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Abstract

Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) has attracted considerable interest from researchers in the past decade. Although the extant research has helped us to develop a good understanding of a number of the issues pertaining to eWOM, several research and managerial questions remain. Furthermore, no attempt has been made to consolidate and synthesize this stream of research. With consumers’ increasing reliance on online retailing and information seeking, as well as the continued growth of social media, the importance of eWOM cannot be overstated. Based on a systematic review of 190 studies, we conduct a multi-dimensional analysis of eWOM communication. We present the key issues in current and emerging literature and propose important questions for future research.
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Introduction

The Internet has transformed the way we search for information, how we interact with each other and, more importantly, the way we shop. Consequently, traditional word-of-mouth (WOM) behavior now has an electronic element resulting in a substantial research stream—electronic WOM (eWOM). Previously, when consumers needed information, they turned to marketer-generated sources, looked at third-party certifications, or sought advice from friends and/or relatives in conversations “over the backyard fence”. eWOM has since subsumed these methods and become more common—in some instances, it has become the preferred method of communication. Thus, eWOM allows consumers to socially interact with one another, exchange product-related information, and make informed purchase decisions via computer-mediated conversations (Blazevic et al. 2013; Hoffman and Novak 1996).

eWOM is defined as “any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, or former customers about a product or company, which is made available to a multitude of people and institutions via the Internet” (Hennig-Thurau et al. 2004, p 39) Previous research has investigated several types of eWOM communications, such as discussion forums (e.g., Andreassen and Streukens 2009; Cheung et al. 2009), UseNet groups (e.g., Godes and Mayzlin 2004), product reviews (Lee and Youn 2009; Sen and Lerman 2007; Tirunillai and Tellis 2012), blogs (Dhar and Chang 2009; Kozinets et al. 2010; Thorson and Rodgers 2006), and social networking sites (SNS) (Dwyer 2007; Trusov, Bucklin, and Pauwels 2009). Although the literature in this area is rich, the broad range of platforms and various types of eWOM, coupled with the myriad of methods used to study them, has led to a fragmentation of the extant literature. This fragmentation poses a risk to the systematic accumulation of knowledge and the integration of the literature’s findings.

The purpose of this paper is threefold. Its first purpose is to conduct a systematic review of eWOM studies published in the past decade and identify the key characteristics, antecedents, and consequences of eWOM. Here, we organize the analysis around a conceptual framework adapted from Nyilasy’s (2005)
review of traditional WOM. Its second purpose is to examine the current state of eWOM research—what we know. Its third purpose is to pose and discuss critical research questions within this framework to provide structure and guidance for future research in this ever-evolving domain—what we need to know.

This paper is structured as follows: First, we present the methodology and the organizing framework for our analysis. Based on this framework, we then present the conceptual background and key differentiating characteristics of eWOM compared to traditional WOM. Next, we present our organizational framework, which summarizes the current knowledge and understanding of this phenomenon. Finally, we develop and discuss key research questions based on this framework to provide guidance for future research.

Methodology and Organizing Framework

We followed Webster and Watson’s (2002) concept-driven systematic review methodology. This method examines the literature from the perspective of concepts presented by all authors rather than the author-driven approach that looks at how individual author(s) have analyzed multiple concepts in several articles. This method has two benefits. First, because eWOM is a relatively new topic, it lacks the deep history that would allow a small number of authors to have heavy research streams. The concept-driven approach allows us to collate relevant research even when an author(s) has produced only one article. Second, it enables us to create a concept matrix that focuses on key areas of investigation and topics that are ripe for development.

To build the initial pool of studies, we conducted searches in such databases as Academic Search Premier, EBSCO, ABI/INFORM Global, the Social Science Citation Index, and Emerald Insights. We used an expansive list of search terms, such as “eWOM”, “online reviews”, “product reviews”, “online recommendations”, “online word-of-mouth”, “online buzz”, “social networks”, “online viral marketing”, “online consumer reviews”, “online communities”, and “virtual communities”. These terms allowed us to search across literature in several disciplines, including Marketing, MIS, Communications, Management, and Psychology, along with a small number of less-represented disciplines (i.e., Economics, Tourism and Hospitality, etc.). After multiple rounds of filtering, we selected 190 studies that fit the following criteria for analysis: 1) the study is published in a peer-reviewed journal; 2) the study’s focus is on various forms of eWOM or at least on a subset of variables; 3) the study has a defined sample and an empirical methodology; and 4) the study addresses eWOM at the individual consumer (micro) or market (macro) level.

