

NEGATIVE WORD OF MOUTH ON TWITTER

A LITTLE HUMANITY NEVER HURTS ANYONE



Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

Author: Maxime Hovenkamp
Student Number: S4205618
Mail Address: mhovenkamp.hovenkamp@student.ru.nl
Bachelorthesis

Study: Communication and Information Sciences
University: Radboud Nijmegen
First Tutor: Rob le Pair
Second Tutor: Béryll Hilberink
Nijmegen, December 18

Abstract

Organizations face great challenges when communicating via social media. More and more companies are using Twitter these days to serve their clients via Internet and react to complaints or negative Word of Mouth. In their use of Twitter, they can choose different styles of communication. The style we aimed to research in this paper is the Human Voice companies can use when replying to tweets with negative Word of Mouth. A Human Voice in tweets is a way of personalisation used by companies to give customers the feeling that they are interacting with a human instead of a big, faceless company. This research aimed to discover differences in the use of Human Voice in tweets by profit and Non Profit organizations. This could assist organizations in learning from each other's techniques and adapting (or improving) their communication styles. Furthermore, we aimed to discover whether there is a connection between the reason why people complain on Twitter and the kind of organization they are directing their complaint to. A corpus has been made consisting of 3290 tweets, all containing a form of negative Word of Mouth. With these tweets, multiple analyses have been performed. We found out that there was an almost significant correlation between the Use of Human Voice and the kind of organization. This indicates a weak relationship between the use of Human Voice and the kind of organization. The use of Human Voice might differ a lot per organization, and supposed is that the Profit Organizations use it in a stronger degree because they assign greater value to customer experience than Non Profit Organizations do. We found a significant correlation considering the reasons for complaint. This means that people complain to Profit Organizations for other reasons than to Non Profit Organizations. This finding could assist companies in adapting their communication style on Twitter to the different reasons and backgrounds of the complaints.

Introduction “Word of Mouth on Twitter: A Little Humanity Never Hurts Anyone”

Social media are highly beneficial for companies (Willemsen, 2014) and more and more marketing departments are starting to focus on their social platforms. Since the rising popularity of for instance Twitter, companies face unique challenges in communicating with clients and satisfying them. Organizations of all kinds need to take into account that everyone can use Twitter to share positive experiences as well as negative ones. Word of Mouth, defined by Kimmel and Kitchen as *information spread by people telling other people*, is spreading its way from offline to online communication (Kimmel & Kitchen, 2014, p.5). Researchers have been able to analyse offline WOM, but the methods for those analysis are not always adequate for online WOM. That is due to the different nature of the online and offline WOM. Therefore, a different method of analysis is needed for online WOM.

For instance, people use Twitter to share experiences with their followers. This is also a form of WOM; not in real life but in an electronic way (from now on: e-WOM). e-WOM can appear on everyone's Twitter, but what is more interesting is whether people tend to believe the information spread. The communication model of Katz and Lazarsfeld (1995) suggests that people such as close friends or family members can influence your opinion by spreading WOM you automatically relate to. As Edelman (2008) suggests, consumers turn to each other increasingly for insights about brands because the brands themselves keep sending mass-media messages without any regard for personal customer preferences. A little side note to this finding is that customers looking for other customers' opinion on the Internet might encounter one another while they would never meet in real life. The Internet opens doors to connections customers themselves could never make. Kimmel and Kitchen (2014, p.7) explain this as follows: *“Social media provide incidental means for WOM to disseminate across multitudes of persons who may only be linked by a common interest or need (so-called weak ties).”*

A phenomenon we increasingly see is n-WOM, a form of e-WOM where customers share negative feelings online, directing their complaints about products, brands, organizations or services towards organizations. Information spreads very fast and companies are no longer in complete control of their own marketing communication. This could have various consequences for companies (on social media). Followers (or so called “fans”) of the brand could spread their opinion, but unsatisfied customers could do that as well. When a customer starts complaining on Twitter or Facebook about a company, others could sympathize with this and join the discussion. In extreme cases, this might result in a phenomenon called “online firestorm”. An online firestorm is a huge wave of outrages on a company generated on social media within a very short time, which may lead to you believe everyone in your social environment has the same attitude towards the targeted brand (Pfeffer, Zorbach & Carley, 2014, 122).

