

1  
2  
3 **‘Just Be There’: Social Media Presence, Interactivity, and Responsiveness, and their**  
4  
5 **Impact on B2B Relationships**  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Abstract**

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 **Purpose** – In B2B settings, research on social media sites (SMS) has primarily examined the  
16 benefits and challenges relating to their use as well as factors driving their adoption. Recently,  
17 attention has turned to the consequences of using SMS in B2B markets. This paper extends this  
18 line of research by investigating the impact of B2B brands’ social media presence, interactivity,  
19 and responsiveness on customers’ perceptions of four indicators of brand relationship strength  
20 (commitment, intimacy, satisfaction, partner quality).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 **Design/methodology/approach** – Data from an online survey (N=200) with customers of UK-  
32 based B2B firms were analysed using structural equation modelling.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Findings** – The study reveals that a supplier’s presence on Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook  
39 has a positive impact on all four brand relationship strength indicators; interactivity enhances  
40 perceived partner quality, while responsiveness positively influences commitment. Differences  
41 across the three SMS are also observed.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 **Research limitations** – The research was conducted on a sample of UK-based firms with  
50 varied degrees of SMS use that may influence the impact on B2B brand relationship strength.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 **Practical implications** – This study indicates that B2B brands ought to focus primarily on  
57 presence on SMS, given its positive impact on brand relationship strength. At the same time,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 however, B2B brands should be active in responding to customers' queries on SMS as well as  
4  
5 interacting with them to enhance commitment and perceived partner quality, respectively.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Originality/value** – This study contributes to the digital marketing and B2B relationships  
11 interface, and is the first to examine the role of B2B brands' presence, interactivity, and  
12  
13 responsiveness on SMS in enhancing relationships with customers.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 **Keywords** – B2B; social media; supplier-customer relationships; commitment; intimacy;  
20  
21 satisfaction; partner quality  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 **Paper type** – Research paper  
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

## Introduction

Social media sites (SMS) provide brands with unique opportunities to foster relationships with customers (Thorbjørnsen et al., 2002, Andzulis et al., 2012, Foltean et al., 2018). This is because SMS, building on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0 (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010), facilitate both synchronous and asynchronous two-way communication between customers and brands. Specifically, brands use SMS to establish their presence online and actively engage with their followers by uploading content or responding to customers' comments and queries (Osei-Frimpong and McLean, 2018). This SMS presence and active brand-customer exchanges in turn replicate face-to-face interactions in an online environment (Ou et al., 2014) supporting the supplier-customer relationship (Andzulis et al., 2012, Foltean et al., 2018).

The value of SMS has been extensively researched in the business-to-consumer (B2C) setting (Dwivedi et al., 2018, Ramadan et al., 2018, Confos and Davis, 2016), where SMS have reshaped the ways in which brands communicate with their customers (Christodoulides, 2009). Yet, given that a substantial proportion of economic activity is consisted of business-to-business (B2B) transactions, recent research has highlighted that future growth in the use of such technologies will come from B2B markets (Wang and Kim, 2017). Empirical research examining the role of SMS use in B2B contexts is at an early stage, having primarily focused on benefits and challenges B2B brands face while using SMS (Michaelidou et al., 2011), and on the assessment of factors driving SMS adoption (Siamagka et al., 2015, Lacka and Chong, 2016, Foltean et al., 2018). However, given that these tools are changing the nature of B2B relationships (Obal and Lancioni, 2013, Song et al., 2007, Golgeci and Gligor, 2017), exploring how the use of SMS leads to stronger supplier-customer relationships emerges as a pressing matter. It is only recently that research examining the consequences of SMS use by B2B brands has emerged, acknowledging that SMS are valuable tools supporting supplier-customer

1  
2  
3 relationships (Quinton and Wilson, 2016, Agnihotri et al., 2016, Foltean et al., 2018), especially  
4 for small-medium enterprises (SMEs), which find SMS to be cost-efficient communication  
5 tools (Broekemier et al., 2015, Henninger et al., 2017). It is somewhat surprising, therefore,  
6 that B2B SMEs do not seem to actively adopt and use SMS or fully embrace their relationship  
7 building and relationship development potential (Michaelidou et al., 2011, Foltean et al., 2018,  
8 Broekemier et al., 2015). Indeed, existing studies reveal that only more innovative B2B SMEs  
9 promote their business to new customers by using SMS to increase awareness and grow  
10 customer interest, with SMS simultaneously being a means for developing brand reputation  
11 (Broekemier et al., 2015). We also lack understanding of how B2B SMEs react to the ways in  
12 which their suppliers post updates, interact with them, and respond to them on SMS. It is  
13 therefore vital to examine the perceptions of representatives from those firms about the impact  
14 of their suppliers' SMS use on key aspects of their relationships with them.

15 Drawing from brand-customer relationships literature, this paper examines the impact of SMS  
16 use by B2B brands on key indicators of brand relationship strength. Specifically, this study  
17 aims to assess the role of SMS presence, interactivity, and responsiveness on customers'  
18 perceptions of four key indicators of B2B brand relationship strength: commitment, intimacy,  
19 satisfaction, and partner quality. The study specifically focuses on the customer's perspective,  
20 as previous research has noted that supplier-customer relationships may be perceived  
21 differently depending on the perspective from which they are examined (Ulaga and Eggert,  
22 2005); hence, customers' perceptions might not be in line with the supplier's assessment  
23 (Caceres and Paparoidamis, 2007). As previous research has mainly studied brand relationships  
24 from the supplier's perspective (Dwivedi et al., 2018), we have limited knowledge of the  
25 customer's perspective as to whether SMS have positive effects on brand relationships in a  
26 B2B context (Keinänen and Kuivalainen, 2015, Guesalaga, 2016). And yet, this is a vitally  
27 important perspective to take, as both B2C and B2B brands grow only when customers develop  
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

1  
2  
3 stronger affiliations with them. Indeed, research in B2B settings has shown that when  
4 customers perceive their relationship with their supplier to be strong and of value, they maintain  
5 loyalty towards the supplier and become less likely to be affected by potential supplier-brand  
6 transgressions or service failures (Caceres and Paparoidamis, 2007).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **In sum**, this paper contributes to the emerging stream of scholarly work at the intersection of  
12 B2B branding, supplier-customer relationships, and social media research in multiple ways.  
13  
14 First, the study contributes to B2B branding literature by providing insight on the ways in  
15 which B2B brands should aim to behave in an increasingly important touchpoint where their  
16 customers, existing and prospective, experience, and engage with their brand. Second, this  
17 research sheds light on the consequences of interactions on online channels (SMS) on key  
18 aspects of B2B supplier-customer relationships, namely commitment, intimacy, satisfaction,  
19 and partner quality. To date, academic research has acknowledged that SMS use presents  
20 significant potential for the development and maintenance of B2B supplier-customer  
21 relationships, yet limited research providing empirical evidence exists in the area (Quinton and  
22 Wilson, 2016, Salo, 2017). This study reveals, for the first time, customers' perceptions of their  
23 B2B suppliers' social media activities and how these influence customers' commitment,  
24 intimacy, satisfaction, and perceived partner quality. Third, the current research contributes to  
25 social media literature by exploring separate dimensions of suppliers' SMS use in B2B settings,  
26 that is, presence, interactivity, and responsiveness as well as via unveiling how their influence  
27 on the four key brand relationship strength indicators differs across different platforms, namely,  
28 Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. Finally, this study, conducted on a sample of B2B SMEs in  
29 a developed economy setting, sheds more light on how these types of organizations use social  
30 media to build relationships and engage with their suppliers and business partners.  
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 This paper is structured as follows. First, literature on the importance of SMS for supplier-  
57 customer relationships in B2B markets, as well as literature on indicators of relationship  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 strength is reviewed. Next, the research hypotheses and model are discussed, prior to  
4 explaining the empirical research design in the methodology section. Research findings are  
5 then presented in the subsequent section, which is followed by a general discussion. The paper  
6 concludes by outlining theoretical and practical implications deriving from this research and  
7 discussing limitations and avenues for future research.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

## 19 **Theoretical Background**

### 20 *The role of SMS in supplier-customer relationships within B2B markets*

21  
22 Given the nature of B2B transactions (i.e. complex decision-making process, large value,  
23 customization needs, etc.), building and sustaining relationships in B2B markets is crucial to  
24 both suppliers and customers. On the one hand, *suppliers* tend to “allocate considerable  
25 investments to maintaining and expanding the scale and scope of the relationships with their  
26 customers” [de Ruyter et al. (2019), p. 94]. This is because they benefit from securing a loyal  
27 customer base (Rauyruen and Miller, 2007, Čater and Čater, 2010) which is less sensitive to  
28 competition (Bendixen et al., 2004) or to potential incidents of transgressions due to product  
29 or service failure (Caceres and Paparoidamis, 2007). Such relationships are thus company  
30 assets (Songailiene et al., 2011) playing an important role in the firm’s success and profitability  
31 (Rauyruen and Miller, 2007, Čater and Čater, 2010). On the other hand, *customers* also desire  
32 a steady, continuous relationship with a supplier that understands their unique needs (Rauyruen  
33 and Miller, 2007) and delivers high-quality products and services (Webster and Keller, 2004).  
34  
35 Supplier-customer relationships refer to *all* reciprocal interactions between the supplier and the  
36 customer, which, however, in B2B markets are very complex (Palmatier et al., 2006,  
37 Hutchinson et al., 2011), including multiple touchpoints and layers (Rauyruen and Miller,  
38 2007). Indeed, the customer experiences the supplier’s brand and interacts with brand-focused  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 messages across multiple touchpoints and communication tools, traditionally including  
4 salespersons, call-centres, promotional material, trade shows, etc. However, in contemporary  
5 marketplaces where digitalisation is revolutionising business (Hofacker et al., 2016, Kannan  
6 and Li, 2017), supplier-customer relationships extend not only offline but also increasingly  
7 online (Thorbjørnsen et al., 2002). This means that customers can now interact with a supplier's  
8 brand via a variety of online tools, which can mimic two-way supplier-customer  
9 communication (Thorbjørnsen et al., 2002, Ou et al., 2014, Foltean et al., 2018).

10  
11 Of particular interest are social media sites (SMS), which facilitate reciprocal communication  
12 between suppliers and customers and which provide multiple benefits to B2B firms that adopt  
13 and actively use them (Michaelidou et al., 2011, Lacka and Chong, 2016, Cortez and Johnston,  
14 2017, Foltean et al., 2018). SMS have been argued to create significant opportunities for  
15 building and developing business relationships (Quinton and Wilson, 2016, Järvinen et al.,  
16 2012). In practice, there are multiple ways B2B firms can use SMS for relationship building  
17 and relationship development purposes, as they can extend brand awareness and generate new  
18 leads, communicate person-to-person with existing customers and offer customer support,  
19 convey content that is relevant to their customers and will thus enable further trust and  
20 confidence about the brand's expertise, and so on (Cawsey and Rowley, 2016). The role of  
21 SMS as communication tools with relationship development and relationship building  
22 properties becomes even more significant for SMEs in B2B contexts. This is because SMEs  
23 are enterprises in the process of continuous transformation and committed to further growth  
24 that can be secured via the effective development of close networks and long-lasting  
25 relationships (Durkin et al., 2013). **As these organizations tend to be resource-deficient, using  
26 cost-effective SMS tools to extend their networks and communicate with existing and  
27 prospective business partners may be vital for business success** (Bocconcelli et al., 2017). This  
28 communication can in turn lead to the development of relationships characterised by mutual  
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

