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Abstract: Social media is the most popular marketing tools for generation millennial and Z. They are known as the most easily switch brand generation. This research contributes to social media marketing analytic research with an exploration of the role of social media influencer on consumer brand switching decision. Data collected through an online survey used a random sampling technique to 390 Indonesian respondents, 195 data fulfilled the criterion. Data analyzed using Least Square, Mann Whitney, and Paired Sample T-Test method. The results show that opinion leaders, celebrities, and social leaders have a significant and positive effect on brand switching and no different impact on millennials and Gen Z. Referring to switching motivation found that social media has more influence as an opinion leader than celebrities or social leaders. The findings of the study suggested some strategies for managers and influencers on how to manage social media brand promotion based on our findings.
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Brand switching defined as shifting of customer brand loyalty to competitor (Fintikasari and Ardyan, 2018), affected by dissatisfied, variety seeking, social identification, benefit maximize (Gulamali and Persson, 2017), the desire to try something new, lower price seeking, discount (Mazursky, Labarbera, and Aiello, 1987), or because the previous brand hard to obtain. Lower price seeking is the highest motivation for alternatives selection. Consumer prefers to choose the lower price when purchasing (Chen, Luo, and Ching, 2008; CrowdTwist, 2017). Lower-income customers search for the alternative brand when price rising, but the higher-income is loyal (Palaniammal and Deepika, 2017; Hanifawati, Suryantini, and Mulyo, 2017). Many of Gen Z spent their money to buy food-beverage (Cheung et al., 2017), while millennials are unknown. Nielsen (2013), reported that customer loyalty for food-beverage brands is
the lowest. From goods and service attributes, the right price is the most persuasive strategy to increase brand switching intention. However, Nielsen reported that brand loyalty has given if the product quality fulfilled its promise. Food-beverage have many substitution and variants, so except pricing strategy, providing variety also an effective approach.

Millennials (Generation Y) and Gen Z are the easiest in brand switching. They alleged as the biggest generation in the world (Berkup, 2014). Millennial was born between 1980 - 2000 (Petra, 2016), have characteristics interested quickly on something new (Fintikasari and Ardyan, 2018), know what they want, have in-depth knowledge about products before purchase (Ordon, 2015), and using social media fluently (Petra, 2016). They are researching efficiently, use information, and compile various information from the internet to solve their problems (Berkup, 2014). With these capabilities, it is not surprising if millennials become very selective and secure to switch brands. Gen Z was born between 1995 – 2010 (Grail Research, 2010; Cruz, 2016; Priporas, Stylos, and Fotiadis, 2017), the other said was born in the mid-1990s (Cheung et al., 2017), also known as very choosy generations (Merriman, 2015).

CrowdTwist (2017) reported that Gen Z is more comfortable to switch brands than millennial. Gen Z is more price-conscious than brand name driven, while millennials are a little less flexible on their brand preferences. Gen Z has higher engagement with brands on social media compared to millennials. Either Gen Z or millennials are generally used multichannel to engage with the brands. Cheung et al. (2017) reported that Gen Z more focuses on quality and authenticity than price. If the brand slow to engage or break their promise, Gen Z quickly switches to a competitor. It seems quality is the most important for them; once they find a brand they like, they continue to buy for a long time. They prefer exciting than eco-friendly or socially responsible brand categories to buy, and they more prone to choose brands that endorse by celebrities. They need evidence from friends, family, or celebrities. They need brand transparency to ensure that the brand is real and has good quality.

Gen Z and millennials connect with social media influencers (SMI) every day (Vero, 2017). There are three types of SMI, namely opinion leader, celebrity endorser, and social leader (Gulamali and Persson, 2017). Previous studies show that they have significant effects on millennial and Gen Z attitude and purchase behavior (McCormick, 2016; Ellison, Padgett, and Fowler, 2017; Vero, 2017; Abreu, 2019), brand switching behavior (Gulamali and Persson, 2017), also change eating behavior (Saboia, Pisco Almeida, Sousa, and Pernencar, 2018). A study of millennial and Gen Z in Thailand found that trust level toward influencers is second after friends and family, they were more likely trust brands promoted by influencers who were talking it on their social media. Personality and ability of influencers in presenting the original, authentic, inspirational and educational visual contents (e.g., videos and images) were the biggest reason to follow influencers. Their purchasing decision more influenced by visual content that displayed the using product experience of influencer. The content considered are more critical than the number of influencer’s follower. Then, this study also reported that food categories are top interest for both groups and beauty products as second preferred.

