of comments</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Pct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 displays the frequency, mean, and standard deviation by the nature of Instagram comments. As can be seen, most of the comments posted were neutral comments and least of the comments were negative.

Table 11

*Frequency, Mean and Standard Deviation for Number of Comments Divided by Nature of Comment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of comments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
<td>10.772%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>69.89%</td>
<td>21.844%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>24.59%</td>
<td>19.610%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Customers commented and liked posts from Anastasia Beverly Hills the most. The average number for likes was (M= 79885, SD= 34754) and the average number for comments was (M= 900, SD= 731).

4.2 Regression

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to assess the ability of the independent variables in the study on customer engagement (likes and comments), after controlling for number of followers, day of the week and total number of posts. The model for both likes and comments was significant as a whole.

The results for multiple regression for numbers of likes on Instagram posts, showed that the variance of the model was 36.8%, $F(18,731) = 25.19$, $p < .001$, and the result for multiple regression for number of comments on Instagram posts, showed that the variance of the model was 12%, $F(18,731) = 6.69$ $p < .001$. Table 12 presents the results regarding factors related to customer engagement, consisting of likes and comments.
### Table 12

**Estimation Results for Customer Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Likes $\beta$</th>
<th>Comments $\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>(baseline)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>- .325***</td>
<td>- .257***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-up face</td>
<td>- .132***</td>
<td>- .193***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face &amp; Product</td>
<td>- .217***</td>
<td>- .224***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td>(baseline)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>- .391***</td>
<td>.160***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>(baseline)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.097***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question &amp; Info</td>
<td>- .010</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>(baseline)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>.255***</td>
<td>- .825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence of comments</td>
<td>(baseline)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of positive comments</td>
<td>- .20</td>
<td>- .080**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of negative comments</td>
<td>- .050</td>
<td>- .034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day of Week</td>
<td>(baseline)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>- .037</td>
<td>- .088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>- .028</td>
<td>- .049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>- .068</td>
<td>- .078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>- .029</td>
<td>- .004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>- .036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>- .138**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of posts</td>
<td></td>
<td>.236***</td>
<td>.227***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followers</td>
<td>.178***</td>
<td>- .084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-values<0.05*, p-values<0.01** and p-values<0.001***

High vivid posts were negatively related to the number of likes but positively related to the number of comments, thus hypothesis 1 (H1) was partly supported. Likes: $\beta_{video} = -.391, p < .001$, comments: $\beta_{video} = .160, p < .001$.

Question based text posts were not significantly related to customer engagement but were positively related to number of comments, thus hypothesis 2 (H2) was also partly supported. Likes: not significant, comments: $\beta_{question} = .097, p < .001$. 
Instagram posts that include face were negatively related to customer engagement, thus hypothesis 3 (H3) is not supported. Likes: $\beta_{\text{face}} = -0.325$, $p < .001$, comments: $\beta_{\text{face}} = -0.217$, $p < .001$

Content created by users was positively related to more likes, but was not related to more comments, thus hypothesis 4 (H4) was partly supported. Likes: $\beta_{\text{creator}} = 0.255$, $p < .001$, comments: not significant.

Positive comments under posts are not related to more likes, however positive comments are related to fewer comments under posts, thus hypothesis 5 (H5a) is partly supported. Likes: not significant, comments: $\beta_{\text{positive}} = -19.2546$, $p < .005$.

Negative comments under posts are not related to lower level of customer engagement, thus hypothesis 5 (H5) is not supported. Likes: Not significant, comments: not significant.

Table 13 below gives an overview of the hypotheses outcome from the study. As can be seen, hypotheses were either supported, not supported or partly supported. The variables “vividness”, “text” and “creator” were partly supported.
Table 13

*Hypotheses Compared with Regression Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Total Customer engagement</th>
<th>Number of likes</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vividness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Partly supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question based</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Partly supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created by users</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Partly supported</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence of comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Discussion and Conclusion

The main goal of the study was to investigate which factors influence customer engagement on Instagram brand pages, in the make-up cosmetics industry when controlled for followers, total number of posts and day of the week. The results showed that few factors are related to customer engagement on Instagram in the industry.