WOM and companies

Companies can use WOM for marketing purposes when turning the negative vibe or reacting properly. It is known to be a challenge, but when handled right, the damage for a company can be controlled. For example, ING-DiBa, a German bank dealt in 2012 with an online firestorm on its facebook page. At first, they just let it happen and watched the

stakes in their page grow sky-high. After a while, followers of the bank started defending the bank on the page. The bank let it pass for two weeks and did not mingle in the conversation. After two weeks, they posted on the page that they read the discussion, they would keep the suggestions in mind and that any other n-WOM message posted from then on, would be deleted (Pfeffer et al., 2014). This approach generated positive WOM for the bank, and researchers agree that this reaction has more positive effects than ignoring the firestorm. Of course, there are lots of possible strategies how to be present and active on social media and how to react best in cases like this. Which strategy works best differs per company and situation.

Companies are aware of the fact that WOM exists and thus most of them have different strategies for promoting positive or repairing negative WOM. It is important to keep in mind that WOM is closely related to the stage of development of the social media management of the company. This is important to remember because companies differ a lot in experience, amount of workers at the social media department, budget and scientific knowledge. For that reason, we cannot expect all companies to act the same way when communicating via webcare. Whether the company is just entering the social media environment or it has a very experienced social media department (like Starbucks) makes a big difference. These differences are visible in the way companies handle WOM. Some companies do not react to it, some react in a very personal way and some companies developed a framework for workers how to react properly (Kerkhof, 2010).

The reasons of WOM

What is interesting for organisations to know is: *why* would people spread (n-)WOM? For companies, it would be helpful to know this so they can adapt and personalize their responses to complaints. This could lead to a better customer satisfaction and to a better image of the company.

It has been assumed for long time that extremely satisfied or extremely unsatisfied customers shared WOM, but new research sheds a light on different possibilities. Motives could also be social- and egorelated (East, Hammond & Wright, 2007) and the request for information and coincidental communication could also generate WOM (Mangold, Miller & Brockway, 1999).

There has been some research on the reasons for complaint on social media. Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, and Gremler (2004) classified eight motives people tend to have to share WOM on social platforms. These motives are invented in a research to WOM in all its forms, so not only n-WOM on Twitter. For that reason, we can use the motives in our research, but they are not made especially for our tweets. After some adaptations and the adding of examples, we could use six of the eight given motives. These motives were as follows:

1. Venting their negative feelings. For instance: "This customer service is worthless because my personal data don't fit in the system. What a failure!"
2. Concern for others. Example: "Weird that this packaging indicates lactose free product but I suffer an allergic reaction... Watch out everybody!"
3. Social benefits. This category is mostly relevant when searching on positive WOM, so we can't include it in our research.
4. Economic incentives. For example: "I had to call three times and still don't have my money back... I'm waiting @cz!!"

5. Helping the company. For instance: "The bus drove by two minutes early... Check the times on the matrix board and keep them updated @breng!"
6. Advice seeking. For instance: "Still waiting for my package to arrive @postNL, do you have an indication at which time it will be here?"
7. Platform assistance. This category will also not take part in our research because it is only present when looking at positive WOM.
8. Extraversion. This form is used to show that the sender of the tweet clearly has more knowledge than the concerned company. "This FOX Sports host doesn't know anything about soccer, he dares to forget about Sterling entirely!"

These motives are likely to influence consumers when writing WOM. Furthermore, Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) classified consumers into four categories of motives why they would transmit e-WOM:

1. Self interested helpers (driven by economic incentives)
2. Multiple motives (they have a lot of drives)
3. Consumer advocates (driven by their concern for others)
4. True altruists (driven to help the company and other consumers)

What we should keep in mind when defining reasons for n-WOM, is that positive WOM (p-WOM) appears much more often (East et al., 2007). It seems as if the internet is full of complaints and negativity, but in reality, this negativity is only a fraction of every WOM message on Twitter. We always think that the negative WOM is clearly the most appearing form in Twitter, but p-WOM is seen more (and even tends to be better remembered; Oetting, Niesytto, Sievert & Dost, 2010).