So, we concluded that SMI has a critical influence on purchase behavior, also allegedly on brand switching of these generations. Thus, this study focuses on Indonesian costumers and has three objectives: 1) knowing brand switching motivation of millennial and Z, 2) analyze the role of SMI in their switching behavior, and 3) analyze the different effects of SMI between millennial and Gen Z switching behavior. This study contributes to social media marketing analytic research with exploration roles of SMI on millennial and Gen Z practice on brand switching. Following the introduction, in the next section, we explained the research method, results, and discussion that answer the hypotheses and implications for managers and influencers based on our findings. In the last section, we show a conclusion and suggestion for future research based on our limitations.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Opinion Leader

Opinion leaders are people who influence others, e.g., behavior, thinking, or decision (Saito, Teramoto, and Inoue, 2015; Ennaji, El Fazziki, El Alaoui El Abdallaoui, Benslimane, and Sadgal, 2018). In e-commerce networks, the influencer has two leading roles: affect the results of consumer purchasing decisions and disseminate product opinions through word of mouth (Zhao, Kou, Peng, and Chen, 2018). A social media user who has high rate engagement with their followers could be an opinion leader (Saito et al., 2015). The parameters include the number of followers, comments or likes on each post. The opinion leader characteristics are well educated, high social status, have extensive information access and active knowledge sharing (Ennaji et al., 2018), expert on product category (Gulamali and Persson, 2017; Ennaji et al., 2018; Casaló, Flavián, and Ibáñez-Sánchez, 2018), deeply experience with products (Huhn, Brantes Ferreira, Sabino de Freitas, and Leão, 2018; Gulamali and Persson, 2017), objective argument and good understanding about product (Gulamali and Persson, 2017). From these characteristics, an expert in product categories is the main characteristic of them. Ennaji et al. (2018), found that knowledge score in the form of the intensity of repeat posting on a particular topic used to detect opinion leader in social media. In their study also distinguish between the real opinion leader, spammer, and similarity profile. The results show that the real opinion leader has a higher knowledge score. With their ability to influence others to buy or use products, the opinion leader becomes the best candidate to promote brands or products.

The previous study shows that opinion leader has significant effects on customers purchase. Casaló et al. (2018), found that the argument of opinion leader affected by originality and uniqueness, on the next step has positive effects to consumer intention, continue interacting in the account, recommend the account online, and follow the advice offered by the opinion leader. While Raghupathi, Fogel, and Fogel (2015), found that benevolence, honest, and truthful were significant effects in increasing purchase intention. It means opinion leader integrity, such as honesty or objective review, has strong associated with increasing intention. Huhn et al. (2018) found that direct persuasive message of opinion leader has significant positive effect on information acceptance and purchase intention. The finding shows that compelling messages not only valued as an attractive message but also as trusted information and evaluation that influence the purchase decision-making process of potential customers. Then, Gulamali and Persson (2017) found that opinion leader had a stronger impact on brand switching when consumers wanted something new or variation needed, and when they were not satisfied. Thus, we extend our hypotheses as follow:

\[ H_1: \text{Opinion leader has significant effects on brand switching} \]

\[ H_2: \text{When consumer switch because dissatisfied, SMI has higher effects as opinion leaders} \]

\[ H_3: \text{When consumer switch for variety-seeking or something new needs, SMI has higher effects as opinion leaders} \]

Celebrities

Celebrities are people who have well known in society because of their achievements or success in specific fields. In Indonesia, they generally are known as artists or people who usually appear on television. They enjoyed public recognition and used it to endorse products (Muda, Musa, Mohamed, and Borhan, 2014). At a particular level, they often being role models by the audience (Juntiwasarakij, 2018) with follows their style, e.g., in fashion, communication, or the brand used (Muda et al., 2014). There are two types of celebrities, namely micro-celebrities (500-10.000 followers) and macro celebrities (millions of followers) (Gilliland, 2017). Celebrity characteristics include success and talented, inspiration, and high social status (Gulamali and Persson, 2017).

