

Engagement, Interactivity, and Diffusion of Innovations

The Case of Social Businesses

Ruth Avidar

Introduction

Engagement has gained increasing popularity in various fields and disciplines including marketing, psychology, communication, public relations, and organizational studies. The Internet, especially social media, has introduced various new ways for public–organization interaction and engagement. Communicative processes within this context involve both engagement and interactive communication. This chapter integrates engagement and interactivity with the diffusion of innovations (DOI) to explore the social processes involved in engagement in an online environment. The DOI theory was presented by Everett M. Rogers in 1962 to explain how a new idea, behavior, or product, spreads over time through a social system and is adopted. Because the process of diffusion is essentially a social process, it involves interactive communication and engagement among potential adopters and others. In the 1960s, communication with others was mostly face-to-face encounters or conversations over the phone. Now, in the era of social networks and smartphones, many encounters take place online, and include various new ways of communication and engagement. Social businesses are a new type of organization that combines environmental aims with business approaches. As such they were used as a case study to argue for the importance of interpersonal communication and opinion leaders in the social processes involved in engagement in an online environment.

Online Engagement

In 2014 the *Journal of Public Relations Research* dedicated an issue to *engagement* arguing that research containing descriptions, classifications, and typologies of engagement was flourishing while lacking a coherent theory (Johnston, 2014). Indeed, scholars have conceptualized and defined engagement as a process, a state of mind and an orientation aiming to improve understanding among participants (Johnston, 2014; Kent & Taylor, 2002; Taylor & Kent, 2014). In recent years *engagement* has gained increasing popularity in various fields and disciplines, while the emergence of the Internet and mobile platforms resulted in an increasing interest in *social media engagement* and *mobile engagement*. Social media engagement involves “communication channels that are used to form or maintain social relationships through the creation and exchange of electronic interpersonal communication” (LaRose, Connolly, Lee, Li, & Hales, 2014, p. 60).

This type of engagement is interdisciplinary, and focuses on opportunities enabled by online and mobile media to engage with individuals, publics, employees, corporations, nonprofits, governmental agencies, and others.

Digital communication presents an opportunity for public relations to apply its existing strengths in earning coverage, building online relationships, and managing corporate reputation (Yaxley, 2012). It is through the interactivity of social media that enables relational exchanges between sellers and buyers, and promotes intimate relationships based on trust, commitment, and emotional bonds (Sashi, 2012). Social media ultimately is a tool that helps to create a more human face for organizations and has the potential to foster relationships with stakeholders (Sweetser, 2014). Social media not only enables interaction and engagement among organizations and publics, but also among members of a public themselves who consume, produce, and share online information and become cocreators of meanings (Ariel & Avidar, 2015). In recent years, electronic word of mouth (eWOM) has become very popular among consumers who share online marketing information on social media platforms. This information influences their attitudes and behavior toward services and products because they perceive its sources as more trustworthy than organizational messages (Chu & Kim, 2011).

Before exploring online engagement, the differences between engagement and interactivity, key elements that contribute to positive relational outcomes, and organization–public relationship (OPR) building (Avidar, 2013, 2017; Hallahan, 2003; Kelleher, 2009; Kelleher & Miller, 2006) will first be discussed.

Interactivity and Engagement

Interactivity is one of the main concepts of computer-mediated communication (CMC) and has been studied for almost four decades. Although it is widely recognized as a characteristic of new media, interactivity can also be found in more traditional settings (McMillan, 2002), and it serves as a point of confluence between mass and interpersonal communication.

Similar to engagement, interactivity does not have a formal operational definition. Research into interactivity can be roughly divided into three types:

The first type of research refers to interactivity as a *perception-related variable* and focuses on participants' experiences and self-reports (Newhagen, 2004; Wu, 1999). These studies frequently focus on customers and analyze how various elements (such as multimedia and speed) influence the ways in which customers perceive or experience the interactivity level of a medium. Other studies focus on the relations between the user's psychological and social characteristics and his/her perceptions of the level of interactivity of a medium (Ariel & Avidar, 2015).