1  
2  
3 commitment and longevity (Durkin et al., 2013), as well as increased opportunities for content  
4 and knowledge information-sharing and identification of new collaboration opportunities  
5 between them and their business partners or suppliers, hence further strengthening relationships  
6 (Wang et al., 2016a).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Therefore, understanding how suppliers' social media efforts contribute to supplier-customer  
12 relationships is crucial (Thorbjørnsen et al., 2002, Smith and Gallicano, 2015, Leek et al., 2016,  
13 Salo, 2017, Foltean et al., 2018), and several calls for further research on this area have been  
14 made (Obal and Lancioni, 2013, Quinton and Wilson, 2016, Cawsey and Rowley, 2016). As it  
15 remains unclear how supplier brand presence on SMS leads to stronger relationships with its  
16 customers, this study seeks to examine how B2B brands' social media efforts influence  
17 customers' perceptions of relationship strength. The next section provides an overview of key  
18 indicators of strong supplier-customer relationships.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 *Indicators of supplier-customer relationship strength*

34  
35 The overall strength of supplier-customer relationships has been captured in B2B research via  
36 the concept of relationship quality (Weaven et al., 2017, Caceres and Paparoidamis, 2007, De  
37 Wulf et al., 2001). Relationship quality is well integrated in B2B literature (Walter et al., 2001,  
38 Ulaga and Eggert, 2005, Čater and Čater, 2010), yet, while there is in general agreement that  
39 it is a multi-dimensional construct, consensus on the exact indicators has not been reached  
40 (Čater and Čater, 2010, Caceres and Paparoidamis, 2007, Hutchinson et al., 2011). In contrast,  
41 research on *brand relationship strength* in B2C settings is much more developed following the  
42 seminal paper by Fournier (1998), who proposed that consumer-brand relationship strength,  
43 otherwise known as Brand Relationship Quality (BRQ hereafter), consists of affective/socio-  
44 emotive (Love/Passion; Self-connection), cognitive (Intimacy; Partner Quality), and  
45 behavioural (Interdependence; Commitment) ties. Drawing from Fournier's qualitative work,  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Thorbjørnsen et al. (2002) developed a BRQ measurement scale for B2C settings which  
4 included love/passion, intimacy, self-connection, and partner quality, while Aaker et al. (2004)  
5 identified four indicators: commitment, intimacy, satisfaction, and self-connection.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 In deciding which indicators should be selected, a careful evaluation of the context in which  
11 brand relationship strength is being examined must take place. Indeed, certain indicators of  
12 brand relationship strength identified in B2C research appear also relevant in B2B contexts.  
13  
14 For instance, Intimacy and Partner Quality are cognitive ties, which are in alignment with the  
15 highly involved nature of B2B interactions (Swani et al., 2014, Brown et al., 2016), and are  
16 thus appropriate for this context. Specifically, *Intimacy* encapsulates the extent to which the  
17 customer has knowledge and perception of brand-related messages (Fournier, 1998), in essence  
18 capturing the deep understanding between two partners that typically emerges via information-  
19 sharing (Aaker et al., 2004). *Partner Quality* signifies the customer's overall appraisal of the  
20 extent to which the brand is reliable and predictable in fulfilling its role, follows the rules of  
21 the relationship, delivers what is expected, and is accountable for its actions (Fournier, 1998).  
22 Furthermore, a strong relationship is also characterised by the customer's overall satisfaction  
23 with, and happiness in, the relationship with the supplier in the present (*Satisfaction*), as well  
24 as their willingness to continue investing in, and maintaining, the relationship in the future, a  
25 notion captured by the construct of *Commitment* (Fournier, 1998, Aaker et al., 2004).  
26 Satisfaction (Crosby et al., 1990) and Commitment (Dorsch et al., 1998) are two indicators of  
27 relationship strength appearing more commonly in B2B research (Hutchinson et al., 2011);  
28 hence, it is logical that these should be included in any empirical examination of relationship  
29 strength. Overall, therefore, this research proposes to examine B2B relationships using the  
30 aforementioned four indicators, namely, Intimacy, Partner Quality, Satisfaction, and  
31 Commitment, as they appear to be more relevant indicators of brand relationship strength in  
32 B2B markets. As it remains unclear how B2B brands' social media efforts influence customers'  
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

1  
2  
3 perceptions of brand relationship strength, the next section develops hypotheses proposing a  
4  
5 positive contribution of suppliers' social media use to customers' perceptions of the four  
6  
7 indicators of brand relationship strength.  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 13 14 **Conceptual Framework & Hypotheses Development**

15  
16 The overarching aim of this research is to examine the role of SMS use on the four key  
17  
18 indicators of brand relationship strength identified above as more relevant for B2B settings:  
19  
20 *Commitment* (the customer's intentions to behave in a manner supportive of B2B relationship  
21  
22 longevity); *Intimacy* (the extent to which the customer has knowledge and deep understanding  
23  
24 of the B2B brand); *Satisfaction* (the customer's overall evaluation about the relationship with  
25  
26 the B2B brand); and *Partner Quality* (the customer's expectations that the B2B brand will be  
27  
28 reliable and predictable in fulfilling its role, will follow the rules of the relationship, will deliver  
29  
30 what is expected, and that it will be held accountable for its actions) (Fournier, 1998, Aaker et  
31  
32 al., 2004). According to previous research, customer relationships with a supplier's brand can  
33  
34 be facilitated by effective use of online communication tools that enable two-way interaction  
35  
36 (Thorbjørnsen et al., 2002, Andersen, 2005, Ou et al., 2014). Building on the ideological and  
37  
38 technological foundations of Web 2.0 (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010), SMS allow for reciprocal  
39  
40 communication and thus are often referred to as "*the technological component of [...] relationship building*" [Andzulis et al. (2012), p. 308]. Recognising the value of SMS, B2B  
41  
42 firms increasingly adopt and use those communication tools to support brand relationship  
43  
44 strategies (Rapp et al., 2013, Itani et al., 2017, Andersson and Wikström, 2017, Murphy and  
45  
46 Sashi, 2018, Nunan et al., 2018, Guha et al., 2018, Hsiao et al., 2019). Yet, the impact of SMS  
47  
48 use on B2B brand relationship strength indicators has not been examined thus far.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Online communication tools enable brands to extend their physical presence to virtual presence  
4  
5 (Lowry et al., 2006). Physical presence is defined as the perception of intimacy or being close,  
6  
7 while virtual presence refers to the perception of being present despite physical separation (Ou  
8  
9 et al., 2014, Chong et al., 2018). Specifically, SMS presence is defined as ‘presentness’, ‘state  
10  
11 of being’ and ‘being available’ on SMS (Smith and Gallicano, 2015). Research notes that  
12  
13 presence is a natural outcome of the communication process, and a consequence of SMS use  
14  
15 (Ou et al., 2014). This is because by setting up SMS brand pages, brands become present on  
16  
17 these sites, and they manifest this presence by posts and updates with which customers can  
18  
19 engage (Osei-Frimpong and McLean, 2018).  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Despite a popular belief that, due to the nature of B2B transactions, suppliers have to be  
25  
26 physically present to develop and maintain relationships with customers (Swani and Brown,  
27  
28 2011), recent research provides evidence that B2B brands’ physical presence can be effectively  
29  
30 replicated by SMS presence (Quinton and Wilson, 2016, Itani et al., 2017, Ogilvie et al., 2018).  
31  
32 This is because by maintaining SMS presence, B2B brands can transfer information to target  
33  
34 customer groups (Järvinen and Taiminen, 2016, Itani et al., 2017), for example to a group of  
35  
36 SMEs (Hsiao et al., 2019). They can also reach customers that might have been unserved due  
37  
38 to physical or geographical constraints (Ogilvie et al., 2018), and as a result develop supplier-  
39  
40 customer relationships more effectively than in a traditional environment (Quinton and Wilson,  
41  
42 2016, Itani et al., 2017).  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 According to the above-mentioned research, and in line with Social Presence Theory, SMS  
48  
49 presence enhances business relationships (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010, Ou et al., 2014, Chong  
50  
51 et al., 2018, Pavlou, 2003). The impact of SMS presence on indicators of brand relationship  
52  
53 strength in B2B settings, however, has not been examined thus far. Notwithstanding, it has  
54  
55 been noted that, despite physical separation, online brand presence can contribute to a  
56  
57 perception of intimacy and being close (Ou et al., 2014). Similarly to physical presence,  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 therefore, SM presence contributes to the development of customers' better understanding of  
4 supplier brands (Andzulis et al., 2012) which reveals overall commitment towards relationships  
5 and leads to relationship enhancement (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). Finally, presence has been  
6 found to enhance customers' perception of need satisfaction (Ou et al., 2014, Kietzmann et al.,  
7 2011), which has positive impact on overall satisfaction with a supplier's brand and, closely  
8 related to satisfaction, partner quality (Agnihotri et al., 2017). Based on the above discussion,  
9 therefore, it is reasonable to assume that SMS presence has a positive impact on brand  
10 relationship strength indicators. Thus, it is hypothesised that:

21 *H1: Social Media Presence has a positive impact on B2B Brand Relationship Strength*

22 *Indicators: (a) Commitment, (b) Intimacy, (c) Satisfaction and (d) Partner Quality*

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 The way brands use SMS is changing; it is moving from solely manifesting SMS presence, to  
29 brands actively interacting with their followers (Weber, 2009, Keinänen and Kuivalainen,  
30 2015). It is not a surprise, therefore, that interactivity has been recognised as an essential  
31 activity of SMS use in a business setting (Swani et al., 2014, Wang et al., 2016b), and that it  
32 has become a core feature of social media marketing (Naylor et al., 2012). Thorbjørnsen et al.  
33 (2002) defines interactivity as dialogue between individuals through online communication  
34 channels, which encompasses perceptions of immediacy and intimacy. Accordingly, SMS  
35 interactivity refers to synchronized supplier-customer exchanges online (Ou et al., 2014,  
36 Quinton and Wilson, 2016). It aims to enhance interactions among SMS users (Foltean et al.,  
37 2018, Felix et al., 2017, Greenberg, 2010), mimic real-life face-to-face supplier-customer  
38 communication (Leek et al., 2016), and facilitate business relationships (Gefen and Straub,  
39 2004, Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010, Quinton and Wilson, 2016, Agnihotri et al., 2012).

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
According to Swani and Brown (2011), B2B face-to-face interaction cannot be replicated  
online. The most recent research, however, challenges this notion (Itani et al., 2017, Andersson

1  
2  
3 and Wikström, 2017, Murphy and Sashi, 2018), showing that B2B businesses adopt social  
4 media to develop and strengthen B2B relationships by engaging customers in interactive  
5 discussions online. Those online exchanges between supplier and customer are now recognised  
6 to be a key component of B2B marketing and branding practices (Itani et al., 2017, Centeno  
7 and Hart, 2012), and one of the reasons why SMEs use social media (Centeno and Hart, 2012,  
8 Odoom, 2017). Despite its importance however, the opportunities deriving from SMS  
9 interactivity to B2B brand relationship are yet to be discovered.