The attractiveness of celebrity has significant positive effects on ad recall, but there is no evidence for purchasing intention, while the credibility of celebrity has significant and positive impacts on ad recall and purchase intention (Hani, Marwan, and Andre, 2018). Mazzella (2016) reported that micro-celebrities have high effects on the restaurant in-
dustry with provided purchase experience on their channel. Interaction when consumers were watching the video, vlog, or talking with celebrities in social media, genuinely blog post has excellent possibilities for consumers to feel a restaurant experience. The authentic experience of celebrity inspires consumers to buy products in these restaurants. Gulamali and Persson (2017) also found that SMI has higher effects as micro-celebrities. Discount offers found as a useful promotion tool of celebrities, the intention to use the discount code depending on the discount percentage, the product, and initial price. However, if promotion too commercial (Jargalsaikhan and Korotina, 2016) or if the celebrity has a negative attitude (Muda et al., 2014) respond of consumers to the celebrity was strongly negative. Thus, our hypotheses extend as follow:

\[ H_4 = \text{celebrities have significant effects on brand switching} \]
\[ H_5 = \text{when the customers switch because lower price seeking, SMI has higher effects as celebrities} \]
\[ H_6 = \text{when the customer switch because the previous brand hard obtained, SMI has higher effects as celebrities} \]

Social Leader

A simple definition of social leader explained by Gulamali and Persson (2017), they are someone which influential in their social network. The leader and follower are a member of the same entity, connected and bonded in community with collective identity (Epitropaki, Kark, Mainemelis, and Lord, 2016). Social leaders communicate brands effectively; in general, they have a direct connection with many people in their community (Vega and Mendez-Vazquez, 2018). According to Gulamali and Persson (2017), consumer decision-making is influenced by social identification needs and do the same with their social community. In extreme cases, a brand has decided whether someone as part of a particular group or not, meaning if someone wants to be recognized as part of a group, then he/she must buy or even leave a specific brand according to his group’s preferences. Then, they explained there are three characteristics of a social leader, namely someone who known, liked by friends/groups or advice followed often by friends/groups, and can be interconnected. Thus, our extends hypotheses as follow:

\[ H_7 = \text{The social leader has significant effects on brand switching} \]
\[ H_8 = \text{When customer switch because brand liked by friends or community, SMI has higher effects as social leaders} \]
\[ H_9 = \text{There is a significantly different effect of SMI on brand switching gen Y and Z} \]

Visual and Verbal Contents

Content of visual (video, image) and verbal (text message or caption, include link) have a significant influence on brand popularity in social media (Sabate, Berbegal-mirabent, Cañabate, and Lebherz, 2014; Schultz, 2017; Hanifawati, Ritonga, and Puspitasari, 2018). In marketing the internet, visual creativity is a leading power to attract consumers to need perception. Previous researches found that visual content has a significant influence on customer purchase decisions (Sharma, Bhosle, and Chaudhary, 2012; Hellberg, 2015; Gulamali and Persson, 2017). However, users prefer to visual content than verbal (Brookes, 2010; Gulamali and Persson, 2017; Hanifawati et al., 2018), it is because the human brain is naturally more comfortable in processing visual information than verbal (Sharma et al., 2012). Thus, we have presented our hypotheses as follow:

\[ H_{10} = \text{SMI has a higher role as visual contents provider than the verbal content provider} \]