The second type of research explores interactivity as a *medium characteristic* and focuses on the technological features of the medium and the ability to generate activity. Bucy and Tao (2007) defined interactivity as “technological attributes of mediated environments that enable reciprocal communication or information exchange, which afford interaction between communication technology and users or between users through technology” (p. 656). This type of interactivity is also known as “functional interactivity” (Bucy & Tao, 2007; Sundar, 2004; Sundar, Kalyanaraman, & Brown, 2003). In the fields of public relations and marketing, interactivity is often explored as a medium characteristic or a perception-related variable. Various studies try to identify general characteristics of a medium (such as user control and two-way communication) that enhance interactivity and relationship building (Ki & Hon, 2006; Watkins & Lewis, 2014). For example, Oh and Sundar (2015) suggest that the interactive features of a website contribute to persuasion outcomes and greater user engagement.

The third type of research treats interactivity as a *process-related variable*, and focus on the process of message transition and reciprocity in a communication setting, mainly regarding

responsiveness and interchange (Avidar, 2013, 2017; McMillan & Hwang, 2002; Rafaeli, 1988). Pearson (1989) argued that communication is interactive, and parties should agree upon rules governing responsiveness among them to have a successful communication. Rafaeli (1988) suggested an interactivity model and argued that interactivity is “an expression of the extent that in a given series of communication exchanges, any third (or later) transmission (or message) is related to the degree to which previous exchanges referred to even earlier transmissions” (p. 111). This type of interactivity is also known as “contingent interactivity” (Kelleher, 2009; Sundar *et al.*, 2003). Avidar (2013) suggested Rafaeli’s (1988) model be broadened and presented the *responsiveness pyramid*. The aim of the pyramid is to clearly distinguish between *responsiveness* and *interactivity*. The responsiveness pyramid makes a distinction between the three types of responses: *noninteractive* (a response that does not refer to a request), *reactive* (a response that solely refers to a request), or *interactive* (a response that refers to a request and initiates an additional turn/s at the same time). According to the pyramid, responses vary in their potential contribution to relational outcomes while interactive responses contributed the most to relational outcomes.

Regardless of the perspective embraced for interactivity, research from all three approaches usually present interactivity as a positive construct, which contributes to relational outcomes and OPR building (Avidar, 2013, 2017; Hallahan, 2003; Kelleher & Miller, 2006; Kelleher, 2009). This presentation of interactivity might lead to confusion between interactivity and engagement. The next section makes a clearer connection between the two constructs.

Engagement

To better understand engagement, we need first to distinguish between interactivity and engagement. Interactivity, as a process-related variable, is a highly responsive type of a message that encourages the continuation of an interaction using elements such as requests, invitations, and suggestions (Avidar, 2013). According to Rafaeli and Ariel (2007), interactivity could be seen as a process of information exchange, while the transmission of information is in the center of the interaction. Hence, interactivity is mainly based on a cognitive component of information exchange between participants.

When looking at *engagement* we can see that engagement contains not merely a cognitive component of information exchange, but also an affective component. Indeed, Johnston (2014) suggests that engagement is a process, a state of mind, or an orientation. In other words, unlike interactivity that exists as soon as a response refers to a request and initiates an additional turn/s (Avidar, 2013), engagement is also an orientation or a state of mind in which all dialogic partners are “willing to give their whole selves” (Kent & Taylor, 2002, p. 26) to the encounter. In other words, interactivity mainly involves information exchange, while engagement also involves feelings and attitudes. Thus participants might interact and exchange information and opinion in an interactive manner, without further engagement. According to Taylor and Kent (2014), to have engagement, there must be a two-way relational give-and-take based on interactive communication aiming to improve understanding among participants (Taylor & Kent, 2014). They also argue that since engagement is part of a dialogue—it is not merely a process of information exchange but rather an orientation that values interpersonal interaction, meaning making, cocreation, and empathy (Taylor & Kent, 2014).