The interesting thing is of course how companies should react when they receive a complaint knowing which of the six identified motives the complainer has. Despite the complexity of identifying reasons of complaint it could be beneficial, as it has not been done before. With the help and adaptation of Henning Thurau's motives, an assumption of reasons could be made. For companies, it could be helpful to know the reasons so they could adapt their customer care and improve webcare facilities.

Researchers have found various ways to respond to n-WOM. Willemsen (2014) and Kelleher (2009) state that the more humanity a company shows (by using Human Voice) in a reaction, the more satisfied receivers will feel. This is due to the feeling that they are interacting with a human instead of a big faceless organisation. We could expect that the more it is used, the more dialogue takes place because it invites people to have a conversation instead of one-way communication to complain.

A human voice in webcare reactions can also lead to more positive evaluation of brands (Willemsen, 2014). Thereby, Kelleher and Miller (2006) found that the human voice influences the perception of trust, satisfaction and engagement and that customers experience the human voice in a tweet as a natural style of communication. When companies choose to communicate via a corporate or very formal voice, the stakeholders perceive the organisation as rigid (Christensen, Firat, & Cornelissen, 2009).

So showing humanity could be a key to satisfied customers. Willemsen (2014) explains this as the "conversational human voice", which captures all kinds of humanity. There are different strategies of applying a human voice:

1. Appealing rhetoric, which means inviting the public to give their opinion or take part in the conversation by saying “let us know how you feel” for instance.
2. Personalisation. Addressing tweeters personally by calling their name or signing a tweet with your own name for instance. What we address as personalisation in this research is indeed the signing of tweets with names or initials, but also the use of the singular words like “I”, “me” or “mine”. This sort of Human Voice will be the sort we will search for, because it is more clearly identified than the other two techniques.
3. Informal vocabulary.

To determine which strategy to apply, companies should adapt the techniques to their target group or type of organisation. According to Willemsen (2014), combining a few of these techniques may work, but companies should never overdo this.

What has not been researched yet, are the differences in human voice companies use. Are there different strategies used by different kinds of organizations? We know that commercial companies such as Ziggo or KPN use personalisation to show human voice, but what about non-profit organisations? Do they apply different strategies?

Answers to these questions could be relevant for companies facing organizational changes or for entirely new companies. Thereby, it could be helpful when developing an online customer service to know what the different approaches of profit and non-profit organisations mean for online webcare.

Research question

Our first research question is as follows:

What are the differences in the use of Human Voice when reacting to n-WOM between profit and non-profit organizations on Twitter and could the use of human voice be a possible trigger for dialogues? We would expect that the more Human Voice is used, the more dialogue takes place.

This has not been researched yet, so it is worth investigating because companies could benefit from it and could make a framework for reacting to WOM and improving their customer relations. Whilst this question is not measuring the effects or appropriateness of webcare, it could give more insight in connections between the use of human voice and the reasons why people formulate a complaint on Twitter.

In order to get more insight into the reasons to complain, we formulated our second research question as follows:

Which reasons do complainers on Twitter have to complain against profit organizations on Twitter and do these reasons differ when complaining to a non-profit organization?

Method

In order to find answers to our research questions, a corpus based analysis had to be done. The method of a corpus is the best fitting method for this research, because of the great amount of data, which can be gathered in it.

Materials

To find out what the differences are in the use of human voice, we needed a numerous amount of n-WOM tweets first. The tweets have been filtered by making an engine that filters all tweets sent with #fail, #faal, #zucht, #jammer, #slecht or #pff. With this filter, the so-called Twitter API (Application Programming Interface) randomly selected tweets sent between 23 Augustus and 21 September. We assumed that people using these hashtags were performing n-WOM. The criteria for tweets to be n-WOM were as follows:

1. Tweets should contain a clear complaint about a service/experience
2. The tweet should be formulated in a way that the company could respond to it
3. It should be visible for the company that they are being mentioned or that the tweet is directed to them, either with a hashtag (#company), a mention (@company) or literally by naming the company.