10  
11 The main role of SMS interactivity is to develop the perception of intimacy between customers  
12 and suppliers, which enhances mutual understanding between both parties (Thorbjørnsen et al.,  
13 2002, Ou et al., 2014). Thus, interactivity is often linked to the concept of reciprocity, which  
14 refers to relationship for mutual benefit of parties involved (Quinton and Wilson, 2016).  
15 Supplier-customer reciprocal actions contribute to relationships, and particularly perception of  
16 partner quality, because their aim is to satisfy interests of both parties (Ou et al., 2014).  
17 Accordingly, interactivity, enables brands to meet customers' expectations (Agnihotri et al.,  
18 2016), and plays a key role in demonstrating understanding and satisfying of customers' needs  
19 (Dennis et al., 2008, Ou et al., 2014). Naturally, therefore, supplier-customer active  
20 participation on SMS has been found to have positive influence on satisfaction (Casaló et al.,  
21 2008, Agnihotri et al., 2009, Hajli, 2014) and overall relationship performance (Trainor et al.,  
22 2014, Foltean et al., 2018). Finally, research has showed that interactivity can contribute to  
23 commitment to the brand relationship as it helps build long-lasting, high-quality relationships  
24 with customers (Teo et al., 2003, Ou et al., 2014). This is in line with Quinton and Wilson  
25 (2016) who, following Palmatier (2008), clarified that SMS can drive relationship quality, and  
26 especially commitment towards the relationship. Building on previous research therefore, it is  
27 hypothesised that:

1  
2  
3 *H2: Social Media Interactivity has a positive impact on B2B Brand Relationship Strength*  
4  
5 *Indicators: (a) Commitment, (b) Intimacy, (c) Satisfaction and (d) Partner Quality*  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Social media is a communication-rich environment, and thus building brand relationships via  
11 social media is more complicated than simply encouraging more interactions (Fournier and  
12 Avery, 2011, Hudson et al., 2016). This is because, empowered by SMS technological  
13 capabilities, customers become active in initiating communication with the brand (Quinton,  
14 2013, Hajli, 2014, Agnihotri et al., 2016, Wang and Kim, 2017, Foltean et al., 2018). This  
15 active involvement of customers requires brands to respond to comments and solve problems  
16 online (Zaheer and Zaheer, 1997, Ou et al., 2014, Hudson et al., 2016, Leek et al., 2016). In  
17 the literature, such activities by suppliers are referred to as responsiveness – the ability to  
18 respond proactively to information within the SMS environment (Yang et al., 2016). Hudson  
19 et al. (2016) note that, by responding to social media comments and solving customers'  
20 problems, brands are able to enhance supplier-customer relationships.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 SMS responsiveness is particularly important for SMEs, which find it easier to use online  
36 communication tools to ask supplier questions, report problem and express their needs. The  
37 importance of proactive involvement of SMEs in online communication is confirmed by  
38 Centeno and Hart (2012) and has been most recently acknowledged in B2B settings (Itani et  
39 al., 2017), where suppliers' ability to respond to customers' queries and solve problems has  
40 been recognised as an important component in relationship building (Ogilvie et al., 2018).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Brands' responsiveness has been found to contribute to customers' perception of partner  
50 quality, which includes relationship failure avoidance and brands' ability to solve problems  
51 (Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002, Aaker et al., 2004, Ahearne et al., 2007, Schivinski and Dabrowski,  
52 2015, Schivinski and Dabrowski, 2016). Furthermore, resolving problems and reacting to  
53 emerging needs enables greater customer satisfaction (Agnihotri et al., 2016, Foltean et al.,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2018); it also indicates B2B brands' reliability, supportiveness, and commitment to serve long-term customer interests (Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002, Ou et al., 2014, Dick and Basu, 1994). Finally, responsiveness has been found to enhance perceptions of intimacy; this is because abilities of conflict resolution are important qualities of intimate relationships (Stern, 1997). Based on the above discussion, it is hypothesised that:

*H3: Social Media Responsiveness has a positive impact on B2B Brand Relationship Strength*

*Indicators: (a) Commitment, (b) Intimacy, (c) Satisfaction and (d) Partner Quality*

(INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE)

## **Methodology**

To test the hypotheses outlined in Figure 1, an online survey was conducted using the FAME database. The FAME database provides a comprehensive set of data and contact details to subscribed members of registered businesses in the UK and Ireland (see: [www.bvdinfo.com](http://www.bvdinfo.com)). The questionnaire was divided into three parts. Firstly, screening questions were included to ensure that respondents: (1) use social media, (2) work for a firm that buys goods/services from other firms, and (3) follow suppliers on social media. Secondly, to test the research hypotheses, items were adopted from Aaker et al. (2004) to measure brand relationship commitment, intimacy, and satisfaction, while items were adopted from Thorbjørnsen et al. (2002) to measure partner quality. Additionally, the study adopted items from Ou et al. (2014) to measure customers' perceptions of the suppliers' social media presence and interactivity, while items from Agnihotri et al. (2016) were used to measure customers' perceptions of the suppliers' social media responsiveness. All items were modified to fit the study's context, and were measured on a 7-point Likert scale (Table 1 provides a full list of the items used in the study). The third part included some demographic questions.



(INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE)

The survey was administered to UK-based small/medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) with up to 250 employees, as these represent approx. 99.9% of all UK businesses (Rhodes, 2018). Since supplier-customer relationships are key in B2B markets, particularly for SMEs (Copp and Ivy, 2001, Broekemier et al., 2015), it was deemed appropriate to examine the perceptions of representatives from those firms about the impact of their supplier's SMS use on the four brand relationship strength indicators.

In total, 200 usable responses were collected (please see Table 2 for sample characteristics). The respondents (52% males, 47% females, with most (30%) being 51+ years old) confirmed that they use SMS for professional reasons, while the most popular SMS respondents used for business (not personal) purposes were Twitter (71.5%), LinkedIn (67.5%), and Facebook (38.5%). Respondents worked in sectors ranging from professional services to logistics and agriculture, with 56% of respondents stating their company had over 25 years of work experience in their particular sector and 48.5% of respondents had more than 5 years of work experience in their firm. Almost 8 in 10 identified themselves as decision makers. The sample included Directors/General Managers (33.5%), Marketing Directors/Managers (28%), Sales Directors/Managers (6.5%), Social Media Directors (9.5%), and other positions (22.5%).

(INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE)

## **Results**

### *Preliminary Analysis*



1  
2  
3 Before the hypothesised model (Figure 1) was specified and estimated using structural equation  
4 modelling (SEM), a series of steps were followed. Firstly, as shown in Table 1, scale reliability  
5 was assessed through calculating Cronbach's alpha coefficient. All scales were above the  
6 critical value of .7 (Pallant, 2013), hence can be considered as reliable measures of their  
7 corresponding variables. Additionally, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to  
8 establish if the four indicators of brand relationship strength do indeed overlap, which could  
9 result in misleading findings. The results indicate that using the principal component analysis  
10 and varimax rotation (Pallant, 2013), the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling  
11 adequacy was 0.900, exceeding the cut-off value of 0.6 with a  $p$ -value  $< .0001$  for Bartlett's  
12 Test of Sphericity (Kaiser, 1970). All items loaded well on constructs they were intended to  
13 measure, averaging above .7 and there was no evidence of cross loading. Thus, the four  
14 constructs are individual indicators of brand relationship strength.

15  
16  
17 Moreover, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using AMOS Graphics  
18 utilising the maximum likelihood estimation to assess the internal consistency of the scale  
19 items. The CFA (also referred to as the measurement model) is often considered the first step  
20 of structural equation modelling before specifying and estimating the structural model. The  
21 results of the CFA indicated no evidence of cross loading. The fit statistics outline adequate  
22 *goodness of fit* ( $\chi^2_{(329)} = 549.823$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $\chi^2/df = 1.67$ , RMSEA = .058, RMR = .083, SRMR  
23 = .057, CFI = .937). Additionally, in line with the fit statistics, all loadings were adequate and  
24 significant ( $p < .05$ ).

25  
26  
27 In addition, following Fornell and Larcker (1981), further analysis satisfied discriminant and  
28 convergent validity. The results indicated that: (1) all loadings were significant ( $p < .001$ ), (2)  
29 the composite reliability for each construct exceeded the recommended level of .70, and (3) the  
30 average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct was above the recommended benchmark

of .50. Additionally, the AVE values were greater than the square of their correlations, thus supporting discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2010).

Lastly, common method bias and multicollinearity were checked to ensure the research did not produce misleading results. Harman's single factor test as well as Podsakoff et al. (2003) approach were calculated to assess common method bias. All factors in the model were presented in Harman's single factor test; the variance explained by the single factor was 32.7%, lower than the threshold of 50%. Furthermore, following Podsakoff et al. (2003), a common latent factor was introduced to the model in AMOS Graphics. The latent factor was assigned all the items (indicators) of the principal constructs in the model as an extension of the CFA. The results outlined that the common latent factor explained an average variance of 0.26. Thus, given the results of the common latent factor and Harman's single factor test, common method bias is unlikely in the data. Further, multicollinearity of all the variables in the model were checked using the variance inflation factor (VIF). The results illustrated that the highest value recorded was 2.26, which affirms that multicollinearity was not violated when compared to the cut-off point of 10 (Hair et al., 2010).

### *Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)*

SEM with an analysis of moment structures takes a confirmatory approach to SEM. Due to the good fit of the CFA measurement model and subsequent analyses, the second stage of the SEM process took place by specifying and estimating the hypothesised structural model shown in Figure 1. The fit statistics of the structural model showed reasonable fit ( $\chi^2_{(1)} = 38.040$ ,  $p < .05$ ,  $\chi^2/df = 38.04$ , RMSEA = .431, SRMR = .0821, RMR = .082, CFI = .945, NFI = .945, GFI = .953) and provided supporting evidence for the hypothesised relationships. The RMSEA value in the model shows poor fit, however models with low degrees of freedom can have artificially large values from the RMSEA calculation, therefore, following Kenny et al. (2015), the

1  
2  
3 RMSEA value should be ignored. The standardised path coefficient regression weights and  
4  
5 statistical significance can be seen in Table 3.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 (INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE)  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 The results in Table 3 show some strong regression coefficients and statistically significant  
16 relationships ( $p < .05$ ), thus supporting some of the research hypotheses. The results assert that  
17 social media presence has a significant influence on customers' commitment ( $\beta = .200$ ,  $p <$   
18  $.05$ ), intimacy ( $\beta = .314$ ,  $p < .001$ ), satisfaction ( $\beta = .286$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and perceived partner  
19 quality ( $\beta = .259$ ,  $p < .001$ ), therefore supporting H1a, H1b, H1c and H1d. This suggests that  
20 firms expect to see their suppliers being active within the social media space, posting status  
21 updates and providing valuable content.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Moreover, suppliers' interactivity on SMS influences perceived partner quality ( $\beta = .206$ ,  $p <$   
31  $.05$ ), supporting H2d. However, a supplier's level of interactivity does not influence customer's  
32 commitment, intimacy, or satisfaction (H2a, H2b, H2c not supported). This outlines that while  
33 interaction in SMS may make a customer feel valued, the interaction does not influence their  
34 level of satisfaction, commitment and intimacy in their relationship with their supplier's brand.  
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

59  
60 Furthermore, the results illustrate that social media responsiveness has a significant influence  
on brand relationship commitment ( $\beta = .201$ ,  $p < .05$ ), supporting H3a. However, suppliers'  
responsiveness on SMS does not significantly influence other key indicators of brand  
relationship strength including intimacy, satisfaction, or partner quality (H3b, H3c, and H3d  
not supported). Therefore, in general, customers may not use SMS to seek a quick response or

1  
2  
3 expect a quick response through such a communication channel. Instead, they may turn to other  
4  
5 channels such as the telephone or email for a more immediate response, thus illustrating why  
6  
7 the responsiveness on SMS does not influence other key indicators of brand relationship  
8  
9 strength.  
10

11  
12 While the results in Table 3 provide interesting insights, given the differences in each social  
13  
14 media platform, it is crucial to also control for social network type. As the results indicated that  
15  
16 differences exist between the different types of SMS, a multi-group analysis was conducted.  
17  
18 The subsequent section discusses these results.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 *Multi-group Analysis – Social Media Platform*

25  
26 As previously outlined, the most popular SMS for business (not personal) purposes amongst  
27  
28 respondents were Twitter (71.5%), LinkedIn (67.5%), and Facebook (38.5%). Given the  
29  
30 differences in the purpose of each of these platforms (i.e. Twitter being a micro-blog network,  
31  
32 LinkedIn a professional network, and Facebook a ‘social focused’ network), following the  
33  
34 Karikari et al. (2017) method, multi-group analyses in AMOS Graphics were conducted to  
35  
36 assess the model across each individual platform. Such analysis provides insight into any  
37  
38 differences across SMS.  
39  
40