Various scholars agree that engagement has a cognitive and an affective component (Jacques, Preece, & Carey, 1995; Laurel, 1993). According to Kang (2014), a decision to engage with an organization is not merely a cognitive rational decision, but rather an affective decision based on trust and affective bonding. Others assert that customer engagement might be a result of a calculative cognitive commitment and an affective emotional commitment (Bowden, 2009;

Sashi, 2012). Chu and Kim (2011) argue that social relationship variables are key determinants of eWOM via social networking sites including normative influence (tendency to conform to the expectations of others) and informational influence (tendency to accept information from knowledgeable others).

Nevertheless, it is important to note that engagement does not necessarily mean consensus or agreement; rather, engagement reflects a dialogic process and orientation in which parties communicate, air different opinions, and exchange ideas without the compulsion to reach an agreement (Kent & Taylor, 2002). It is also worthwhile to note that referring to various online activities on new media platforms as “online engagement” is misleading. Indeed, content managers and marketers often refer to “likes,” “comments,” and “shares” on their Facebook pages as evidences of interactivity and engagement with their publics. Nevertheless, as argued by Ariel and Avidar (2015), new platforms are not inherently interactive or engaging but rather *enable* interactivity and engagement, and in order to decide whether a process of communication was interactive or involved engagement, there is a need to analyze the interaction and decide based on its unique characteristics whether there was a two-way relational give-and-take based on interactive communication that aimed to improve understanding among participants (Table 34.1) (Taylor & Kent, 2014).

Although interactivity and engagement can be found in various online settings, this chapter will integrate interactivity and engagement with the Rogers’ DOI theory to explore the importance of interpersonal communication and opinion leaders in the process of engagement in an online environment.

Table 34.1 Similarities and differences between interactivity and engagement

	<i>Interactivity</i>	<i>Engagement</i>
Similarities	<p>A two-way communication that involves responsiveness and interchange (Avidar, 2013)</p> <p>No compulsion to reach an agreement</p> <p>Usually presented as a positive construct, which contributes to relational outcomes and OPR building (Avidar 2013, 2017; Hallahan, 2003; Kelleher & Miller, 2006; Kelleher, 2009)</p>	<p>A two-way communication that involves responsiveness and interchange</p> <p>No compulsion to reach an agreement</p> <p>Usually presented as a positive construct, which contributes to relational outcomes and OPR building</p>
Differences	<p>A process of message transition and reciprocity (Rafaeli & Ariel, 2007)</p> <p>Focuses on the transmission of information (Rafaeli & Ariel, 2007)</p> <p>Based on a cognitive component of information exchange between participants</p> <p>Exists as soon as a response refers to a request and initiates an additional turn/s (Avidar, 2013)</p>	<p>A process, a state of mind or an orientation (Johnston, 2014) involving feelings and attitudes</p> <p>Focuses on a two-way relational give-and-take (Taylor & Kent, 2014)</p> <p>Has a cognitive and an affective component (Jacques <i>et al.</i>, 1995; Laurel, 1993)</p> <p>Exists when there is a two-way relational give-and-take aiming to improve understanding among participants (Taylor & Kent, 2014)</p>

Engagement and DOI: The Case of Social Businesses

Diffusion of innovations theory

The DOI (Rogers, 1962, 1995) explains how a new idea, behavior, or product diffuses over time through a specific population or social system and is adopted by the population. According to the theory, to be self-sustaining, an innovation must be widely adopted by the population and reach a critical mass. There is a five-stage process by which an individual decides whether to adopt an innovation and whereby diffusion is accomplished. The first stage of the process is *knowledge*—when an individual is exposed to the existence of an innovation; the second stage is *persuasion*—when an individual forms a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the innovation; the third stage is *decision*—when there is engagement in activities that lead to adopting or rejecting the innovation; the fourth stage is *implementation*—the innovation is used; and the final stage is *confirmation*—an individual seeks reconfirmation of an innovation-decision already made or reverses a previous decision.