We also aimed to find differences in the appearing of dialogues. Therefore, a dialogue in this research is defined as: “A conversation consisting of at least three different tweets; one sent by a person as a complaint, a reaction sent by a company and a reaction to that reaction by the person complaining”.

Procedure

With these tweets, a corpus of about 11.000 tweets has been made. Students filtered these tweets by only selecting the tweets that were really n-WOM. This turned out to be a relatively heavy task, because not all tweets sent with these hashtags were meant seriously or they were not WOM. For instance, we found a lot of tweets saying “Oh I lost my keys again, gonna be late! #fail”, which of course cannot be counted as n-WOM. The final corpus of tweets counted 3290 tweets left to analyse.

Thirteen students coded around 800 tweets per person, defining whether the tweet was n-WOM or not by giving it a one or a zero. After deciding that, the object of complaining was identified: was it an actual product, a service, the communication, an idea or was the object of complaint unclear? For instance, someone tweeting about a dysfunctional router complains about an object, but a tweet about the long waiting line at customer service is related to a service. Afterwards, the sector of the company towards which the complaint was sent was categorised: either as being governmental, transports related, financial, sales, media or other.

Regarding the tweets, the way in which the company is mentioned was labelled: either with a mention sign in the beginning, or elsewhere in the tweet, or without a mention sign at all. Second attribute to identify here was the way of approaching the company: with a mention sign, a hashtag or by literally naming it. What we looked at next was if there were a reaction on the tweet by the company it was directed to and if that reaction led to a conversation. If there was a conversation, we counted the number of exchange units. We also identified two forms of human voice. The first variable identified how the

sender of the webcare tweet signed its tweet: by ^name, ^initials or not at all. The second Human Voice variable we looked at was whether the sender used the first person singular (with words like “I, me, mine”) or not. These two forms of Human Voice are both Personalisation (Willemsen, 2014). Willemsen identified three categories, but Personalisation is the one most clearly measurable. From now on a reference to Human Voice will be including only these two forms of Personalisation. The Human Voice was operationalized by creating a new variable that described the use of Human Voice as none, medium (only one of the two kinds of personalisation was used) or strong (both kinds were used in the same reaction).

For the second research question, which concerned the reasons to complain to Profit or Non Profit Organizations on Twitter, two students worked on the same data. Ten per cent of these data was coded by two researchers to make the analysis more reliable. By analysing the corpus of n-WOM tweets, the reasons of complaints could be discovered by coding the tweets. These two researches decided to use six of the eight reasons found by Hennig-Thurau (2004) and made clear instructions how to identify a reason. For example, a tweet saying “O my god this political party totally doesn’t keep its promises” can be coded as follows: because it is clear that this person does not have a reason for complaining and the complaining is the goal itself, this reason would be “Venting negative feelings”. When someone does have a reason to complain, because he or she wants help, we identified the reason as “Looking for advice”. An example of a tweet we did this with was “Does Twitter have a technical failure at the moment? I can’t see the amount of followers.. Fix this please you don’t ever fix anything @Twitter”.

The motives we used were as follows:

1. Venting their negative feelings.
2. Concern for others.
3. Economic incentives.
4. Helping the company.
5. Advice seeking.
6. Extraversion.

When working with two separate coders, the Cohen’s Kappa could be measured to find the trustworthiness of our identified reasons. The reliability of the two different coders of the reasons to complain was good: $\kappa=.902$, $p < .001$.

Analysis of Human Voice and Profit/Non Profit Organizations

The research group thus included 3290 nWOM tweets with the hashtags “fail”, “faal”, “zucht”, “jammer”, “slecht” or “pff”. These hashtags were used by tweeters complaining to Profit as well as Non Profit organizations. Our analysis is logically constructed around the tweets that did receive a response and we left out the tweets without a response of the analysis. The main characteristic we are interested in, is the use of Human Voice in the reaction tweets sent by both kinds of organizations.