METHOD

This study used a quantitative approach. Data collected through an online survey of 390 Indonesian respondents were conducted from 13 March 2019 to 20 Mei 2019. Questionnaires randomly distributed through social media, such as Whatsapp, Instagram, Facebook, and Linked. Questionnaire characteristics were close-ended questions with limited answers. There are three types of the scale used, namely the Guttman scale (yes or no), Likert (strongly disagree/agree 7-point scale), and multiple-choice questions. Several choices presented, then respondents choose one of the most appropriate.
The population is social media active users and 17-38 years old (17-23 for Gen Z and 24-38 for millennials). For the unknown number of population, 386 samples were accepted (Sugiyono, 2013). The data analyzed were selected according to the criteria had food-beverage purchased that promoted by SMI. Only 195 data met the criteria. A total of 69.23% of respondents were women and 30.77% men. They were 17-23 years old (54.87%) and 24-38 years old (45.13%). Monthly expenditure < 1 million (31.28%), 1-5 million (60%), and > 5 million (8.72%). A total of 96.92% of respondents were followers of SMI and 8.72% not, but they had purchase experience by influencer promoted. The most social media used include Instagram, Facebook, Youtube, and Twitter, with the highest multi-channel is Instagram, and Facebook. The amount of 92.16% of respondents still purchases the previous brand, only 7.84% loyal to the new brand. The purchased of product categories included packaged food-beverage (53.33%), culinary (32.31%), fresh food (4.10%), cake (0.51%), and others (9.74%).

Hypotheses $H_1$, $H_4$, and $H_7$ tested using the Least Square method using EVIEWES 10. Hypotheses $H_2$, $H_3$, $H_5$, $H_6$, $H_8$, $H_9$, $H_{10}$ with paired sample t-test using SPSS 22. Hypotheses $H_{10}$ tested using Mann Whitney method with SPPSS 22. The regression equation shown in equation 1, where $Y$ is the dependent variable, $c$ is the regression coefficient, $X$ is the independent variable, $\beta$ is the vector coefficient, and $\epsilon$ is the residual.

\[ Y = c + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_1 X_2 + \beta_1 X_3 + \epsilon \text{............... (1)} \]

Variable Definitions and Measurements

Brand switching is changes of consumer brand loyalty to the competitor brand in the same product category, for example, I often bought yogurt, the brand name is “Yakult,” then an influencer promoted a new brand “Walagri” from the different company, and I became a loyal buyer, or sometimes still Yakult. Measured using the Guttman scale “Yes” or “No,” while for purchasing decisions measured using visual and verbal indicators with Likert scale. An opinion leader is a social media user who has 500 - 10,000 followers or more. They have characteristics of expert product categories, in-depth product experience, and objective argument about the product. Celebrity is a social media user with 500 – 10,000 followers (micro-celebrities) or more (macro celebrities). They have at least one characteristic of successful and talented in their field, inspirational (referring to advice, suggestion, lifestyle). The social leader is a social media user who has 500 – 10,000 followers or more with characteristics people who are well known or have a close relationship with respondents as group or individual. Visual is content in the form of videos or images that influence the purchase decision of users. Verbal is content in the form of text messages or captions that accompany a picture or video and influence the purchase decision of users. Visual and verbal measured using Likert scale.

RESULTS

Validity and Reliability of Model

Factor loading > 0.4 is recommended minimum value for validity (Taherdost, 2018). The results show that the model is valid, with the factor loading of item 0.615 – 0.744. The reliability test used Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient, referring to Mohajan (2017), in social studies, alpha value 0.7, is recommended. Then, the reliability accepted with Cronbach’s Alpha item between 0.903 – 0.910, and Cronbach’s Alpha total 0.906.

Choosing the Best Model

The normality test used the Jarque-Berra method, normal data distribution, if p-value> 0.05. The results shows that p-value (0.316628) > 0.05, thus normality is fulfilled. Test of linearity used the Ramsey method, accepted if Uji p-value of t-statistic > 0.05. Linearity is accepted with p-value of t-statistic (0.8083) > 0.05. Autocorrelation detected using Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test method, non-autocorrelation fulfilled if the p-value of F-statistic > 0.05. The results shows p-value of F-statistic (0.8922) > 0.05, then non-autocorrelation is fulfilled. Heteroscedasticity tested using Breusch Pagan Godfrey method, homoscedastic is accepted if the p-value of F-statistic > 0.05. The results show
that p-value of F-statistik (0.1912) > 0.05, thus homoscedastic is fulfilled. Multicollinearity tested using Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) method, fulfilled if VIF < 10. The data have shown that the value of VIF for Opinion Leader 1.546190, Celebrities 1.768526, and Social Leader 1.584386; these were < 10. Thus multicollinearity is fulfilled. The results of model feasibility test (F-test) indicate the model was feasible with a p-value of F-statistics 0.000 < 0.05, meaning the independent variables were clear explanations of the dependent variable. According to Adjusted R-Squared, independent variables explained 46.77% of the dependent variable.