Rogers (1962, 1995) distinguishes between five different adopter categories based on their innovativeness (Innovators, Early Adopters, Early Majority, Late Majority, and Laggards), and argues that gaining awareness-knowledge is usually not a passive activity; rather, it requires that the public actively expose themselves to messages about innovation. In addition, their predispositions influence their behavior toward communication messages and the effects of the messages. Rogers (1962, 1995) also stresses that while mass media channels can play an important role in achieving awareness-knowledge, opinion leaders and close ties play an important role in facilitating engagement, since most individuals in the persuasion stage turn to others to obtain a subjective opinion about the innovation. In other words, DOI has great relevance for engagement since it demonstrates how interactive interpersonal communication facilitates the outcomes of an engagement process, or in the words of Rogers (2002), DOI is essentially “a social process through which people talking to people spread an innovation” (p. 990). This social process involves interactivity since it is based on a cognitive component of information exchange between individuals aiming to better understand an innovation, and also on engagement, since it involves an affective component of two-way relational give-and-take between individuals sharing their subjective opinions, attitudes, and feelings regarding an innovation.

To better understand the social processes involved in engagement in an online environment, social businesses as a case study will be used to explore interactivity and engagement.

Social businesses

First introduced in 1976 by the Nobel Peace Prize winner, Prof. Muhammad Yunus from Bangladesh, social businesses are a new type of a business. As explained by Yunus (2007), a social business is a financially self-sustainable business that is created and designed to address a social problem. Unlike a “regular” business, its aim is not to maximize profits (although profits are desirable). Unlike a nonprofit organization, it does not rely on donations or grants.

Social businesses engage in various social activities such as employing and empowering distressed youth, employing mentally and physically disabled, and promoting weakened and minority populations. Examples of social businesses include a bakery that trains distressed youth to be confectioners or a call center that employs the blind.

As a financially self-sustainable business, social businesses need customers and clients to survive. Public relations can help social businesses raise awareness of their products and services, build a strong and positive reputation, and engage with strategic publics (McKie & Toledano, 2008; Wilcox & Cameron, 2010). Raising awareness of a business is satisfactory only for the first stage of *Knowledge*. To form a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward social businesses, potential

adopters need to interact with “others,” such as organizational representatives, adopters and potential adopters, volunteers, and employees and learn from their knowledge and experience.

Interactivity, engagement and DOI: The case of social businesses

As previously explained, DOI has great relevance for engagement since it demonstrates how interactive interpersonal communication facilitates the outcomes of an engagement process. Interpersonal communication often involves interactivity and engagement in the form of exchanging and sharing information, opinions, and attitudes. This chapter uses social businesses as a case study, not only because social businesses are a new type of organization, thus making them relevant for DOI theory, but also because the dual nature of social businesses “invites” the exchange of information about their business-like characteristics (i.e., prices, locations, products, and services) as well as subjective opinions and attitudes regarding their societal goals (i.e., empowering distressed populations, fighting poverty, and reducing unemployment).

According to the DOI theory (Rogers, 1962, 1995) the first stage in the process of diffusion is *knowledge*, or when an individual is exposed to the existence of an innovation. The exposure to an innovation often starts with no interactivity or engagement, while potential adopters are exposed passively or actively to media channels (TV, papers, radio, and Internet). Sometimes the process of diffusion ends in this stage because the innovation does not fit the potential adopter’s needs, believes interests, and attitudes. In other cases, potential adopters move to two-way communication to better understand the innovation. In this stage of *persuasion* potential adopters turn to close ties and opinion leaders to obtain a subjective opinion about the innovation based on their personal experience. This interpersonal communication can be interactive and involve exchanges of information and opinions (when each turn refers to previous turn/s and initiates additional turn/s) (Avidar, 2013), and it can become engagement when it involves feelings and attitudes in a two-way relational give-and-take (Taylor & Kent, 2014). In either case the usage of interpersonal communication during the DOI process helps facilitating the outcomes of an engagement process.