Reactions of Organizations

In total, 524 of the 3290 Tweets were directed to a Non Profit Organization. Only 75 of the 524 tweets to a Non Profit Organization received a response (which is 14,3%). Of the tweets sent to a Profit Organization, 37,4% received a response. Possible causes for this are discussed in the Discussion Section. As shown in Table 1, Profit Organizations significantly replied often than Non Profit Organizations ($\chi^2(1)=105.205, p<.001$).

Table 1 Responses to Complaints by Profit and Non Profit Organizations

	No webcare reaction	Webcare reaction	Total
Non Profit, count	449	75	524
Non Profit, Adjusted Residual	10.3	-10.3	
Profit, count	1731	1035	2766
Profit, Adjusted Residual	-10.3	10.3	
Total count	2180	1110	3290

We operationalized Human Voice in two ways: (a) the webcare reaction tweet concluded the words “I”, “me” or “mine” or (b) the tweets were signed with a name or initials. As Table 2 shows, most tweets contained a form of Human Voice in the form of signing a tweet with initials.

Table 2 The Frequency of the use of Human Voice by Signing a Tweet with a Name or Initials

	Frequency	Percent
None	349	10.6
Initials	580	17.6
Name	181	5.5
Total	1110	33,7

As Table 3 shows, Human Voice in the form of the words I, Me or Mine takes place less often than Human Voice in terms of the use of names or initials. As shown below, in 476 cases one of the three words was noticed.

Table 3 The Frequency of the use of Human Voice by using the words I, Me or Mine

	Frequency	Percent
Not I, me or mine	634	19.3
I, me or mine	476	14.5
Total	1110	33.8

To determine whether there is a difference in the use of Human Voice between Profit and Non Profit organizations, we conducted multiple analyses with the *type of Organizations* and *the Use of Human Voice* as variables. Regarding the Human Voice, this variable was measured as a nominal variable (made into one variable as explained in the Method Section). We performed a Chi Square test with the degree of Human Voice and the kind of organization being Profit or Non Profit. As shown in Table 4, some adjusted residuals are close to 1.96, which indicates that the differences, which were almost significant, indicate a tendency. The kind of organization did not show a significant relationship with the use of Human Voice ($\chi^2(2)=4.817, p=.090$). As this is close to .05, we could say that the use of Human Voice has a weak relationship to the kind of organisation.

Table 4 the Use of Human Voice By Profit and Non Profit Organizations

		No Human Voice	Medium Human Voice	Strong Human Voice	Total
Non Profit	Count	24	31	20	75
	Expected Count	16.6	33.2	25.5	75
	Adjusted Residual	2.1	-.5	-1.3	
Profit	Count	222	460	533	1035
	Expected Count	229.4	457.8	347.8	1035
	Adjusted Residual	-2.1	.5	1.3	
Total	Count	246	491	373	1110
	Expected	246	491	373	1110

As shown in Table 4, there were a lot of tweets that did not contain a form of Human Voice. Profit Organizations significantly used Human Voice more often than Non Profit Organizations. The Adjusted Residual is close to 1.96, so this is a significant finding. Non Profit Organizations used the Medium Human Voice most often, whilst Profit Organizations preferred a strong use. Non Profit Organizations sent more tweets with no form of Human Voice than with a strong form of Human Voice.

Regarding the second part of the first research question, we would have to find out to what extent the degree of Human Voice relates to the amount of dialogue on Twitter. The Profit Organizations use the strongest kind of Human Voice the most, and following our hypothesis, there would be more dialogues when tweeting to a Profit Organization.

To test this hypothesis, we performed another Chi Square Test. The test turned out to be significant for the Profit Organizations ($\chi^2(2)=17.331, p < .001$) but not significant for Non Profit Organizations ($\chi^2(2)=.604, p = .739$). This significance is entirely assigned to Profit Organizations, also because the Adjusted Residuals (in Table 6) of the Non Profit Organizations are way too far from 1.96. So when strong Human Voice is used by Profit Organizations, more dialogues appear. It seems, according to Table 5, that when

the strong form is used, there is significantly more dialogue than when no form or the medium form is used.