Results showed that product based content was related to the highest customer engagement compared to other categories. That is consistent with the study from Phua et al. (2017) which stated that customers were more motivated to watch brand related content, such as products, on Instagram, compared to other social media platforms. This is also consistent with the Mac product emphasis on Instagram (Duffy, 2016). It would be interesting to look at the difference in engagement on brand new products compared to older products. If companies in the industry are good at creating a buzz about their products, it might explain why customers engage with images/videos of products rather than other images/videos.

Customers were less likely to engage with content such as face content (and close-up face content, and face and product content). That is inconsistent with the study from Bakhshi et al. (2014) that showed that users were much more likely to engage with photos of faces compared to other photos. However, their study was performed on regular user profiles, not brand profiles.

Face content received fewest likes and “face and product” content received fewest comments. Face content drove lowest customer engagement in total. The study from Marwick (2015) showed that face content drove higher engagement compared to other content, however, that study was conducted on user pages, not on brand pages. It might be that customers prefer to watch face images/videos of their friends while they expect to see product images from the brands they follow.

Highly vivid brand posts were related to fewer numbers of likes, but more comments, which means that customers are more motivated to like photos and less motivated to like videos, and that they are more motivated to comment on videos and less motivated to comment on photos.

The results are partly supported by previous studies which showed that a high level of vividness was related to more comments (however, a high level of vividness was also related to less likes). Hellberg (2015) found that high vivid brand posts were positively related to higher engagement, however, those results applied to engagement on both comments and likes, that is high vivid posts were both related to more likes and
comments, whereas in this study high vivid posts were only related to more comments on posts. De Vries et al., (2012) found that high vivid posts were associated with a higher number of likes, which is inconsistent with this study. The study from Cvijikj and Michahelles (2013) found that high vivid posts were related to less engagement, which partly supports the result from this study about high vivid posts being related to lower numbers of likes.

The results are therefore partly supported by the hypothesis (H1), which stated that highly vivid posts were related to higher engagement.

This result indicates that customers on Instagram are more motivated to like images rather than video. This might be because Instagram is more focused on images than videos as the app originally only allowed images with the video feature being added later. This indicates that diversity exists between the platforms. However, those results might also be limited to the make-up cosmetics industry, that is, that customers in the industry are more motivated to watch make-up related images than videos.

Regarding the text variable in the study, results showed that question-based texts were related to higher numbers of comments compared to other texts, which is consistent with previous studies (de Vries et al., 2012). Customers are more motivated to comment, rather than like, on posts containing questions possibly because they feel more motivated to answer questions than no-question texts. Other types of text categories were not significant, meaning that types of text did not affect customer engagement, except for when it was question based. The results are consistent with hypothesis stated (H2), which was that question based text had higher impact on customer engagement, compared to other types of text.

Content that was created by users rather than the brand itself, received more likes compared with content that was created by the organization. That indicates that brands should keep working with influencers and users, because the regramming technique seems to be effective in regards to likes, however the effect on comments was not significant. The results are therefore partly supported by the hypothesis (H3), which was that content created by users would have more impact on customer engagement, compared to other content. To the author’s knowledge there are no other studies that have investigated this activity. This is interesting, because the results are an important contribution to the literature of customer engagement. Although this activity is widely used by brands on Instagram brands pages, it has not been investigated academically.
until now. The regram culture is dominant on Instagram and especially in the make-up cosmetics industry.

Share of positive comments under brand post was related to fewer comments on posts. That is inconsistent with the study from de Vries et al. (2012) since their study found that the share of positive comments was related to higher numbers of comments on posts. The difference could be explained by the differences in culture and norm between Facebook and Instagram, and perhaps by customers in the make-up cosmetics industry being more motivated to like than comment on photos. The results are not consistent with hypothesis (H5a) that positive comments on post are related to higher engagement level compared to other comments. Share of negative comments was not significant in the study.