41  
42 However, before such analysis can take place, it is important to determine equivalence across  
43  
44 each group (Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook), thus measurement invariance was conducted.  
45  
46 The purpose of this test is to ensure that the same construct is being measured across the  
47  
48 specified groups. Measurement invariance was calculated by assigning constraints to each  
49  
50 group; following this, the difference in the CFI value between the constrained model and the  
51  
52 configural model was calculated. A CFI difference value of  $< .01$  was presented, thus  
53  
54 equivalence between groups can be assumed [see: Cheung and Rensvold (2002)]. Then, a chi  
55  
56 square difference test was conducted between the constrained model and the unconstrained  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 model. The results revealed a significant difference between the models ( $\chi^2_{(24)} = .41, p = < .05$ ).  
4  
5 However, this only informs that there is a difference between each model. Thus, individual  
6  
7 path analysis is required to assess if differences exist between each path within each social  
8  
9 media platform.  
10

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 (INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE)  
16  
17  
18

19 The path analysis shown in Table 4 outlines significant differences in the hypothesised  
20  
21 relationships across the three SMS (Twitter, LinkedIn, and Facebook). Social media presence  
22  
23 plays an important role across all three SMS for intimacy, satisfaction and partner quality;  
24  
25 however, the results outline that – while insignificant in relation to Twitter and Facebook –  
26  
27 social media presence has a significant influence on brand relationship commitment on the  
28  
29 LinkedIn platform. This result may be explained by the purpose of the LinkedIn social network,  
30  
31 where presence on such a platform offers businesses a *connection*, therefore possibly building  
32  
33 a closer bond than the one-way relationship often found on Twitter and Facebook. Additionally,  
34  
35 given that LinkedIn is a B2B-focused professional platform, the expectation of a supplier  
36  
37 having presence on LinkedIn may offer a sense of security and transparency to the customer,  
38  
39 who in turn shows more commitment in the relationship.  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Moreover, in a similar vein, the results posit that social media interactivity has a significant  
45  
46 influence on partner quality on the LinkedIn platform, while no such relationship is found on  
47  
48 either Twitter or Facebook. Thus, the results pertain that the ability to communicate or seek  
49  
50 information from a supplier when needed within a professional domain (i.e. a professional  
51  
52 network) enhances customers' perceptions about the B2B partner quality. Given that Twitter  
53  
54 and Facebook are less professional-focused SMS in comparison to LinkedIn, this may explain  
55  
56 the insignificant results in such platforms.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Furthermore, the results assert that while social media responsiveness does not influence any  
4 of the indicators of brand relationship strength on the LinkedIn platform or the Facebook  
5 platform, a significant influence is found between social media responsiveness on brand  
6 relationship commitment and satisfaction within the Twitter platform. Many firms adopt  
7 Twitter as a customer service channel and a way in which firms (or customers) can seek  
8 responsive customer support. Thus, given the expectation that customer service support can be  
9 gained from the Twitter platform, it is fitting that social media responsiveness influences brand  
10 relationship satisfaction. Additionally, based on the works of Parasuraman et al. (2005),  
11 providing a responsive customer service has been noted as a key dimension of service quality  
12 within the online environment (McLean and Osei-Frimpong, 2017). Thus, given customer  
13 service is often provided in the Twitter platform, the results indicate that responding to such  
14 interactions on Twitter increases customers' commitment towards the supplier brand.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Discussion & Implications**

36  
37 Digital technologies have profound impact on businesses (Cortez and Johnston, 2017, Foltean  
38 et al., 2018). SMS, in particular, present many benefits and opportunities for businesses  
39 operating both in B2C and B2B markets. Research examining SMS use and its impact on B2C  
40 firms is extensive, yet, surprisingly, limited empirical academic research has been conducted  
41 within B2B settings (Lacka and Chong, 2016, Agnihotri et al., 2016, Chong et al., 2018, Foltean  
42 et al., 2018). This study contributes to this emerging research stream by providing insights into  
43 the impact of SMS use on B2B supplier-customer relationship. Specifically, through  
44 quantitative research with UK-based SMEs being customers of B2B firms, this study reveals  
45 the impact of B2B firms' SMS presence, interactivity and responsiveness on key indicators of  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 relationship strength between a supplier's brand and a customer, namely intimacy,  
4  
5 commitment, satisfaction, and partner quality.  
6

7  
8 This research indicates that SMS presence plays a key role in B2B supplier-customer  
9  
10 relationships. The findings reveal that SMS presence has significant influence on commitment,  
11  
12 intimacy, satisfaction and partner quality. This is in line with previous research, which notes  
13  
14 that SMS presence has a positive impact on business relationships (Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010,  
15  
16 Ou et al., 2014, Chong et al., 2018), particularly in B2B settings (Quinton and Wilson, 2016,  
17  
18 Itani et al., 2017, Ogilvie et al., 2018). B2B brands should aim to establish and maintain their  
19  
20 presence on Twitter, LinkedIn and Facebook that, as this study reveals, are the three sites used  
21  
22 by customers to follow B2B suppliers' brands. This multi-platform presence will drive  
23  
24 customer experience (Pozza, 2014, Iankova et al., 2018) and will contribute to relationship  
25  
26 building. This is further confirmed by Hudson et al. (2016), who revealed that presence has a  
27  
28 positive impact on marketing practices, and here, in particular, on customer relationship  
29  
30 management (CRM) activities. It is thus noted that B2B brands should pay particular attention  
31  
32 to their presence on LinkedIn, which, as revealed by this study, increases their customers'  
33  
34 commitment to their relationship with the supplier's brand. LinkedIn presence, manifested  
35  
36 through posts and updates, therefore, leads customers to perceive the supplier's brand as being  
37  
38 close and available, which enhances customers' commitment to maintain the business  
39  
40 relationship.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Although the findings indicate that SMS presence is important for brand relationship building,  
47  
48 SMS interactivity and responsiveness are also important. This study revealed that SMS  
49  
50 interactivity has a positive influence on perceived partner quality. This indicates that customers  
51  
52 value the two-way interaction with suppliers on SMS, and said interaction enhances their  
53  
54 perception of the supplier's partner quality. Thus, this study echoes Palmatier (2008) as well  
55  
56 as Quinton and Wilson (2016) highlighting the impact of SMS interactivity on perceived  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 partner quality (i.e. the customer's appraisal of the extent to which the B2B brand is reliable  
4 and predictable in fulfilling its role, follows the rules of the relationship, delivers what is  
5 expected, and is accountable for its actions (Fournier, 1998, Aaker et al., 2004)). The findings  
6 also reflect previous research conducted in B2C settings, which has shown that interactivity  
7 can help firms build high-quality relationships with them (Teo et al., 2003), as it assists in  
8 developing mutual understanding (Ou et al., 2014). This study highlighted that SMS  
9 interactivity is particularly important if it takes place on LinkedIn as opposed to Twitter and  
10 Facebook, which yet again confirms that LinkedIn is the preferred SMS for supplier-customer  
11 relationship building. Through the course of this research, this paper revealed that LinkedIn  
12 interactivity enhances customers' perceptions of partner quality in B2B markets.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 **Furthermore**, this study confirmed findings of previous research (Agnihotri et al., 2016, Foltean  
27 et al., 2018) that SMS responsiveness has a positive impact on brand relationship commitment.  
28 Interestingly, however, this research showed that responsiveness positively influences  
29 satisfaction as well, but only on Twitter. This may be a result of firms' recent drive to use  
30 Twitter as a customer service channel where customers can seek responses from suppliers  
31 (Culotta and Cutler, 2016, Iankova et al., 2018). The positive impact of Twitter responsiveness  
32 on satisfaction is in line with Agnihotri et al. (2016), who also identified a positive impact of  
33 social media responsiveness on customers' satisfaction in B2B contexts.

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 **Finally, this paper** concludes by stating that SMS use is key in supplier-customer relationships  
46 in B2B settings. Although there are observable differences between different SMS and their  
47 impact on key indicators of brand relationship strength, it is noted that SMEs use SMS to follow  
48 updates, interact with B2B supplier brands, and ask questions, all of which strengthen the  
49 relationship with the supplier's brand. The study's findings derive a number of theoretical and  
50 practical implications, as outlined below.

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### *Theoretical and Managerial contributions*

First, this research contributes to the emerging research stream on SMS use and its impact on B2B firms, and particularly on supplier-customer relationships. Although SMS have been recognised to create significant opportunities for B2B supplier-customer relationships, limited research exists in this area (Quinton and Wilson, 2016, Salo, 2017). Previous research has, therefore, called for studies that will provide insights into SMS use and its impact on supplier-customer relationships (Salo, 2017, Quinton and Wilson, 2016, Guesalaga, 2016). This research addresses this call.

Second, this paper has provided a more detailed understanding of how exactly interactions on online channels (SMS) can facilitate relationship building goals, by shedding light on the consequences of different types of interactions on SMS platforms on key aspects of B2B supplier-customer relationships. Specifically, SMS use involves a complex web of activities that have the potential to facilitate or hinder relationship building with customers (Smith and Gallicano, 2015, Mehmet and Clarke, 2016). Indeed, firms' SMS use does not only restrict to maintaining presence via posting regular updates, but also involves interacting with customers (e.g. via seeking feedback, setting quizzes, etc.) as well as responding to customers' questions. This research has examined in depth how SMS presence, interactivity and responsiveness each influence four key indicators of brand relationship strength, namely, commitment, intimacy, satisfaction and partner quality. Moreover, the findings of this study provide detailed insight about further complexities that firms using SMS face when interacting with their customers on multiple SMS platforms. In particular, the study has revealed differences among Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn in regards to the impact of presence, interactivity and responsiveness on those four indicators.

Third, this research was conducted on a sample of B2B SMEs, which use social media to engage with their suppliers. Centeno and Hart (2012) remark that SMEs tend to engage in non-

1  
2  
3 traditional branding practices, however thus far empirical research on B2B SMEs has been  
4 somewhat scattered. Via exploring the context of the UK-based B2B SMEs and revealing how  
5  
6 SMS use contributes to the B2B relationship building in developed economies, the findings of  
7  
8 this research address calls for studies in B2B SMEs branding practices in different economic  
9  
10 contexts (Odoom, 2017).  
11  
12

13  
14 The findings of this research offer B2B firms much needed practical guidance into SMS use in  
15  
16 the effort to enhance B2B supplier-customer relationships. The growing body of research,  
17  
18 including the current study, strongly suggests that a purposeful SMS strategy is needed.  
19  
20 Specifically, according to Guesalaga (2016), B2B firms are increasingly using SMS but they  
21  
22 still have little understanding about its consequences, and thus they lag behind in the race to  
23  
24 leverage social media for business purposes (Michaelidou et al., 2011, Broekemier et al., 2015).  
25  
26 The findings presented in this paper confirm that, in today's environment, B2B firms can no  
27  
28 longer be casual about SMS. Specifically, there are three practical implications emerging from  
29  
30 this study. First, B2B firms are encouraged to carefully design their social media strategies and  
31  
32 work actively to develop their presence on Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter, as those are the  
33  
34 SMS sites used by customers to follow suppliers' brands. Second, B2B brands are encouraged  
35  
36 to develop their presence and interact with their customers on LinkedIn in particular, if they  
37  
38 wish to enhance customers' brand commitment and perceived partner quality. Third, they  
39  
40 should also pay particular attention to Twitter and use it to solve customers' queries and  
41  
42 problems, which, as revealed in this study, will further enhance customers' brand relationship  
43  
44 commitment.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 *Limitations and future research directions*  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 While this study is one of the first to examine SMS use on key indicators of brand relationship  
4 strength in B2B settings, the research has some limitations that open avenues for future  
5  
6 research.  
7  
8

9  
10 First, in the study's conceptualisation and operationalisation of the B2B brand relationship  
11 strength, interaction effects between individual indicators have not been considered. For  
12 example, future research could examine the impact of SMS use on perceived partner quality  
13 and how this may subsequently lead to brand relationship commitment. Future research could  
14 also examine other aspects of supplier-customer relationships, such as trust, or willingness to  
15 recommend the supplier's brand to others.  
16  
17

18  
19 Second, the research was conducted on a sample of UK-based B2B SMEs firms with varied  
20 degrees of SMS use. Therefore, further research is needed to explore the extent to which the  
21 findings presented in this paper are generalized beyond this setting. Future research could  
22 examine the findings of the present research with B2B SMEs based in a range of settings that  
23 vary in terms of institutional, cultural or economic environments. For instance, the comparison  
24 between countries where use of SMS is more or less advanced may reveal differences in terms  
25 of the importance of certain dimensions of SMS use on brand relationship strength. Similarly,  
26 further examination of the current study's findings with B2B SMEs based in emerging  
27 economies would be particularly useful. This is because those firms have limited access to  
28 resources, hence can potentially benefit substantially from the use of SMS. Indeed, existing  
29 research has acknowledged that empirical studies on those firms' branding and customer  
30 relationship management practices are much needed (Odoom, 2017).  
31  
32

33  
34 Third, as revealed, there are differences in the impact of various types of SMS on the four  
35 indicators of brand relationship strength, hence, further research examining such differences  
36 among LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook and others would be useful. Research extending the  
37 present study could consider other aspects of SMS use (for example, direct messaging), and  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 examine their impact on relationships customers form with B2B brands. We also encourage  
4 research, which would further explore B2B SMS use by making a distinction between active  
5 and passive presence as well as standardised and customised communication. Here, qualitative  
6 exploration would be most welcome to unveil the complexity of SMS use in B2B settings.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Finally, the current study did not directly account for the level of engagement between the  
12 supplier and the customer on social media (e.g. frequency with which the customer visits the  
13 supplier's social media profile, extent of monitoring the supplier's social media activities, etc.).  
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

Future research could explore this further, as increased levels of engagement may lead to positive relationship outcomes. Considering the increasing importance of SMS in B2B contexts, such research is much needed.