Table 5 Dialogues in Relation to the use of Human Voice

		No dialogue	Dialogue	Total
Human Voice	Not used, count	117	129	246
	Expected count	91.1	154.9	246
	Adjusted residual	3.9	-3.9	
	Used in medium form, count	178	313	491
	Expected count	181.8	309.2	491
	Adjusted residual	-.5	.5	
	Used in strong form, count	116	257	373
	Expected count	138.1	234.9	373
	Adjusted residual	-2.9	2.9	
	Total Count	411	699	1110
	Expected count	411	699	1110

Table 6 Dialogue in Relation to No, Strong or Medium Human Voice regarding Profit and Non Profit Organizations

Non Profit Organizations				No Human Voice	Medium Human Voice	Strong Human Voice	Total
Non Profit	Dialogue?	No	Count	11	11	8	30
			Expected Count	9.6	12.4	8	30
			Adjusted Residual	.7	-.7	.0	
		Yes	Count	13	20	12	45
			Expected Count	14.4	18.6	12	45
			Adjusted Residual	-.7	.7	.0	
Profit	Dialogue?	No	Count	106	167	108	381
			Expected Count	81.7	169.3	129.9	381
			Adjusted Residual	3.8	-.3	-3.0	
		Yes	Count	116	293	245	654
			Expected Count	140.3	290.7	223.1	654
			Adjusted Residual	-3.8	.3	3.0	

Analysis of reasons to complain

Regarding the second research question, we tested if the reasons of complaining had a connection with the kind of organization. For this question, we coded 400 random tweets of the total corpus with six of the eight motives of Hennig-Thurau (2004) to complain. Ten per cent of these tweets was coded by two researchers to make the analysis more reliable. The reliability of the two different coders of the reasons to complain was good: $\kappa=.902, p<.001$. As shown in Table 7, most people complained just to vent their negative feelings. This means that they had no other motive, such as money or the desire for help.

Table 7 Reasons to Complain per Organization

	Venting negative feelings	Concern for others	Economic incentives	Helping the company	Advice seeking	Extraversion	Total
Non Profit	47	2	1	2	3	9	64
Profit	55	26	11	7	31	5	135
Total	102	28	12	9	34	14	199

Our particular interest lies in the difference between Profit and Non Profit organizations, so we made a scorecard to show which reasons are most popular per organization:

Table 8 Reasons to Complain Ranking List per Organization

Top six Profit Organization	Top six Non Profit Organizations
1: Venting negative feelings	1: Venting negative feelings
2: Advice seeking	2: Extraversion
3: Concern for others	3: Advice seeking
4: Economic incentives	4: Helping the company & concern for others*2
5: Helping the company	6: Economic incentives
6: Extraversion*	
<i>*Extraversion was not seen in complaints directed to Profit Organizations</i>	<i>*2 These reasons were both seen two times so share the fourth place in the ranking</i>

This scorecard shows that “Venting negative feelings” is for both kinds of organizations the most popular reason. The rest of the numbers are scattered, could this be significantly related to the kind of organization?

To find this out, we performed a Chi Square test. The kind of organization did show a significant relationship with the Reason to Complain ($\chi^2(5)=35.728, p<.001$). This means that the Reason to Complain has a correlation with the kind of organization the complaint is directed at. For both types of organizations, the will to vent negative feelings is the foremost reason, but the economic incentives are a consistent reason regarding the Profit Organization, whilst tweets to a Non Profit Organization with economic incentives are almost negligible. The Adjusted Residual for *Concern for Others* and *Economic Incentives* is with 1.8 very close to 1.96, so especially for these two reasons, the finding is significant.