This chapter explores how engagement, interactivity and DOI work to explain the diffusion of social businesses in Israel. A survey conducted in 2015 among 962 Israeli participants, found that almost 80 percent of respondents did not know what a social business is, have never been in any contact with social businesses, and were not exposed to social businesses via online or “traditional” media (Avidar, 2017). In other words, the majority did not even start the process of DOI and have not reached even the first stage of *knowledge-awareness*. The *Knowledge* stage is crucial for the continuation of DOI because people cannot engage, experience, or adopt an innovation without knowing about it. Approximately a fifth of the respondents (21%) knew what a social business was before the majority and therefore was categorized as *Early Knowers*. The members of this group did not have interactive communication or engagement with representatives of social businesses or with others, but they had some kind of knowledge about social businesses, which they partially received from online media (52%) and traditional media (36%). Indeed, as suggested by Rogers (1962, 1995), *Early Knowers* are not necessarily adopters of an innovation because they might decide to reject the innovation. Eighteen percent of the respondents identified themselves as personally engaged with social businesses. The members of this group had mostly passed all five stages of the process of diffusion from *knowledge* to *confirmation*. Based on the distinction made by Rogers (1962, 1995), we can identify this group as *Innovators* or *Early Adopters* because they have had a personal experience with social businesses before the majority. As previously explained, a decision to engage with an organization is not merely a cognitive rational decision based on knowledge and information, but rather an affective decision based on trust and affective bonding (Kang, 2014). Indeed, looking at the group of *Innovators* or *Early Adopters* we can see that their relations with social businesses involve both a cognitive and an affective component:

The cognitive component

Rogers (1995) argues that the innovation-decision process involves information-seeking and information-processing activities, aimed to reduce uncertainty about the advantages and disadvantages of an innovation. The cognitive component helps to promote the process of diffusion by gaining understanding of an innovation based on the knowledge and experiences of others. This often involves interactive communication with close ties, organizational representatives, change agents, opinion leaders, and online communities. Indeed, the members of this group knew what social businesses are and what they do through online media, traditional media, and exchanges with close ties and organizational representatives. In addition, they were Facebook friends of at least one social business (Avidar, 2017). Rogers (1962, 1995) argued the cognitive component of DOI is present mainly in the first stage of *knowledge*, and the second stage of *persuasion*.

The affective component

Rogers (1995) suggests that at the persuasion stage, the individual “forms a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the innovation. Whereas the mental activity at the knowledge stage was mainly cognitive (or knowing), the main type of thinking at the persuasion function is affective (or feeling)... the individual becomes more psychologically involved with the innovation” (Rogers, 1995, pp. 167–168). This involvement helps to form a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward an innovation.

When a potential adopter forms a favorable attitude toward an innovation, this might lead to *affective commitment* in which the potential adopter feels a voluntary desire to commit (Bansal, Irving, & Taylor, 2004). He/she develops an emotional attachment, identification, and involvement with the innovation (Kang, 2014; Meyer & Smith, 2000). In other words, when a potential adopter of a social business develops an affective component toward the organization, we can identify this as a willingness to engage. Indeed, looking at the *Innovators* and *Early Adopters* we can see that they have expressed a positive attitude toward both the “business-like” and “societal” characteristics of social businesses; most of them agreed that social businesses contribute to society, empower distressed populations and reduce unemployment, and most importantly they felt a voluntary desire to commit to social businesses by actually becoming volunteers, investors, employees, or employers in social businesses (Avidar, 2017). Rogers (1962, 1995) argues that the affective component is present mainly in the second stage of *persuasion* and the third stage of *decision*. As for interactivity, although we cannot know the exact level of interactivity used in the exchanges between *Innovators*, their close ties, and organizational representatives, we can assume based on the relational outcomes of the process that it was high.

Implications for DOI and engagement

The aim of this chapter was to integrate interactivity and engagement with the Rogers’ DOI theory and explore the importance of interpersonal communication in the social processes involved in engagement in an online environment.