## References

- AAKER, J., FOURNIER, S. & BRASEL, S. A. 2004. When Good Brands Do Bad. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31, 1-16.
- AGNIHOTRI, R., DINGUS, R., HU, M. Y. & KRUSH, M. T. 2016. Social media: Influencing customer satisfaction in B2B sales. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 53, 172-180.
- AGNIHOTRI, R., KOTHANDARAMAN, P., KASHYAP, R. & SINGH, R. 2012. Bringing "Social" Into Sales: The Impact of Salespeople's Social Media Use on Service Behaviors and Value Creation. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 32, 333-348.
- AGNIHOTRI, R., RAPP, A. & TRAINOR, K. 2009. Understanding the role of information communication in the buyer - seller exchange process: antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 24, 474-486.
- AGNIHOTRI, R., TRAINOR, K. J., ITANI, O. S. & RODRIGUEZ, M. 2017. Examining the role of sales-based CRM technology and social media use on post-sale service behaviors in India. *Journal of Business Research*, 81, 144-154.
- AHEARNE, M., JELINEK, R. & JONES, E. 2007. Examining the effect of salesperson service behavior in a competitive context. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35, 603-616.
- ANDERSEN, P. H. 2005. Relationship marketing and brand involvement of professionals through web-enhanced brand communities: The case of Coloplast. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 34, 39-51.
- ANDERSSON, S. & WIKSTRÖM, N. 2017. Why and how are social media used in a B2B context, and which stakeholders are involved? *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 32, 1098-1108.
- ANDZULIS, J. M., PANAGOPOULOS, N. G. & RAPP, A. 2012. A Review of Social Media and Implications for the Sales Process. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 32, 305-316.
- BENDIXEN, M., BUKASA, K. A. & ABRATT, R. 2004. Brand equity in the business-to-business market. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 33, 371-380.
- BOCCONCELLI, R., CIOPPI, M. & PAGANO, A. 2017. Social media as a resource in SMEs' sales process. *The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 32, 693-709.
- BROEKEMIER, G., CHAU, N. N. & SESHADRI, S. 2015. Social media practices among small business-to-business enterprises. *Small Business Institute Journal*, 11, 37-48.
- BROWN, J. R., WEAVER, S. K., DANT, R. P. & CROSNO, J. L. 2016. Boosting the effectiveness of channel governance options: The moderating role of relational norms. *European Journal of Marketing*, 50, 29-57.
- CACERES, R. C. & PAPAROIDAMIS, N. G. 2007. Service quality, relationship satisfaction, trust, commitment and business - to - business loyalty. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41, 836-867.
- CASALÓ, L. V., FLAVIÁN, C. & GUINALÍU, M. 2008. Promoting Consumer's Participation in Virtual Brand Communities: A New Paradigm in Branding Strategy. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 14, 19-36.
- ČATER, T. & ČATER, B. 2010. Product and relationship quality influence on customer commitment and loyalty in B2B manufacturing relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39, 1321-1333.
- CAWSEY, T. & ROWLEY, J. 2016. Social media brand building strategies in B2B companies. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 34, 754-776.

- 1  
2  
3 CENTENO, E. & HART, S. 2012. The use of communication activities in the development of  
4 small to medium - sized enterprise brands. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 30,  
5 250-265.  
6  
7 CHEUNG, G. W. & RENSVOLD, R. B. 2002. Evaluating Goodness-of-Fit Indexes for Testing  
8 Measurement Invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*,  
9 9, 233-255.  
10  
11 CHONG, A. Y. L., LACKA, E., BOYING, L. & CHAN, H. K. 2018. The role of social media  
12 in enhancing guanxi and perceived effectiveness of E-commerce institutional  
13 mechanisms in online marketplace. *Information & Management*, 55, 621-632.  
14  
15 CHRISTODOULIDES, G. 2009. Branding in the post-internet era. *Marketing Theory*, 9, 141-  
16 144.  
17  
18 CONFOS, N. & DAVIS, T. 2016. Young consumer-brand relationship building potential using  
19 digital marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 50, 1993-2017.  
20  
21 COPP, C. B. & IVY, R. L. 2001. Networking Trends of Small Tourism Businesses in Post-  
22 Socialist Slovakia. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39, 345-353.  
23  
24 CORTEZ, R. M. & JOHNSTON, W. J. 2017. The future of B2B marketing theory: A historical  
25 and prospective analysis. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 66, 90-102.  
26  
27 CROSBY, L. A., EVANS, K. R. & COWLES, D. 1990. Relationship Quality in Services  
28 Selling: An Interpersonal Influence Perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 68-81.  
29  
30 CULOTTA, A. & CUTLER, J. 2016. Mining Brand Perceptions from Twitter Social Networks.  
31 *Marketing Science*, 35, 343-362.  
32  
33 DE RUYTER, K., KEELING, D. I. & COX, D. 2019. Customer-supplier relationships in high  
34 technology markets 3.0. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 79, 94-101.  
35  
36 DE WULF, K., ODEKERKEN-SCHRÖDER, G. & IACOBUCCI, D. 2001. Investments in  
37 Consumer Relationships: A Cross-Country and Cross-Industry Exploration. *Journal of*  
38 *Marketing*, 65, 33-50.  
39  
40 DENNIS, A. R., FULLER, R. M. & VALACICH, J. S. 2008. Media, Tasks, and  
41 Communication Processes: A Theory of Media Synchronicity. *MIS Quarterly*, 32, 575-  
42 600.  
43  
44 DICK, A. S. & BASU, K. 1994. Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual  
45 framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22, 99-113.  
46  
47 DORSCH, M. J., SWANSON, S. R. & KELLEY, S. W. 1998. The Role of Relationship Quality  
48 in the Stratification of Vendors as Perceived by Customers. *Journal of the Academy of*  
49 *Marketing Science*, 26, 128-142.  
50  
51 DURKIN, M., MCGOWAN, P. & MCKEOWN, N. 2013. Exploring social media adoption in  
52 small to medium-sized enterprises in Ireland. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise*  
53 *Development*, 20, 716-734.  
54  
55 DWIVEDI, A., JOHNSON, L. W., WILKIE, D. C. & DE ARAUJO-GIL, L. 2018. Consumer  
56 emotional brand attachment with social media brands and social media brand equity.  
57 *European Journal of Marketing*, (in press).  
58  
59 FELIX, R., RAUSCHNABEL, P. A. & HINSCH, C. 2017. Elements of strategic social media  
60 marketing: A holistic framework. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 118-126.  
61  
62 FOLTEAN, F. S., TRIF, S. M. & TULEU, D. L. 2018. Customer relationship management  
63 capabilities and social media technology use: Consequences on firm performance.  
64 *Journal of Business Research*, (in press).  
65  
66 FORNELL, C. & LARCKER, D. F. 1981. Evaluating Structural Equation Models with  
67 Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18,  
68 39-50.  
69  
70 FOURNIER, S. 1998. Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in  
71 Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24, 343-373.