Table 9 The Reasons to Complain per Organization

			Non Profit	Profit	Total
Reason	Venting negative feelings	Count	47	55	102
		Adjusted Residual	4.3	-4.3	
	Concern for others	Count	2	26	28
		Adjusted Residual	-1.8	1.8	
	Economic Incentives	Count	1	11	12
		Adjusted Residual	-1.8	1.8	
	Helping the Company	Count	2	7	9
		Adjusted Residual	-.7	.7	
	Advice seeking	Count	3	31	33
		Adjusted Residual	-3.2	3.2	
	Extraversion	Count	9	5	14
		Adjusted Residual	2.7	-2.7	
Total		Count	64	135	199

Conclusion and Discussion

The first research question was *“What are the differences in use of human voice when reacting to n-WOM between profit and non-profit organizations on Twitter and could the use of human voice be a possible trigger for dialogues?”* Regarding the first research question, we found a non-significant relationship between the Use of Human Voice and the kind of organization. This finding was almost significant, so we could say there was a weak relationship. This fits in the expectations partly, as we thought there might be a connection because of a greater professionalism in the costumer care of Profit organisations. We did find that the use of Human Voice triggers dialogues.

There are many possible differences between these kinds of organizations that could explain this finding. To start with, Profit Organizations often have a customer service with a social media team who react to WOM on daily basis. We could say that Profit Organizations have way more financial resources, means and capacity to monitor and reply to (online) WOM. This could be the reason why people complaining to Profit Organizations received more replies with Human Voice than the tweets to Non Profit Organizations. Because these organizations do not aim to make profit, their focus is entirely different. For example, they would prefer to use their financial resources for research rather than establishing a trendy social media team. However, this does not fully explain the differences in use of Human Voice.

What we could say, regarding the previous remarks, is that social media experts working for Profit Organizations have more knowledge and feeling for online conversations than non-experts working at costumer service for a Non Profit Organization. This is likely because the Profit sector greatly values these experts and the Non Profit does that less. Profit Organizations must always try their best to keep costumers close and focus more on their webcare to achieve that; Non Profit Organizations have that in a lesser degree. They use other ways to bind people to the organization because they have another goal with their customers. An expert in the Profit Sector might know that they should use Human Voice for the greater costumer experience and be more aware of the possible dialogues. So the fact that the real experts work in the Profit sector and that they care in a greater way about customer experience could be a reason why they use Human Voice more often and in a stronger degree.

People tweeting to a Non Profit Organization received reply in lesser degree than people complaining to a Profit Organization. This is explainable with the finding that Profit Organizations use Human Voice more, so they are more active in customer service, dialogues and inviting complainers for conversation.

Concerning the second part of the first research question, there has been found that the use of Human Voice leads to more conversations. Huibers and Verhoeven (2014) aimed to seek whether Human Voice led to more satisfaction, but didn't succeed. The aim of this paper was not to search this, but the fact that Human Voice leads to more reactions could predict that customers value these tweets more. In line with the research question we found out that the degree of Human Voice correlates with the amount of dialogue on Twitter. That finding was in line with expectations, as we knew that Human Voice invites people to start a dialogue and leads to a more personal approach. Customers reacted more on the Human Voice tweets than to the more formal and detached tweets without

Human Voice. So if companies want to have conversations with the customers, or they aim to better understand them, the use of Human Voice on Twitter is recommended. Willemsen (2014) and Kelleher (2009) state that the more humanity a company shows (by using “Human Voice”) in a reaction, the more satisfied receivers will feel. This could also be in line with the finding that they react more on the “Human Voice Tweets”.

Both kinds of companies use Human Voice in more than 50% of their reply-tweets, but the Profit organizations used the strongest form the most whilst Non Profit used the Medium variant. This could also explain why there are more dialogues when tweeting to a Profit organization.