First we distinguished between interactivity and engagement and explained that while interactivity is a process of information exchange that exists as soon as a response refers to a request and initiates an additional turn/s (Avidar, 2013), engagement is also a state of mind or an orientation (Johnston, 2014) involving a two-way relational give-and-take (Taylor & Kent, 2014). The theory of DOI was used to explain the importance of interactive interpersonal communication to a successful process of engagement. Potential adopters of social businesses belonged to three groups. The first group demonstrated that without knowing about an innovation there is no DOI, interactivity, or engagement. The second group revealed that knowing about an innovation is not sufficient to promote engagement. The members of this group had some kind of knowledge about social businesses, which they partially received from the media. Nevertheless,

they did not have interpersonal communication (interactive or other) with close ties and opinion leaders about social businesses, and have not engaged with social businesses.

Only the members of the third group that used interpersonal communication with others have engaged with social businesses and completed the process of DOI. The members of this group knew what social businesses are and what they do, they were exposed to social businesses through online media, social networks, and traditional media, and they were interacting with representatives of social businesses and others. In addition, they have expressed a positive attitude toward both the business-like and societal characteristics of social businesses, and committed themselves to social businesses by becoming volunteers, investors, employees, or employers in social businesses. In other words, the members of this group used interpersonal communication to engage with social businesses on a cognitive and an affective basis of trust and bonding (Kang, 2014), while becoming both professionally and personally engaged. Thus, only the members of the third group have successfully passed all five stages of DOI from *knowledge* to *confirmation*.

From a more practical standpoint, and based on the findings of the study, it is recommended for practitioners and organizational representatives working for social businesses to try to promote DOI through engagement with potential adopters. Since Rogers (1962, 1995) argues that *Early Adopters* are opinion leaders, and they are perceived by potential adopters as “the individual to check with” (p. 264) before using an innovation, organizational representatives can encourage the members of the third group to share their experiences online with potential adopters and try to engage with them. These *Early Adopters* might play an important role in fulfilling the cognitive and affective needs of potential adopters, who look for success stories and experiences of others before deciding whether to adopt or reject a service or a product. As suggested by Chu and Kim (2011), positive electronic eWOM might influence the attitudes and behavior of potential adopters to form a favorable attitude toward social businesses and adopt them. Future scholarly research might explore whether items posted on social media platforms about the societal characteristics of social businesses (i.e., personal stories of employees working in social businesses, stories of empowerment of distressed youth) generate more interactive discussions, positive eWOM and engagement than items about the business-like characteristics of social businesses (i.e., sales and recommendations of services and products), thus revealing which aspect of social businesses better facilitates engagement.

References

- Ariel, Y., & Avidar, R. (2015). Information, interactivity, and social media. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 23(1), 19–30.
- Avidar, R. (2017). Public relations and social businesses: The importance of enhancing engagement. *Public Relations Review*, 43(5), 955–962.
- Avidar, R. (2013). The responsiveness pyramid: Embedding responsiveness and interactivity into public relations theory. *Public Relations Review*, 39(5), 440–450.
- Bansal, H. S., Irving, P. G., & Taylor, S. F. (2004). A three-component mode of customer commitment to service providers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32, 234–250.
- Bowden, J. L. (2009). The process of customer engagement: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 17(1), 63–74.
- Bucy, E. P., & Tao, C.-C. (2007). The mediated moderation model of interactivity. *Media Psychology*, 9(3), 647–672.
- Chu, S.-C., & Kim, Y. (2011). Determinants of consumer engagement in electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites. *International Journal of Advertising*, 30(1), 47–75.
- Hallahan, K. (2003, May). A model for assessing Web sites as tools in building organizational-public relationships. Paper presented to the Public Relations Division at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