When frequency for different brands was examined, results showed that customers commented and liked most on average on posts from Anastasia Beverly Hills. This is interesting since Mac has more followers than Anastasia Beverly Hills, but less engagement. The results are in line with a recent study that states that marketers should not only focus on frequency and reach, but rather focus on customer engagement, or how many likes/comments/shares posts receive (Peters, Chen, Kaplan, Ogniben, & Pauwels, 2013).

Comments on posts were significantly lower on Sundays than other days, while most of the likes were on Saturdays, although not significant, it might give an insight or ideas for the most popular day for likes.

5.1 Conclusion

This study gives valuable information on how Instagram can be measured for the make-up cosmetics industry. Measuring the effect of social media marketing is important for knowing the customers and to set organizational goals (Chaffey & Chadwick, 2012). The research contributes to the social media and Instagram literature in the make-up cosmetics industry. This study provides valuable information about customer engagement on Instagram and for professionals in the make-up cosmetics industry, since customer engagement on Instagram has not been studied efficiently. The study also points out a gap in the literature since there were no studies that had looked at customer engagement in this manner within the literature of customer engagement on Instagram, as well as no studies that looked at the regramming activity which many professionals in the make-up cosmetics industry use, as well as in other industries.
To summarize, this study recommends that brands have the following tips in mind when posting on Instagram:

- Product based content encourages more customer engagement
- Images receive more likes than videos.
- Videos receive more comments than images.
- Question based texts receive more comments than other text
- Regramming accounts for more likes

Previous studies have mentioned that if a social media content/feature is rewarding for customers in one way or another, they are more likely to like or comment on the post (Hellberg, 2015; Hong, 2011; Johanna et al., 2012). The result of the present study might therefore indicate that these factors/features are among those that are rewarding for customers in the make-up cosmetics industry.

5.2 Limitations and Recommendations

This study has several limitations. First limitation lies in the categorization of the comments in the study. There were a few comments in other languages than English. Author categorized those comments as neutral. However, these comments were only few.

The second limitation of the study is the possibility of other factors than listed in the study that could affect the customer engagement level on brand posts. For example, the trends that are popular at the moment (for instance matte lipsticks are popular at the moment, therefore photos of matte lipsticks might receive higher engagement than other posts) or the popularity of the influencer/user that created content for the brand. It would be interesting for future studies to analyze brand posts, based on trends or on the popularity of the user/influencer that brand uses content from. Studies could analyze user/influencer pages and the brands could choose their influencer based on that.
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Appendix A – Instagram Sharing Page and The Social Media Platforms That can be Shared at the Same Time

- Write a caption...
- Tag People
- Add Location
- Facebook
- Twitter
- Tumblr
- Flickr
Appendix B – Instagram Mentioning Feature

too faced

54.3k likes

too faced This soft, flawless look is giving us LIFE. @juliapauls used Born This Foundation in Warm Nude and Born This Way Concealer in Light Medium to get look #bornthisway #regram

view all 80 comments

blessed_wardrobe_x Flawless 💖
eye_candy_etc 😍
carinazzle Perfection

missfoxy_c Hi girls! I love make up if you like too, follow me! Ciao ragazze! Se ti piace il make up seguitemi 😘

makeupby_madz hey i'm a 16 y/o aspiring makeup artist ❤️ check out my account for tons of makeup 😘

corinaslierramaa ✨✨✨Self-Taught MI would love is you checked out and followed my makeup account! ✨✨✨

makeupbymexxxo 17 yr old makeup
Appendix C – Instagram Regramming Technique

62.6k likes 2w

_@sama_ Rainy day makeup 🌧️ Using @urbandecaycosmetics Naked Ultimate Basics palette, Solstice shadow and Distortion glitter liner, @tartecosmetics Tartest liner in Aubergine, @maccosmetics lipstick in Yeah_

view all 420 comments

kellyboone93 Loving the solstice!!

urbandecaycosmetics 💫 mackenziekie Where's this hoodie from?!

cicatrizliquidgold Love girls in hoods... For some unknown reason lol

carmenmora_ @cristalazzz

jordanbaileys @ellelarelimbrick

melly.blaze @katsystylefair 😎

lissandrealovesart @bonnieborseli

@elsabettabeboni uniquelybeautiful_bymegane That shadow

Add a comment...