- 1  
2  
3 FOURNIER, S. & AVERY, J. 2011. Putting the Relationship Back Into CRM. *MIT Sloan*  
4 *Management Review*, 52, 63-72.
- 5 GEFEN, D. & STRAUB, D. W. 2004. Consumer trust in B2C e-Commerce and the importance  
6 of social presence: experiments in e-Products and e-Services. *Omega*, 32, 407-424.
- 7 GOLGECI, I. & GLIGOR, D. M. 2017. The interplay between key marketing and supply chain  
8 management capabilities: the role of integrative mechanisms. *Journal of Business &*  
9 *Industrial Marketing*, 32, 472-483.
- 10 GREENBERG, P. 2010. The impact of CRM 2.0 on customer insight. *Journal of Business &*  
11 *Industrial Marketing*, 25, 410-419.
- 12 GUESALAGA, R. 2016. The use of social media in sales: Individual and organizational  
13 antecedents, and the role of customer engagement in social media. *Industrial Marketing*  
14 *Management*, 54, 71-79.
- 15 GUHA, S., HARRIGAN, P. & SOUTAR, G. 2018. Linking social media to customer  
16 relationship management (CRM): a qualitative study on SMEs. *Journal of Small*  
17 *Business & Entrepreneurship*, 30, 193-214.
- 18 HAIR, J., BLACK, W., BABIN, B. & ANDERSON, R. 2010. *Multivariate Data Analysis: A*  
19 *Global Perspective*, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- 20 HAJLI, M. N. 2014. The role of social support on relationship quality and social commerce.  
21 *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 87, 17-27.
- 22 HENNINGER, C. E., ALEVIZOU, P. J. & OATES, C. J. 2017. IMC, social media and UK  
23 fashion micro-organisations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 51, 668-691.
- 24 HOFACKER, C. F., DE RUYTER, K., LURIE, N. H., MANCHANDA, P. & DONALDSON,  
25 J. 2016. Gamification and Mobile Marketing Effectiveness. *Journal of Interactive*  
26 *Marketing*, 34, 25-36.
- 27 HSIAO, S.-H., WANG, Y.-Y., WANG, T. & KAO, T.-W. 2019. How social media shapes the  
28 fashion industry: The spillover effects between private labels and national brands.  
29 *Industrial Marketing Management*.
- 30 HUDSON, S., HUANG, L., ROTH, M. S. & MADDEN, T. J. 2016. The influence of social  
31 media interactions on consumer-brand relationships: A three-country study of brand  
32 perceptions and marketing behaviors. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*,  
33 33, 27-41.
- 34 HUTCHINSON, D., WELLINGTON, W. J., SAAD, M. & COX, P. 2011. Refining value-  
35 based differentiation in business relationships: A study of the higher order relationship  
36 building blocks that influence behavioural intentions. *Industrial Marketing*  
37 *Management*, 40, 465-478.
- 38 IANKOVA, S., DAVIES, I., ARCHER-BROWN, C., MARDER, B. & YAU, A. 2018. A  
39 comparison of social media marketing between B2B, B2C and mixed business models.  
40 *Industrial Marketing Management*, (in press).
- 41 ITANI, O. S., AGNIHOTRI, R. & DINGUS, R. 2017. Social media use in B2B sales and its  
42 impact on competitive intelligence collection and adaptive selling: Examining the role  
43 of learning orientation as an enabler. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 66, 64-79.
- 44 JÄRVINEN, J. & TAIMINEN, H. 2016. Harnessing marketing automation for B2B content  
45 marketing. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 54, 164-175.
- 46 JÄRVINEN, J., TOLLINEN, A., KARJALUOTO, H. & JAYAWARDHENA, C. 2012. Digital  
47 and Social Media Marketing Usage in B2B Industrial Section. *Marketing Management*  
48 *Journal*, 22, 102-117.
- 49 KAISER, H. F. 1970. A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35, 401-415.
- 50 KANNAN, P. K. & LI, H. A. 2017. Digital marketing: A framework, review and research  
51 agenda. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34, 22-45.
- 52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 KAPLAN, A. M. & HAENLEIN, M. 2010. Users of the world, unite! The challenges and  
4 opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53, 59-68.
- 5 KARIKARI, S., OSEI-FRIMPONG, K. & OWUSU-FRIMPONG, N. 2017. Evaluating  
6 individual level antecedents and consequences of social media use in Ghana.  
7 *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 123, 68-79.
- 8 KEINÄNEN, H. & KUIVALAINEN, O. 2015. Antecedents of social media B2B use in  
9 industrial marketing context: customers' view. *Journal of Business & Industrial*  
10 *Marketing*, 30, 711-722.
- 11 KENNY, D. A., KANISKAN, B. & MCCOACH, D. B. 2015. The Performance of RMSEA in  
12 Models With Small Degrees of Freedom. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 44, 486-  
13 507.
- 14 KIETZMANN, J. H., HERMKENS, K., MCCARTHY, I. P. & SILVESTRE, B. S. 2011. Social  
15 media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media.  
16 *Business Horizons*, 54, 241-251.
- 17 LACKA, E. & CHONG, A. 2016. Usability perspective on social media sites' adoption in the  
18 B2B context. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 54, 80-91.
- 19 LEEK, S., CANNING, L. & HOUGHTON, D. 2016. Revisiting the Task Media Fit Model in  
20 the era of Web 2.0: Twitter use and interaction in the healthcare sector. *Industrial*  
21 *Marketing Management*, 54, 25-32.
- 22 LOWRY, P. B., ROBERTS, T. L., ROMANO, N. C., CHENEY, P. D. & HIGHTOWER, R.  
23 T. 2006. The Impact of Group Size and Social Presence on Small-Group  
24 Communication: Does Computer-Mediated Communication Make a Difference? *Small*  
25 *Group Research*, 37, 631-661.
- 26 MCLEAN, G. & OSEI-FRIMPONG, K. 2017. Examining satisfaction with the experience  
27 during a live chat service encounter-implications for website providers. *Computers in*  
28 *Human Behavior*, 76, 494-508.
- 29 MEHMET, M. I. & CLARKE, R. J. 2016. B2B social media semantics: Analysing multimodal  
30 online meanings in marketing conversations. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 54,  
31 92-106.
- 32 MICHAELIDOU, N., SIAMAGKA, N. T. & CHRISTODOULIDES, G. 2011. Usage, barriers  
33 and measurement of social media marketing: An exploratory investigation of small and  
34 medium B2B brands. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40, 1153-1159.
- 35 MURPHY, M. & SASHI, C. M. 2018. Communication, interactivity, and satisfaction in B2B  
36 relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 68, 1-12.
- 37 NAYLOR, R. W., LAMBERTON, C. P. & WEST, P. M. 2012. Beyond the "Like" Button:  
38 The Impact of Mere Virtual Presence on Brand Evaluations and Purchase Intentions in  
39 Social Media Settings. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 105-120.
- 40 NUNAN, D., SIBAI, O., SCHIVINSKI, B. & CHRISTODOULIDES, G. 2018. Reflections on  
41 "social media: Influencing customer satisfaction in B2B sales" and a research agenda.  
42 *Industrial Marketing Management*, 75, 31-36.
- 43 OBAL, M. & LANCIONI, R. A. 2013. Maximizing buyer-supplier relationships in the Digital  
44 Era: Concept and research agenda. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42, 851-854.
- 45 ODOOM, R. 2017. Antecedents of social media usage and performance benefits in small- and  
46 medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 30,  
47 383-399.
- 48 OGILVIE, J., AGNIHOTRI, R., RAPP, A. & TRAINOR, K. 2018. Social media technology  
49 use and salesperson performance: A two study examination of the role of salesperson  
50 behaviors, characteristics, and training. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 75, 55-65.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 OSEI-FRIMPONG, K. & MCLEAN, G. 2018. Examining online social brand engagement: A  
4 social presence theory perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 128,  
5 10-21.  
6  
7 OU, C. X., PAVLOU, P. A. & DAVISON, R. M. 2014. Swift Guanxi in Online Marketplaces:  
8 The Role of Computer-Mediated Communication Technologies. *MIS Quarterly*, 38,  
9 209-A24.  
10  
11 PALLANT, J. 2013. *SPSS survival manual : a step by step guide to data analysis using IBM*  
12 *SPSS*, Maidenhead, Berkshire, England, Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: McGraw  
13 Hill.  
14  
15 PALMATIER, R. W. 2008. Interfirm Relational Drivers of Customer Value. *Journal of*  
16 *Marketing*, 72, 76-89.  
17  
18 PALMATIER, R. W., DANT, R. P., GREWAL, D. & EVANS, K. R. 2006. Factors Influencing  
19 the Effectiveness of Relationship Marketing: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Marketing*,  
20 70, 136-153.  
21  
22 PARASURAMAN, A., ZEITHAML, V. A. & MALHOTRA, A. 2005. E-S-QUAL: A  
23 Multiple-Item Scale for Assessing Electronic Service Quality. *Journal of Service*  
24 *Research*, 7, 213-233.  
25  
26 PAVLOU, P. A. 2003. Consumer Acceptance of Electronic Commerce: Integrating Trust and  
27 Risk with the Technology Acceptance Model. *International Journal of Electronic*  
28 *Commerce*, 7, 101-134.  
29  
30 PODSAKOFF, P. M., MACKENZIE, S. B., LEE, J.-Y. & PODSAKOFF, N. P. 2003. Common  
31 method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and  
32 recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.  
33  
34 POZZA, I. D. 2014. Multichannel management gets "social". *European Journal of Marketing*,  
35 48, 1274-1295.  
36  
37 QUINTON, S. 2013. The community brand paradigm: A response to brand management's  
38 dilemma in the digital era. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 29, 912-932.  
39  
40 QUINTON, S. & WILSON, D. 2016. Tensions and ties in social media networks: Towards a  
41 model of understanding business relationship development and business performance  
42 enhancement through the use of LinkedIn. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 54, 15-  
43 24.  
44  
45 RAMADAN, Z. B., ABOSAG, I. & ZABKAR, V. 2018. All in the value: The impact of brand  
46 and social network relationships on the perceived value of customer endorsed Facebook  
47 advertising. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52, 1704-1726.  
48  
49 RAPP, A., BEITELSPACHER, L., GREWAL, D. & HUGHES, D. 2013. Understanding social  
50 media effects across seller, retailer, and consumer interactions. *Journal of the Academy*  
51 *of Marketing Science*, 41, 547-566.  
52  
53 RAUYRUEN, P. & MILLER, K. E. 2007. Relationship quality as a predictor of B2B customer  
54 loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 21-31.  
55  
56 RHODES, C. 2018. *Business statistics* [Online]. House of Commons Library. Available:  
57 <https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06152>  
58 [Accessed 21/02/2019].  
59  
60 SALO, J. 2017. Social media research in the industrial marketing field: Review of literature  
and future research directions. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 66, 115-129.  
SCHIVINSKI, B. & DABROWSKI, D. 2015. The impact of brand communication on brand  
equity through Facebook. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 9, 31-53.  
SCHIVINSKI, B. & DABROWSKI, D. 2016. The effect of social media communication on  
consumer perceptions of brands. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 22, 189-214.

- SIAMAGKA, N.-T., CHRISTODOULIDES, G., MICHAELIDOU, N. & VALVI, A. 2015. Determinants of social media adoption by B2B organizations. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 51, 89-99.
- SIRDESHMUKH, D., SINGH, J. & SABOL, B. 2002. Consumer Trust, Value, and Loyalty in Relational Exchanges. *Journal of Marketing*, 66, 15-37.
- SMITH, B. G. & GALLICANO, T. D. 2015. Terms of engagement: Analyzing public engagement with organizations through social media. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 53, 82-90.
- SONG, M., BERENDS, H., VAN DER BIJ, H. & WEGGEMAN, M. 2007. The Effect of IT and Co-location on Knowledge Dissemination. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 24, 52-68.
- SONGAILIENE, E., WINKLHOFFER, H. & MCKECHNIE, S. 2011. A conceptualisation of supplier - perceived value. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45, 383-418.
- STERN, B. B. 1997. Advertising Intimacy: Relationship Marketing and the Services Consumer. *Journal of Advertising*, 26, 7-19.
- SWANI, K. & BROWN, B. P. 2011. The Effectiveness of Social Media Messages in Organizational Buying Contexts. *American Marketing Association*, 22, 519.
- SWANI, K., BROWN, B. P. & MILNE, G. R. 2014. Should tweets differ for B2B and B2C? An analysis of Fortune 500 companies' Twitter communications. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 43, 873-881.
- TEO, H.-H., OH, L.-B., LIU, C. & WEI, K.-K. 2003. An empirical study of the effects of interactivity on web user attitude. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 58, 281-305.
- THORBJØRNSEN, H., SUPPELLEN, M., NYSVEEN, H. & PEDERSEN, P. E. 2002. Building brand relationships online: A comparison of two interactive applications. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 16, 17-34.
- TRAINOR, K. J., ANDZULIS, J., RAPP, A. & AGNIHOTRI, R. 2014. Social media technology usage and customer relationship performance: A capabilities-based examination of social CRM. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 1201-1208.
- ULAGA, W. & EGGERT, A. 2005. Relationship Value in Business Markets: The Construct and Its Dimensions. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*, 12, 73-99.
- WALTER, A., RITTER, T. & GEMÜNDEN, H. G. 2001. Value Creation in Buyer-Seller Relationships: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Results from a Supplier's Perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 30, 365-377.
- WANG, W. Y. C., PAULEEN, D. J. & ZHANG, T. 2016a. How social media applications affect B2B communication and improve business performance in SMEs. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 54, 4-14.
- WANG, Y. C. L., HSIAO, S.-H., YANG, Z. & HAJLI, N. 2016b. The impact of sellers' social influence on the co-creation of innovation with customers and brand awareness in online communities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 54, 56-70.
- WANG, Z. & KIM, H. G. 2017. Can Social Media Marketing Improve Customer Relationship Capabilities and Firm Performance? Dynamic Capability Perspective. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 39, 15-26.
- WEAVEN, S., BAKER, B. L. & DANT, R. P. 2017. The Influence of Gratitude on Franchisor-Franchisee Relationships. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55, 275-298.
- WEBER, L. 2009. *Marketing to the social web: how digital customer communities build your business*, Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons.
- WEBSTER, F. E., JR. & KELLER, K. L. 2004. A roadmap for branding in industrial markets. *Journal of Brand Management*, 11, 388-402.