- Jacques, R., Preece, J., & Carey, T. (1995). Engagement as a design concept for multimedia. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communication, 24*(1), 49–59.
- Johnston, K. A. (2014). Public relations and engagement: Theoretical imperatives of a multidimensional concept. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 26*, 381–383.
- Kang, M. (2014). Understanding public engagement: Conceptualizing and measuring its influence on supportive behavioral intentions. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 26*(5), 399–416.
- Kelleher, T. (2009). Conversational voice, communicated commitment, and public relations outcomes in interactive online communication. *Journal of Communication, 59*, 172–188.
- Kelleher, T., & Miller, M. B. (2006). Organizational blogs and the human voice: Relational strategies and relational outcomes. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(2), 395–414.
- Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review, 28*(1), 21–37.
- Ki, E.-J., & Hon, L. C. (2006). Relationship maintenance strategies on Fortune 500 company Web sites. *Journal of Communication Management, 10*, 27–43.
- LaRose, R., Connolly, R., Lee, H., Li, K., & Hales, K. D. (2014). Connection overload? A cross cultural study of the consequences of social media connection. *Information Systems Management, 31*, 59–73.
- Laurel, B. (1993). *Computers as theatre*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- McKie, D., & Toledano, M. (2008). Dangerous liaison or perfect match? Public relations and social marketing. *Public Relations Review, 34*, 318–324.
- McMillan, S. J. (2002). Exploring models of interactivity from multiple research traditions: Users, documents, and systems. In L. Lievrouw & S. Livingston (Eds.), *Handbook of new media* (pp. 162–182). London, UK: Sage.
- McMillan, S. J., & Hwang, J. S. (2002). Measures of perceived interactivity: An exploration of the role of direction of communication, user control, and time in shaping perceptions of interactivity. *Journal of Advertising, 31*(3), 14–29.
- Meyer, J. P., & Smith, C. A. (2000). HRM practices and organizational commitment: Test of a mediation model. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 17*, 319–331.
- Newhagen, J. E. (2004). Interactivity, dynamic symbol processing, and the emergence of content in human communication. *The Information Society, 20*, 393–396.
- Oh, J., & Sundar, S. (2015). How does interactivity persuade? An experimental test of interactivity on cognitive absorption, elaboration, and attitudes. *Journal of Communication, 65*, 213–236.
- Pearson, R. (1989). A theory of public relations ethics (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Ohio University, Athens.
- Rafaeli, S. (1988). Interactivity: From new media to communication. In R. P. Hawkins, J. M. Wiemann, & S. Pingree (Eds.), *Advancing communication science: Merging mass and interpersonal process* (pp. 110–134). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rafaeli, S., & Ariel, Y. (2007). Assessing interactivity in computer-mediated research. In A. N. Joinson, K. Y. A. McKenna, T. Postmes, & U.-D. Reips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Internet psychology* (pp. 71–89). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (2002). Diffusion of preventive innovations. *Addictive Behaviors, 27*(6), 989–993.
- Sashi, C. M. (2012). Customer engagement, buyer-seller relationships, and social media. *Management Decision, 50*(2), 253–272.
- Sundar, S. S. (2004). Theorizing interactivity's effects. *The Information Society, 20*, 387–391.
- Sundar, S. S., Kalyanaraman, S., & Brown, J. (2003). Explicating Web site interactivity: Impression formation effects in political campaign sites. *Communication Research, 30*(1), 30–59.
- Sweetser, K. D. (2014). Government gone wild: Ethics, reputation, and social media. In M. W. DiStaso & D. S. Bortree (Eds.), *Ethical practice of social media in public relations* (pp. 205–216). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Taylor, M., & Kent, M. L. (2014). Dialogic engagement: Clarifying foundational concepts. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 26*(5), 384–398.
- Watkins, B., & Lewis, R. (2014). Initiating dialogue on social media: An investigation of athletes' use of dialogic principles and structural features of Twitter. *Public Relations Review, 40*(5), 853–855.

- Wilcox, D. L., & Cameron, G. T. (2010). *Public relations: Strategies and tactics* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Wu, G. (1999). Perceived interactivity and attitude toward Websites. Paper presented at the American Academy of Advertising Annual Conference, Albuquerque, NM.
- Yaxley, H. M. L. (2012). Digital public relations—revolution or evolution? In: A. Theaker (Ed.), *The public relations handbook* (pp. 411–432). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.