The Effect of Social Media Influencer on Brand Switching

Dependent variable test results indicate that opinion leader (p-value < 0.001; \( \beta = +0.538 \)), celebrities (p-value < 0.001; \( \beta = +0.538 \)), and social leader (p-value < 0.001; \( \beta = +0.781 \)) have significant positive influence on brand switching. Equation 2 shows that increasing promotion through opinion leader, celebrities, or social leader increase brand switching decision. Therefore, hypotheses \( H_1 \), \( H_4 \), and \( H_7 \) are accepted. The results of Mann Whitney test shows no significant difference between opinion leader (p-value 0.227 > 0.05), celebrities (p-value 0.566 > 0.05), and social leader (p-value 0.750 > 0.05) on brand switching. Thus, hypotheses \( H_9 \) rejected.

\[
Y = 3.756 + 0.538X_1 + 0.359X_2 + 0.781X_3 + \varepsilon \quad (2)
\]

**Brand Switching Motivation**

Brand switching motivation of respondents in this study include: previous brand hard to get (2.05%; \( n=4 \)); friends or community liked the brand (8.21%; \( n=16 \)); the lower price seeking (8.21%; \( n=16 \)); variety-seeking or something new seeking (71.28%; \( n=139 \)); and dissatisfied (10.26%, \( n=20 \)). Thus, variety-seeking is the highest motivation of brand switching of food-beverage categories. Hereafter, we tested the effect of SMI on brand switching based on these motivations using paired sample t-test. Each motivation divided into three pairs: opinion leader with celebrities, opinion leader with a social leader, and celebrities with social leader. The objectives are to find a correlation, differences, and the most influential influencer types.

**The Role of SMI on Brand Switching**

**Motivation 1: dissatisfied**

In this motivation, shows a significant positive correlation between opinion leader and celebrities (p-value < 0.001; \( r=0.764 \)), increasing the role of celebrities increase opinion leader impacts on switching brand 58.37% (Table 1). This pair has significant positive differences (p-value < 0.001; \( \bar{F}=+4.520850 \)), where opinion leader has higher effects (=11.09030) than celebrities (=6.56945). In the opinion leader and social leader pair also shows a significant and positive correlation (p-value < 0.001; \( r=0.540 \)), social leader increase the effects of opinion leader amount 29.16%. There are significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Statistics</th>
<th>Paired sample correlation</th>
<th>Paired Differences Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
<td>11.09030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
<td>6.56945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
<td>11.09030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
<td>3.41875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
<td>6.56945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
<td>3.41875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 Paired Sample T-Test for Dissatisfied**

**Source:** Primary data, processed, 2019
positive differences between the impacts of opinion leader and social leader (p-value < 0.001; \(=+7.671550\)), where opinion leader (=11.09030) has more significant results than the social leader (=3.41875).

Between celebrities and social leaders (p-value < 0.001; \(r=0.810\)) shows significant positive correlation. The role of celebrities on brand switching can be increased by 65.61% with social leader’s presence. Both have significant positive differences (p-value < 0.001; \(=+3.150700\)), the influence of celebrities (=6.56945) is greater than the social leader (=3.41875). Thus, it concluded that when consumers switch because dissatisfied, SMI has a higher role as opinion leader (=11.09030) than celebrities or social leaders. Thus \(H_2\) is accepted. These results support the findings of Gulamali and Persson (2017).

**Motivation 2: a variety-seeking or something new seeking**

Table 2 shows a significant positive correlations between opinion leader and celebrities (p-value < 0.001; \(r=+0.506\)). There are significant positive differences between opinion leader and social leader (p-value < 0.001; \(=+3.522108\)). Opinion leader (=10.16926) had greater effects than celebrity (=6.64715). According to mean differences and correlation value, the influence of opinion leader increase by 25.60% with celebrities. In the opinion leader and social leader pairs shown a significant positive correlation (p-value < 0.001; \(r =+0.438\)) and significantly and positively different (p-value < 0.001; \(=+3.143180\)). The effect of opinion leader (=10.16926) is more significant than the social leader (=3.50397). This motivation shows that the influence of opinion leaders will increase by 19.18% with the role of social leader. Between celebrities and social leader also shows a significant and positive correlation (p-value < 0.001; \(r=0.479\)) and significantly and positively different (p-value < 0.001; \(=+3.143180\)). celebrity has a greater effect (=6.64715) than the social leader (=3.50397). Thus, we concluded that when consumers switch because variety-seeking or need something new, SMI has a greater effect as opinion leader (=10.16926). So, \(H_3\) is accepted. This finding also supports the study of Gulamali and Persson (2017).