- 1  
2  
3 YANG, S., LIN, S., CARLSON, J. R. & ROSS, W. T. 2016. Brand engagement on social  
4 media: will firms' social media efforts influence search engine advertising  
5 effectiveness? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 32, 526-557.  
6  
7 ZAHEER, A. & ZAHEER, S. 1997. Catching the Wave: Alertness, Responsiveness, and  
8 Market Influence in Global Electronic Networks. *Management Science*, 43, 1493-1509.  
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

European Journal of Marketing

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

**Response to reviewers' comments**  
**Manuscript ID EJM-03-2019-0231.R2**

8 We would like to sincerely thank the Editors of the Special Issue "Digital Marketing and  
9 Business-to-Business Relationships" for offering us the opportunity to revise and resubmit  
10 again our paper titled "Just Be There': Social Media Presence, Interactivity, and  
11 Responsiveness, and their Impact on B2B Relationships" (EJM-03-2019-0231.R2).  
12

13 Once again, we are very grateful to the anonymous reviewers for the encouragement, time and  
14 detail they have provided. As with the previous revision, the following pages explain in detail  
15 how we have addressed each comment in the order that it was provided.  
16

17 We believe we have accommodated all comments successfully, and we hope the revised  
18 manuscript will be considered favourably.  
19

20 Thank you.

21  
22 The authors  
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

1  
2  
3 **Reviewer: 1**

4 **Recommendation: Minor Revision**

5  
6  
7  
8 **Comments:**

9 I've enjoyed your work and it clearly has a lot to say of relevance. Thanks for taking  
10 earlier comments to heart and I hope you are able to address the current - mostly minor  
11 -thoughts as well.

12  
13 Thank you for your comment and encouragement. We have addressed your comments  
14 individually below. All the revisions appear in the manuscript in red colour.

15  
16  
17  
18 **Additional Questions:**

19  
20 **1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to**  
21 **justify publication?: The topic has great currency - relevant and with good insights for**  
22 **B2B relationship building.**

23 Thank you for your comment.

24  
25  
26  
27 **2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of**  
28 **the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is**  
29 **any significant work ignored?: the improvements by the authors following the first round**  
30 **are substantial. The literature is well presented.**

31 Thank you for your comment.

32  
33  
34  
35 **3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts**  
36 **or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is**  
37 **based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: appropriate and**  
38 **well discussed.**

39 Thank you for your comment.

40  
41  
42  
43 **4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions**  
44 **adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: yes**

45 Thank you for your comment.

46  
47  
48  
49 **5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any**  
50 **implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with**  
51 **the findings and conclusions of the paper?: while this requires some additional work, the**  
52 **potential for making good implications for theory and practice are present.**

53 Thank you for your comment. We have addressed your specific comments below.

54  
55  
56  
57  
58 **6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against**  
59 **the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's**  
60

1  
2  
3 readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as  
4 sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: I like the paper and your responses to my  
5 earlier concerns have been well-resolved. I mostly want your work to be more eloquent  
6 so that it has greater impact. I do not intend to copy edit the entire paper for you.  
7 Meanwhile, when particular parts of the paper shouted for tweaking, I paused to give you  
8 commentary. In addition to my notes, I think if you could pause page by page and tweak  
9 the paper in lots of minor ways, you will maximize impact once published.

10  
11 Thank you for your comment. According to your suggestions, we have revisited our manuscript  
12 and have made some revisions. These are described in detail below, under each of your  
13 comments.  
14  
15

16  
17 **Pg 4: You say, “use SMS to increase customer interest as well as awareness, and promote**  
18 **their business to new customers...” Perhaps, ...promote their business to new**  
19 **customers by using SMS to increase awareness and grow customer interest, with SMS**  
20 **simultaneously being a means for developing brand reputation...**

21  
22 Thank you for your comment. We have now revised this sentence to read as follows:

23  
24 *“Indeed, existing studies reveal that only more innovative B2B SMEs promote their business*  
25 *to new customers by using SMS to increase awareness and grow customer interest, with SMS*  
26 *simultaneously being a means for developing brand reputation (Broekemier et al., 2015).”*  
27  
28

29  
30 **Pg 4. Quite awkward phrasing that is not well connected to the previous thought: What**  
31 **however also remains unclear is how B2B SMEs respond to the ways with which their**  
32 **suppliers are present, interact with, and respond to them on SMS.**

33  
34 You need to do something about the “what however also” part – it might be as simple as  
35 opening with “We also lack understanding of how B2B...” I would also delete the “are  
36 present” part of the sentence – being present is understood by the interacting/responding  
37 action. It is actually a matter of finding a better way to indicate the value of “presence”  
38 that is part of your work as well as the other actions. But, I leave it to you to improve.  
39

40 Thank you for your comment. We have now revised this sentence and it reads as follows:

41  
42 *“We also lack understanding of how B2B SMEs react to the ways in which their suppliers post*  
43 *updates, interact with them, and respond to them on SMS.”*  
44  
45

46 **Your phrasing (lines 40 – 55) never quite says WHY it is important to take the**  
47 **customer’s perspective, aside from the perspective possibly being different. The mere**  
48 **lack of research from this perspective does not attest to WHY there should be more from**  
49 **this perspective (I’ve provided a thought related to this below in underlined text). Also,**  
50 **your Ulaga & Eggert reference begs the question of whether you measure both in your**  
51 **study – this would be the only way to determine whether this possible difference exists in**  
52 **your study (possibly the most important point you make here). Clarify what you are**  
53 **about to do for the reader and why it matters.**  
54  
55

56 Thank you for your comment. Thank you for pointing out the issue with the Ulaga & Eggert  
57 reference. Existing literature uses the terms ‘relationship quality’ and ‘relationship strength’  
58 interchangeably: according to Caceres and Pappas (2007), “relationship *quality*”  
59 represents an overall means of assessing the *strength* of a relationship between two firms (also  
60



see Garbarino and Johnson, 1999; Smith, 1998). However, we acknowledge that the way this has been expressed here suggests that two different concepts are being measured. In reality, what we simply wanted to highlight here was that relationships are not perceived in the same way by the supplier and the customer. So, we have now revised this to read as follows:

*“The study specifically focuses on the customer’s perspective, as previous research has noted that supplier-customer relationships may be perceived differently depending on the perspective from which they are examined (Ulaga and Eggert, 2005)”.*

We would also like to thank you for highlighting that we need to explain more why it is important to examine the customer’s perspective. We have taken on board the suggestion you provided below and have added the sentence you recommended, as well as additional explanation. Please see below.

**Pg 4: you say, “As previous research has mainly studied brand relationships from the supplier perspective (Dwivedi et al., 2018), research studies that explore the customer’s perspective of how B2B brands utilise SMS are extremely limited.”**

**Consider: “As previous research has mainly studied brand relationships from the supplier perspective (Dwivedi et al., 2018), we have limited knowledge of the customer’s perspective as to whether SMS has positive effects on the relationship with their B2B partners/suppliers). And yet, this is a vitally important perspective to take, as brands grow only when customers develop stronger affiliations with the brand.**

Thank you for your comment. We have now revised this as per your suggestions, and have also added the sentence you have recommended to justify importance. We have also added further explanation why examining the customer’s perspective is important. This now reads as follows:

*“As previous research has mainly studied brand relationships from the supplier’s perspective (Dwivedi et al., 2018), we have limited knowledge of the customer’s perspective as to whether SMS have positive effects on brand relationships in a B2B context (Keinänen and Kuivalainen, 2015, Guesalaga, 2016). And yet, this is a vitally important perspective to take, as both B2C and B2B brands grow only when customers develop stronger affiliations with them. Indeed, research in B2B settings has shown that when customers perceive their relationship with their supplier to be strong and of value, they maintain loyalty towards the supplier and become less likely to be affected by potential supplier-brand transgressions or service failures (Caceres and Paparoidamis, 2007).”*

**Finally, the transition to start pg 5 begins with “therefore”. I tend to prefer, “In sum” here as you are revisiting points made in the preceding paragraphs. But, this is a very small stylistic preference.**

Thank you for your comment. We have now replaced ‘Therefore’ with ‘In sum’.

**Pg 7, you say: “As these organizations are resource-deficient, SMS are very cost-effective...” Perhaps, “As these organizations tend to be resource-deficient, using cost effective SMS tools to extend their networks and communicate with existing and prospective business partners may be vital for business success.**

Thank you for your comment. We have now revised this, and it now reads:

1  
2  
3 “As these organizations tend to be resource-deficient, using cost-effective SMS tools to extend  
4 their networks and communicate with existing and prospective business partners may be vital  
5 for business success (Bocconcelli et al., 2017).”  
6  
7

8  
9 **Pg 10, you say, ““the technological component of the [...] relationship building” delete  
10 ‘the’**

11 Thank you for your comment. We have now deleted this.  
12  
13

14  
15 **Pg 22, delete ‘General’ from the heading.**

16 Thank you for your comment. We have now deleted ‘General’ from the heading and it now  
17 reads “Discussion & Implications”.  
18  
19

20  
21 **Pg 23. You say, “Although the findings indicate that SMS presence is key in brand  
22 relationship building, SMS interactivity and responsiveness should not be ignored. “is  
23 key” replace with “helps in..” or, “important for” I make this point only because “is  
24 key” has a specific connotation. also, “should not be ignored”. How about “are also  
25 important.”**

26  
27 Thank you for your comment. We have now replaced ‘is key in’ with ‘is important for’. We  
28 have also replaced ‘should not be ignored’ with ‘are also important’. The sentence now reads  
29 as follows:  
30

31 *“Although the findings indicate that SMS presence is important for brand relationship  
32 building, SMS interactivity and responsiveness are also important.”*  
33  
34

35  
36 **Pg 24; you say “This paper concludes by stating that SMS use is key in supplier-customer  
37 relationships in B2B settings.” You previously said “Finally” in the prior paragraph.  
38 I’m inclined to delete the entire paragraph here, letting the next heading speak for itself.**

39 Thank you for pointing this out. We have replaced ‘Finally’ with ‘Furthermore’ in the previous  
40 paragraph, and we have added the word ‘Finally’ in the last paragraph that presents the overall  
41 conclusion of the paper.  
42  
43

44  
45 **Pg 24: line 49 or 50, delete “Thus far,”**

46 Thank you for your comment. We have now deleted this and the sentence starts with: *“Although  
47 SMS have been...”*  
48  
49

50  
51 **Pg 25: You say, “cautious...further layers of complexity, which has to be accounted for  
52 while using them” you then state your second contribution. I am not clear how this  
53 contribution resolves either the cautious comment or the layers of complexity comment.  
54 This contribution needs more work.**

55  
56 Thank you for your comment. We fully agree with you and have now revised this paragraph to  
57 make our point here clearer. The paragraph now reads as follows:  
58  
59  
60



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

“Second, this paper has provided a more detailed understanding of how exactly interactions on online channels (SMS) can facilitate relationship building goals, by shedding light on the consequences of different types of interactions on SMS platforms on key aspects of B2B supplier-customer relationships. Specifically, SMS use involves a complex web of activities that have the potential to facilitate or hinder relationship building with customers (Smith and Gallicano, 2015, Mehmet and Clarke, 2016). Indeed, firms’ SMS use does not only restrict to maintaining presence via posting regular updates, but also involves interacting with customers (e.g. via seeking feedback, setting quizzes, etc.) as well as responding to customers’ questions. This research has examined in depth how SMS presence, interactivity and responsiveness each influence four key indicators of brand relationship strength, namely, commitment, intimacy, satisfaction and partner quality. Moreover, the findings of this study provide detailed insight about further complexities that firms using SMS face when interacting with their customers on multiple SMS platforms. In particular, the study has revealed differences among Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn in regards to the impact of presence, interactivity and responsiveness on those four indicators.”

**Pg 25: you say, “This research addresses this call and provides a better understanding of SMS use and its impact on B2B supplier-customer relationships.” Just say, “This research addresses this call.” The rest is redundant given the previous sentence.**

Thank you for your comment. We have deleted the second part of that sentence, as per your suggestion.