So tweets with a Human Voice receive more reactions. But that still leaves us with the question why people would complain on Twitter. Knowing the reasons of complaining could be beneficial for companies, so they can adapt their customer care (and use of Human Voice) and personalize it. The reasons why people complain or perform n-WOM on twitter turned out to have a significant relation with the kind of organization. For both kinds of organizations, the will to vent negative feelings was the most appearing reason to complain. This means that customers had no other goal, such as getting their money back or being assisted. Regarding the Profit Organizations, economic incentives were also a stimulus for complaining, whilst the Non Profit Organizations faced this reason less often. This could be because of the fact people paid money for a product or service, which did not function optimally, and they wanted financial compensation for it. Non Profit Organizations do not sell anything, so complaining with the goal of obtaining money does not apply to a Non Profit Organization. The results were significant, so it can be concluded that there is a connection between the reasons and the organizations. This was expected because of the different positions of the companies in society. The role of Profit Organizations is mostly to sell people products or services, whilst Non Profit organizations aim at helping people or serving them.

Our research has some limitations. Tweets to Non Profit Organizations were less represented in the corpus, with only 15,9%. Ideally, there would be more Non Profit Organization Tweets so the analysis would be more reliable. The tweets in the corpus were coded by thirteen different researchers, so the results would be more certain if one or two researchers coded the entire corpus. That would make the research more reliable, because there would be less mistakes and it would be easier for the researchers to consult each other about the coding. This would take a lot of time, so in further research it could be taken into account.

For further research, it could be interesting to aim at finding whether web care including Human Voice is more adequate and which form of Human Voice would be the best. We have found motives of clients to complain, but we didn’t aim to find any perceptions of the web care reactions to these complaints.

There has been some research (by Huibers and Verhoeven for instance) on the effects of Human Voice on corporate reputation; this would also be an interesting focus in future research. For these kinds of research, an experimental design would be necessary. The outcomes of this research could be a helpful starting point for the material and design of such an experimental follow-up research.

Sources

- East, R., Hammond, K., & Wright, M., (2007). "The relative incidence of positive and negative word of mouth: a multi-category study." *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 24 (2): 175-184.
- Edelman (2008). "Edelman Trust Barometer." www.edelman.com. Visited at 30-10-2015.
- Christensen, L.T., Firat, A.F., & Cornelissen, J. (2009). New tensions and challenges in integrated communications. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 14(2), 207-219.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K.P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D.D., (2004). Electronic Word-of-Mouth via Consumer-Opinion Platforms: What Motivates Consumers to Articulate Themselves on the Internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18 (1): 38-52.
- Huibers, J.C., & Verhoeven, J.W.M. (2014). Het gebruik van webcarestrategieën en conversational human voice in Nederland, en de effecten hiervan op de corporate reputatie. *Tijdschrift voor Communicatiewetenschap*, 42 (2), 165-189
- Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F., (1995). *Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Kelleher, T. (2009). Conversational Voice, Communicated Commitment, and Public Relations Outcomes in Interactive Online Communication. *Journal of Communication* 59, 172-188.
- Kelleher, T., & Miller, B.M. (2006). Organizational blogs and the human voice: relational strategies and relational outcomes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11, 395-414.
- Kerkhof, P. (2010). Merken en social media. In: S. van den Boom, E. Smit, & S. de Bakker (Eds.), *Nachtmerrie of droom: de ROI van customer media*, p. 149-154. Heemstede (NL): Customer Media Council.
- Kimmel, A. J., & Kitchen, P. J. (2014). WOM and social media: presaging future directions for research and practice, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 20:(1-2), 5-20, DOI: 10.1080/13527266.2013.797730
- Mangold, W. G., Miller, F., & Brockway, G.R.,(1999). Word-of- Mouth Communication in the Service Marketplace.*Journal of Services Marketing*, 13 (1); 73-89.
- Oetting, M., Niesytto, M., Sievert, J. & Dost, F., (2010). Positive Word-of-Mouth is More Effective than Negative – Because It Sticks!. TRND Research Report. <http://www.trnd.com/company>
- Pfeffer, J., Zorbach, T., & Carley, K. M. (2014). Understanding online firestorms: Negative word-of-mouth dynamics in social media networks, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 20 (1-2), 117-128.
- Willemsen, L. (2014). Hoe persoonlijk moet je zijn in webcare? *Marketingfacts*. <http://www.marketingfacts.nl/berichten/hoe-persoonlijk-moet-je-zijn-in-webcare>, visited at 4-10-2015