**Table 2  Paired Sample T-Test for Variety Seeking or Need Something New**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paired Samples Statistics</th>
<th>Paired sample correlation</th>
<th>Paired Differences Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
<td>10.16926</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
<td>6.64715</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
<td>10.16926</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
<td>3.50397</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
<td>6.64715</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
<td>3.50397</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***significant at \(\alpha < 0.000\)

**Source:** Primary data, processed, 2019

**Motivation 3: lower price seeking**

Table 3 shows a significant positive relationship between opinion leader and celebrities (p-value > 0.05; \(r =+0.742\)), opinion leader and social leader (p-value > 0.05; \(r =+0.706\)), social leader and celebrity (p-value > 0.001; \(r =+0.828\)).
There are significant and positive differences between opinion leaders and celebrities (p-value < 0.001; $\beta = 3.174250$). Opinion leader ($\mu = 10.32269$) has a greater influence than celebrity ($\mu = 7.14844$). Mean differences value indicates that celebrity increases the role of opinion leader on brand switching because of the price factor of 55.06% ($r^2 = 0.5506$). Both have significant positive different (p-value < 0.001; $\beta = 6.577188$), where opinion leader ($\mu = 10.32269$) has more significant influence than the social leader ($\mu = 3.74550$). There are significant and positive differences effects between celebrity and social leader (p-value < 0.001; $\beta = 3.402938$). Celebrity ($\mu = 7.14844$) has stronger influence than social leaders ($\mu = 3.74550$), where social leaders increase celebrity influence by 68.56% ($r^2 = 0.6856$). Thus, we concluded that when consumers switch for seeking a lower price, SMI has more power as an opinion leader than a celebrity or social leader. Therefore, hypothesis H5 rejected.

**Motivation 4: previous brand hard to get**

In this motivation, there is no significant relationship between opinion leader and celebrity (p-value > 0.1), opinion leader and social leader (p-value > 0.1), also social leader and celebrity (p-value > 0.1).

The paired differences test results show significant and positive differences between celebrities and social leader (p-value < 0.05; $\beta = 2.721750$), while another pairs show non-significant differences, while in celebrity and social leader pairs show that celebrity ($\mu = 6.03850$) has higher effects than social leaders ($\mu = 3.31675$). Thus, the effects of celebrity ($\mu = 6.03850$) is greater than the social leader. It means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Paired Sample T-Test for Lower Price Seeking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired Samples Statistics</td>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 1</strong></td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 2</strong></td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 3</strong></td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at $\alpha < 0.05$; ***significant at $\alpha < 0.001$**

**Source:** Primary data, processed, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Paired Sample T-Test for Previous Brand Hard to Get</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired Samples Statistics</td>
<td>Correlation (r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 1</strong></td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 2</strong></td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 3</strong></td>
<td>Celebrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at $\alpha < 0.05$**

**Source:** Primary data, processed, 2019
The Role Of Social Media Influencer On Brand Switching Of Millenial and... when customers switch because of previous brand hard to get, SMI has a higher effect as celebrities rather than social leaders. Thus, the hypothesis H\textsubscript{6} is accepted.

**Motivation 5: brands liked by friends or community**

Table 5 shows a significant and positive relationship between opinion leader and celebrity (p-value > 0.05; r = +0.642), opinion leader and social leader (p-value > 0.05; r = +0.717), also social leader and celebrities (p-value > 0.001; r = +0.800). There is significant and positive differences between opinion leaders and celebrities (p-value < 0.001; =+3.561063). Opinion leader (=10.06775) has more significant effect than celebrities (=6.50669), then celebrities can increase the influence of opinion leader towards brand switching by 41.22% (r\textsuperscript{2}=0.4122).