79k likes 18h

urbandecaycosmetics @sama_ 's look using Moondust Eyeshadow in Solstice is everything. 😍 #UrbanDecay

view all 414 comments

olgallemo @pinkbebesfede il tuo ombretto 😍

jedevcarr @saint_hell would look so good on you!! Love it

sarsleom @gerflizz only a few weeks away 🎉

sofie_greeneeyes @stephyyay_89 I loove this!!

carolinebet Beyond gorgeous 😍😍😘😘

stephshey25 @nursesface28 This would be an awesome concert eye 😎

candyschollz I need this shadow!! @gabi_h

edeladama.mua @maybe_a_makeupartist 😍

@mymayrobinson @kirarebeccafox try OIL

Add a comment...
Appendix D – Instagram Profiles From the Brands in the Study

Mac Instagram example

Urban Decay Instagram example

Too Faced Instagram example

A. B. H. Instagram example

Nyx cosmetics Instagram example
Appendix E - Meet and Greet Instagram Posts From Brands

nyx cosmetics Sunshine State, here we come! Join us this weekend (Nov 18-20) for the grand opening of our newest NYX Professional Makeup store at the Miami International Mall in Florida! On Saturday, Nov 19 at 2PM, come meet Youtube star @nicoleguerriero Follow the link in our bio and click THIS PHOTO for more details! #nyxcosmetics #nyxprofessionalmakeup

View all 120 comments

chichio90: Awwe wish I could come but I'm in Pensacola FL UGH!!! 🙁
mar_jorlex: Unicornesh go to the NYX Professional Makeup FB events page. You'll find info there 😊
imanxmi: @byyrahemdi unicornesh @mar_jorlex aw thank you so much!
imanxmi: @byyrahemdi

Heart Add a comment... ・・・

nyx cosmetics What happens in Vegas! 🎉
We're teaming up with @ultabeauty to help celebrate the GRAND OPENING of their new store in Town Square Las Vegas! Address: 5689 Las Vegas Blvd South, Las Vegas, NV 89119-3301 🕉️Come by tomorrow (11/4) to check it out and meet beauty babe @iluvssarahh from 12-2PM! 😘NYXcosmetics #Ultabeauty

View all 73 comments
glembyndeede: I want to go 😍
loveyglam: OMGOMGOMG
cairconicodes: please 😥 I wish I could 🌹
kelseylouise808: beautybygissell I wish one day I get to her level!!! Can’t wait
ruthinwonderland: BITCH ITS IN VEGAS @bereniceaford11
ruthinwonderland: DAMN IT I FORGOT WHERE

Heart Add a comment... ・・・
Appendix F – Influencer Collaboration

THE POWER OF MAKEUP BY NIKKIE TUTORIALS
LIMITED EDITION

YAAAAAAS! We’ve teamed up with global beauty megastar NikkieTutorials to create this limited edition collection to celebrate the transformative power of makeup. Nikkie is the ultimate Too Faced girl who is makeup OBSESSED and believes in its ability to inspire confidence and change the world just like us! Her exclusive collection features everything you need to create endless looks, including 9 all new eye shadows and a deluxe Better Than Sex Mascara in a can’t-get-anywhere-else PURPLE shade.

“When life gives you lemons, punch it in the face and ask for GLITTER.” - Nikkie

97.2k likes

nikkietutorials Can’t believe it is actually happening, and that I’m FINALLY able to tell you I’ll be collaborating with @tooaced for an exclusive kit Fall 2016.

WHO’S EXCITED? @gabrielalondras @nikkie4toofaced

view all 3,002 comments

maadolton @druhan

druhan @maadolton nikkieeeeeeeeeee

courteystrella @chloesblake31

yaaaaaassssssss

mommie0312 Also available for

Add a comment...
Appendix G – Instagram Uploading Feature on Brands Websites

We love to share. Get inspired by the NYXCommunity with some of the latest looks using our products.

SHOW US HOW YOU OWN IT

#TOOFACED