**Pg 25. In general I think you could strengthen the practical implications paragraph. First, you begin with “Some”. Be specific, aka, “There are # of practical implications...First...” You could also articulate why it matters better, aka, In today’s environment, B2B firms can no longer be casual about SMS. The growing body of research, including the present findings, strongly suggests a purposeful SMS strategy is needed.... (this kind of framing demonstrates your conviction and gives better direction).**

Thank you for your comment. We have now revised the practical implications paragraph according to your suggestions, starting with providing direction about the need for B2B brands to follow a purposeful SMS strategy, and then outlining clearly the three practical implications directly emerging from our study. The paragraph now reads as follows:

“The findings of this research offer B2B firms much needed practical guidance into SMS use in the effort to enhance B2B supplier-customer relationships. The growing body of research, including the current study, strongly suggests that a purposeful SMS strategy is needed. Specifically, according to Guesalaga (2016), B2B firms are increasingly using SMS but they still have little understanding about its consequences, and thus they lag behind in the race to leverage social media for business purposes (Michaelidou et al., 2011, Broekemier et al., 2015). The findings presented in this paper confirm that, in today’s environment, B2B firms can no longer be casual about SMS. Specifically, there are three practical implications emerging from this study. First, B2B firms are encouraged to carefully design their social media strategies and work actively to develop their presence on Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter, as those are the SMS sites used by customers to follow suppliers’ brands. Second, B2B brands are encouraged to develop their presence and interact with their customers on LinkedIn in particular, if they wish to enhance customers’ brand commitment and perceived partner quality. Third, they should also pay particular attention to Twitter and use it to solve

1  
2  
3 *customers' queries and problems, which, as revealed in this study, will further enhance*  
4 *customers' brand relationship commitment."*  
5  
6

7 **Pg 25, you say "...LinkedIn as well as Twitter"... try "LinkedIn, and Twitter...**

8  
9 Thank you for your comment. We have now revised this, and it now reads: *"...Facebook,*  
10 *LinkedIn, and Twitter"*  
11  
12

13  
14 **Pg 26: you say, "it should be acknowledged that" delete this. Also, you need to make**  
15 **the point more clear. I think it is a matter of saying that you "have not considered**  
16 **interaction effects, such as (explain to the reader by an example).**  
17

18 Thank you for your comment. We have now deleted the "it should be acknowledged that"  
19 phrase. We have also revised the phrasing, as you suggested. The next sentence also provides  
20 an example of such effects that could be explored further in future research. We have  
21 highlighted this by bringing the 'For example' in the beginning of the sentence. So, this now  
22 reads:  
23

24 *"First, in the study's conceptualisation and operationalisation of the B2B brand relationship*  
25 *strength, interaction effects between individual indicators have not been considered. For*  
26 *example, future research could examine the impact of SMS use on perceived partner quality*  
27 *and how this may subsequently lead to brand relationship commitment."*  
28  
29

30  
31 **Pg 26" You say, "The findings of the research therefore, are limited to the context in**  
32 **which this research has been carried out." You do not know this – what is not known is**  
33 **the extent that your findings can be generalized beyond the setting. I also do not know**  
34 **why you'd limit future research to emerging economies – it could be just as important to**  
35 **conduct this research in countries with more and less advanced use of SMS, etc.**  
36

37 Thank you for your comment. We have revised the sentence and it now reads as follows:

38 *"Therefore, further research is needed to explore the extent to which the findings presented in*  
39 *this paper are generalized beyond this setting."*  
40

41 The statement with regards to future research to emerging economies was a recommendation  
42 from Reviewer 2 in the first round of reviews. However, we agree with you that this may  
43 sound too restrictive and we have revised this. This whole paragraph now reads as follows:  
44

45 *"Second, the research was conducted on a sample of UK-based B2B SMEs firms with varied*  
46 *degrees of SMS use. Therefore, further research is needed to explore the extent to which the*  
47 *findings presented in this paper are generalized beyond this setting. Future research could*  
48 *examine the findings of the present research with B2B SMEs based in a range of settings that*  
49 *vary in terms of institutional, cultural or economic environments. For instance, the*  
50 *comparison between countries where use of SMS is more or less advanced may reveal*  
51 *differences in terms of the importance of certain dimensions of SMS use on brand*  
52 *relationship strength. Similarly, further examination of the current study's findings with B2B*  
53 *SMEs based in emerging economies would be particularly useful. This is because those firms*  
54 *have limited access to resources, hence can potentially benefit substantially from the use of*  
55 *SMS. Indeed, existing research has acknowledged that empirical studies on those firms'*  
56 *branding and customer relationship management practices are much needed (Odoom,*  
57 *2017)."*  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Reviewer: 2**

4 **Recommendation: Accept**

5  
6  
7  
8 **Comments:**

9 **The authors have satisfactorily addressed the comments. Good Job!**

10 Thank you for your comment and encouragement.

11  
12  
13  
14 **Additional Questions:**

15 **1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to**  
16 **justify publication?: Yes**

17 Thank you for your comment.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22 **2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of**  
23 **the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is**  
24 **any significant work ignored?: Yes**

25 Thank you for your comment.

26  
27  
28  
29  
30 **3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts**  
31 **or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is**  
32 **based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Satisfactory.**

33 Thank you for your comment.

34  
35  
36  
37 **4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions**  
38 **adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes**

39 Thank you for your comment.


40  
41  
42  
43 **5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any**  
44 **implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with**  
45 **the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes**

46 Thank you for your comment.

47  
48  
49  
50 **6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against**  
51 **the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's**  
52 **readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as**  
53 **sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Satisfactory**

54 Thank you for your comment.

Figure 1. Research framework



**Table 1. Measurement Scales**

Variable	Scale Reference	Adapted Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Commitment	Adapted from: Aaker et al (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My company is very loyal to supplier X</li> <li>• My company is willing to make small sacrifices in order to keep using supplier X</li> <li>• My company would be willing to postpone purchase if supplier X was temporarily unavailable</li> <li>• My company would stick with supplier X even if it let us down once or twice</li> <li>• My company is so happy with supplier X that we no longer feel the need to watch out for other alternatives</li> <li>• My company is likely to be using supplier X one year from now</li> </ul>	.774
Intimacy	Adapted from: Aaker et al (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My company would feel comfortable sharing detailed info about our business with supplier X</li> <li>• My company would feel comfortable describing supplier X to someone who was not familiar with it</li> <li>• My company is familiar with the range of products/services supplier X offers</li> <li>• My company has become very knowledgeable about supplier X</li> <li>• Supplier X really understands my company's needs in this sector</li> </ul>	.836
Satisfaction	Adapted from: Aaker et al (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My company is completely satisfied with supplier X</li> <li>• My company is completely pleased with supplier X</li> <li>• Supplier X is turning out to be better than we expected</li> </ul>	.846
Partner Quality	Adapted from: Thorbjornsen et al (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplier X treats my company like an important and valuable customer</li> <li>• Supplier X is dependable and reliable</li> <li>• Supplier X has always been good to my company</li> <li>• If supplier X makes a claim or promise about its products, it's probably true</li> </ul>	.899
Social Media Presence	Adapted from: Ou et al (2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a sense of human contact on supplier X's social media</li> <li>• There is a sense of personalness on supplier X's social media</li> <li>• There is human warmth on supplier X's social media</li> </ul>	.939

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a sense of human sensitivity on supplier X's social media</li></ul>	
Social Media Interactivity	Adapted from: Ou et al (2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I feel that I have a lot of control over my experience on supplier X's social media</li><li>• While on supplier X's social media, I can choose freely what I want to see</li><li>• On social media, supplier X facilitates two-way communication between us</li><li>• On social media, supplier X gives me the opportunity to talk to them</li></ul>	.883
Social Media Responsiveness	Adapted from: Agnihotri et al (2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supplier X is never too busy to respond to special requests on social media</li><li>• If I need something important, I am always able to reach supplier X on social media</li><li>• Supplier X always responds to social media posts/messages promptly, if originally not available</li></ul>	.886

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

**Table 2. Sample Characteristics**

<b>B2B industrial sector representation</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Service	41	20.5
Technology	22	11
Financial	5	2.5
Basic materials	2	1.0
Retail	12	6.0
Healthcare	9	4.5
Consumer goods	5	2.5
Manufacturing	33	16.5
Wholesale	5	2.5
Other	66	33.0
<b>Years of company operation in sector</b>		
1 to 5 years	5	2.5
6 to 10 years	14	7.0
11 to 15 years	18	9.0
16 to 20 years	18	9.0
20-25 years	33	16.5
More than 25 years	112	56.0
<b>Role in company</b>		
Director / CEO / General Manager	67	33.5
Marketing Director / Marketing Manager	56	28.0
Sales Director / Sales Manager	13	6.5
Social Media Manager	19	9.5
Other	45	22.5
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	104	52.0
Female	94	47.0
Prefer not to say	2	1.0
<b>Age range</b>		
20-25 years old	17	8.5
26-30 years old	26	13.0
31-35 years old	28	14.0
36-40 years old	20	10.0
41-45 years old	22	11.0
46-50 years old	19	9.5
51 years old and over	60	30.0
Prefer not to say	8	4.0
<b>Highest education level attained</b>		
High school graduate	23	11.5
Bachelor degree	91	45.5
Master degree	53	26.5
Doctoral degree	2	1.0
Other	16	8.0
Prefer not to say	15	7.5
<b>Total number of respondents</b>	<b>200</b>	



**Table 3. SEM Standardised Regression Estimates**

Hypotheses		Standardised Estimate $\beta$	S. E	R <sup>2</sup>
H1a SM Presence	→ Commitment	.200 **	.066	.12
H1b SM Presence	→ Intimacy	.314 ***	.049	.17
H1c SM Presence	→ Satisfaction	.286 ***	.061	.17
H1d SM Presence	→ Partner Quality	.259 ***	.056	.17
H2a SM Interactivity	→ Commitment	-.010 <sup>ns</sup>	.091	.12
H2b SM Interactivity	→ Intimacy	.108 <sup>ns</sup>	.066	.17
H2c SM Interactivity	→ Satisfaction	.058 <sup>ns</sup>	.084	.17
H2d SM Interactivity	→ Partner Quality	.206 **	.076	.17
H3a SM Responsiveness	→ Commitment	.201 **	.078	.12
H3b SM Responsiveness	→ Intimacy	.034 <sup>ns</sup>	.057	.17
H3c SM Responsiveness	→ Satisfaction	.136 <sup>ns</sup>	.072	.17
H3d SM Responsiveness	→ Partner Quality	.001 <sup>ns</sup>	.065	.17

\*\*\* $\rho < 0.001$ , \*\* $\rho < 0.05$ , <sup>ns</sup> Not Significant

**Table 4. Multi-group path Analysis (Social Media Platform)**

RELATIONSHIP	PATH COEFFICIENT (B, P)		
	Twitter	LinkedIn	Facebook
SMP→Commitment	$\beta = .140, p = ns$	$\beta = .234, p < **$	$\beta = .142, p = ns$
SMP→Intimacy	$\beta = .240, p < **$	$\beta = .303, p < **$	$\beta = .447, p < ***$
SMP→Satisfaction	$\beta = .205, p < **$	$\beta = .319, p < **$	$\beta = .349, p < **$
SMP→Partner Quality	$\beta = .193, p < **$	$\beta = .270, p < **$	$\beta = .412, p < ***$
SMI→Commitment	$\beta = .030, p = ns$	$\beta = .012, p = ns$	$\beta = .081, p = ns$
SMI→Intimacy	$\beta = .055, p = ns$	$\beta = .107, p = ns$	$\beta = .076, p = ns$
SMI→Satisfaction	$\beta = .110, p = ns$	$\beta = .126, p = ns$	$\beta = .088, p = ns$
SMI→Partner Quality	$\beta = .209, p = ns$	$\beta = .223, p < **$	$\beta = .038, p = ns$
SMR→Commitment	$\beta = .311, p < ***$	$\beta = .157, p = ns$	$\beta = .220, p = ns$
SMR→Intimacy	$\beta = .154, p = ns$	$\beta = .021, p = ns$	$\beta = .020, p = ns$
SMR→Satisfaction	$\beta = .205, p < **$	$\beta = .055, p = ns$	$\beta = .176, p = ns$
SMR→Partner Quality	$\beta = .030, p = ns$	$\beta = .042, p = ns$	$\beta = .113, p = ns$

(\*\*\* $\rho < 0.001$ , \*\* $\rho < 0.05$ , *ns* Not Significant – SMP = Social Media Presence; SMI = Social Media Interactivity; SMR = Social Media Responsiveness)