In the opinion leader and social leader pairs, there are significant and positive differences (p-value < 0.001; =6.510438). Opinion leader (=10.06775) has a stronger influence than the social leader (=3.55731). There are also significant differences between celebrities and social leaders (p-value < 0.001; =2.949375). Celebrities (=6.50669) is more influential than social leaders (=3.55731). By comparing mean, we concluded that when consumers switch brands because of friends or community like it, SMI has a higher effect as an opinion leader. Thus, hypothesis H\textsubscript{8} rejected. This finding, contrary to Gulamali and Persson (2017), they found that when the brand liked by friends, social media influencer, foremost perceived as a social leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Paired Sample T-Test for Brands Liked by Friends or Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paired Samples Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>Opinion Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>Celebrities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**significant at α < 0.05; ***significant at α < 0.001**

**Source:** Primary data, processed, 2019

**The influence of visual and verbal content**

Results show significantly positive relationship between the visual and verbal pairs on all motivations (p-value < 0.001, r=+0.708; p-value < 0.001, =0.686123), dissatisfied (p-value < 0.001, r=+0.878; p-value < 0.001, =0.793600), variety seeking or something new needs (p-value < 0.001, r=+0.692; p-value < 0.001, =1.371138), and hard to find brand (p-value < 0.05, r=+0.980; p-value < 0.05, =1.168500). Whereas motivation of lower prices seeking (p-value < 0.05, r=+0.517) and friends or community liked brand (p-value < 0.05, r=+0.740) indicates significant relationship but non-different between visual and verbal.

By comparing the mean value in paired sample statistics, indicates that visual content has a stronger influence on purchase decision than verbal content. It means SMI has a stronger influence as a visual content provider than the verbal content provider. This finding is in line with Vero (2017). Strong correlation value in paired sample correlation indicates that although verbal has a lower effect, it can
increase the influence of visual content on the purchase decision. Thus, hypothesis \( H_0 \) is accepted, and this finding support Gulamali and Persson (2017) and Brookes (2010) studies that consumers prefer visual rather than verbal content. However, in Gulamali and Persson (2017), they found that in dissatisfaction cases, verbal content was a greater influence than visual. They were finding contrary to our findings.

**DISCUSSION**

The results of this study show that SMI is handy tools in promoting food-beverage on social media. Linqia (2017), reported that many marketers are currently using influencers to promote their brands, the goals are to create more authentic content, encourage brand involvement, and direct channels to brand pages. The results show a significant and positive influence of opinion leaders, celebrities, and social leaders on brand switching. Interestingly, the effect is the same for millennials and Gen Z. Although brand engagement on Gen Z is higher than millennials (CrowdTwist, 2017) and Gen Z has more influenced by celebrities (Cheung et al., 2017), but in purchasing decision stage, the effect of influencers in their switching behavior is the same.

Almost all motivations show that SMI has stronger effects as opinion leaders. Only on motivation “brand hard to get,” SMI has stronger influence as celebrities. Interestingly, the role of opinion leaders in each motivation correlates significantly and positively with celebrities and social leaders. We explain these findings into two possibilities, referring to roles of the influencer as individual correlations and as influencer characteristics correlation. For example, in motivation wants variety or want to try something new as the most chosen motivation, shows a significant and positive relationship on all pairs of SMI. First, if this refers to individual influencer correlation when consumers watch or read an influencer promotion which identified as opinion leader then switching decision to the new brand will increase if another influencer, which is known as celebrities or social leaders. In this possibility, the company needs to use at least two or more influencers who meet the criteria of opinion leaders, celebrities, or social leaders. Second, if correlation refers to the influencer characteristics, for example, we found a strong positive relationship between opinion leader and celebrity. It means, when consumers are interested in buying a brand because they consider that influencer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Paired Sample T-Test for Visual and Verbal Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paired Samples Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Motivation</td>
<td>Visual 7.54040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 1</td>
<td>Visual 6.85428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal 7.38445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 2</td>
<td>Visual 7.51594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 3</td>
<td>Visual 6.83560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal 7.57719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 4</td>
<td>Visual 5.63050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation 5</td>
<td>Visual 4.46200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal 7.82787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal 7.22100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***significant at \( \alpha < 0.001 \); ** significant at \( \alpha < 0.05 \)

**Source:** Primary data, processed, 2019
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has product expertise, product experience and provides an objective argument about products, then the effect on switching intention will increase if the influencer also known as successful, talented, or inspiring person. In this term, companies only need one influencer who meets these multiple criteria to promote brands.

An interesting question then, how do companies utilize SMI properly? Firstly, we highlight that SMI intended in this study is based on the inherent characteristics of an individual social media user and synthesized into roles limited into three types of roles, namely opinion leader, social leader, and celebrity. That means every social media user can play as these influencers, including the company. Referring to Muda et al. (2014), there is a celebrity endorser, people who with their success works to undermine a brand; then a celebrity entrepreneur is people who known successfully launch a product and then promote own product. In the social media era, many entrepreneurs act as celebrity entrepreneur endorsers, and they actively promote their brand or company. Therefore, we recommend at least four strategies to manage social media influencers to increase purchasing decision of the potential consumer; for a start-up, it means how to win consumers to switch to their new brand. First, do as a celebrity entrepreneur by actively inspiring others, growing followers, starting to promote products, influencing them by providing experience, and reviewing exciting topics about the product categories. It is maybe the cheapest strategy for start-up and small-medium enterprises (SMEs). In this way, the owner not only acts as a celebrity entrepreneur but also as an opinion leader. Remember that by only having 500-10,000 followers, a social media user can become a micro-celebrity. The ability of social media personal branding in this way is needed.

Secondly, build the strength of social leader with a brand network community (page brand). In addition to being useful for branding and promotion, this strategy is also effective in building active (two-way) communication with customers, gained potential consumers widely, and fostering new ideas for product and service development (Hanifawati et al., 2018). Thirdly, use the external influencers to endorse the product. For strategy effectiveness, the brand needs to choose the right influencers who have the expertise and experience in the product category, as the results of this study prove that influencers with the opinion leader characteristics have a stronger influence on consumer purchasing decisions. Fourthly, the ability of social media influencers or brands to present engaging visual content is most valuable, as this study shows that social media influencers have more significant as a visual content provider rather than verbal. In terms of food-beverage products, the visual concept is how the visual presentation the experience and emotions of the product. That means only by looking at pictures or watch videos, and consumers feel or taste the product. Video has a stronger influence than images (Hanifawati et al., 2018). Thus, our suggestion for influencers is essential to have expertise in the product category promoted and the ability to present objective arguments of product performance and product experience. As for sharing positive inspiration through talent and success, or has social community activity can be a high supporting to increase the influence of a social media influencer.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based on this study, we concluded that social media has a significant influence on brand switching food-beverage of millennial and Gen Z. Their motivation influenced higher by variety-seeking or desire to try something new. Thus, companies need to increase product innovation capabilities to provide a variety of products. Opinion leaders, social leaders, and celebrities have significant influences on brand switching, and there is no difference between millennials and Z. SMI is known more significant effect as a visual content provider than verbal. Based on the switching motivational background indicate that SMI has stronger influence as opinion leaders, means that brand promotion will be most effective if promoted by someone who has product expertise, product experience, and presents objective arguments for the brand's performance. While
talented, success and social community involvement were a supporting force to increase their influence.

**Recommendations**

Although this study has significant contributions, it still has limitations. First, the measurement of opinion leaders, social leaders, and celebrities in this study only based on consumer ratings. The weakness is that if the company wants to find them on social media, the indicator is difficult to measure. The implication for future research is to develop tools to opinion leaders, social leaders, and celebrities detection on social media according to product categories and audiences target, and also duplication profiles differentiated. It will be helping companies to find the right influencers for the right product categories and audience targets. Second, the characteristics of consumers in this study are only limited to the age group Y and Z, even though there are exist generations X whose numbers are also quite large, and there are other characteristics of consumers except for age such as income, lifestyle, even the values are interested in studying in effect correlation to these influencer roles. We guest that this information helps companies in better understanding of consumer behavior related to their products.
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