To organize the key findings and concepts, we adopted Nyilasy’s (2005) framework, which organizes key issues surrounding traditional WOM communication episodes (see Table 1). The framework is based on the fundamental assumption that every WOM episode has two parties—the sender and the receiver. Further, WOM episodes have several antecedents and consequences for both senders and receivers. It is valuable to distinguish these two areas because the communication channels between senders and receivers can often be flawed or have issues with the exchange (Lin, Geng, and Whinston 2005). Thus, the framework has two dimensions: ‘units of analysis’ (sender and receiver of WOM) and ‘focus of the study’ (antecedents and consequences/effects), resulting in four quadrants.

Our analysis helps to illuminate several important issues pertaining to each quadrant of the framework, as depicted in Fig. 1. For each issue, we first outline our current knowledge about the issue and discuss how key eWOM characteristics influence several dimensions of eWOM. Subsequently, we provide research questions and note gaps in our knowledge that offer important directions for future research.

Table 1: eWOM organizing framework (adapted from Nyilasy 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Antecedents of eWOM (causes)</th>
<th>Consequences of eWOM (effects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit of analysis</td>
<td>Sender of eWOM</td>
<td>Q1: Antecedents of eWOM senders — why do people talk online?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receiver of eWOM</td>
<td>Q3: Antecedents of the receiver — why do people listen online?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 We chose this method over a quantitative meta-analysis for a number of reasons. The primary reason was that for a meta-analysis to be meaningful, a reasonably large number of empirical studies must exist from which data can be drawn and used as meta-analytic input (DeCoster 2004). Because we examine various antecedents and consequences of eWOM, conducting a credible meta-analysis would have required a reasonable number of studies that have reported the effect sizes for each relationship between our proposed antecedents and consequences. Upon examination, we realized that the data were not either rich or extensive enough to conduct a quantitative meta-analysis.

2 We also cover unpublished dissertations and sought completed works from scholars by posting on various online academic communities (e.g., ELMAR for marketing scholars).

3 Because the systematic review is not the central focus of this paper, we do not present detailed descriptive enumeration of all of our findings. However, the relevant detailed description of the methods and findings, including an expansive list of all of the antecedents and consequences, are available from the authors.

Conceptual Background

Traditional WOM

Ernest Dichter (1966) published one of the first seminal WOM studies in the Harvard Business Review. His study identifies four key motivations that drive individuals to engage in WOM behavior: perceived product-involvement, self-involvement (gratification of emotional needs from the product), other involvement...
(a need to give something to the person receiving the WOM transmission), and message involvement (talk that is stimulated by the way the product is presented in media). Although this was very beneficial and effective, as Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) note, the work provided no development of the typology. This gap has been addressed several times. Sundaram, Mitra, and Webster (1998) conducted the most prominent and comprehensive investigation, in which they discover eight major motives (four positive and four negative) for WOM behavior: altruism, product involvement, self-enhancement, helping the company, negative WOM altruism, anxiety reduction, vengeance, and advice seeking.

Other major aspects that explain WOM behavior include such individual consumers’ characteristics as ‘sociability’ (Reynolds and Darden 1971). A WOM message can also be more or less powerful depending on the person receiving and encoding the message. This is also observed when a consumer has had previous interactions with a product or brand (Bone 1995; Herr, Kardes, and Kim 1991) and when the message is congruent with the receiver’s current knowledge (Laczniak, DeCarlo, and Ramaswami 2001).

In sum, it is agreed upon in the literature that WOM is powerful and has a much greater impact on consumers than other forms of marketing communication (Day 1971). We build upon this extant research by examining how WOM has evolved in the electronic/computer-mediated realm. Here, we discuss the unique characteristics of eWOM and how they are different from traditional WOM.

### eWOM Characteristics

EOM takes place in a more complex computer-mediated context, whereas traditional WOM typically happens in a face-to-face/one-on-one context. With traditional WOM, participants are in close proximity and can draw from a wealth of social and contextual cues. Often, these conversations are private in nature. On the other hand, with eWOM, participants engage in communication with a network of people (e.g., Kozinetes et al. 2010) in online communities where conversations are more visible. People who form these communities come together due to mutual shared interests in specific products/services or a topic/activity. In most situations, these individuals do not know each other and have only online communications to maintain their relationships. The online-only nature of the communication adds several interesting variables to the mix in terms of how eWOM is generated and consumed.

This is best illustrated by taking an anecdotal look at a person communicating with an acquaintance in person as opposed to communicating in an online community. In person, the largest audience the sender could possibly anticipate is just...
one person. Therefore the sender, using the power of the personal relationship or otherwise, can be as persuasive as the context allows. Online, however, the sender must have some understanding that his/her statements will live forever and reach a seemingly infinite number of receivers who the sender may or may not know (Godes and Mayzlin 2004). In addition, in the online community, the people receiving the communication may or may not truly understand or trust the motivations of the sender. They also have already received similar or divergent messages from other senders in the community. Consequently, the ways in which messages are conveyed and consumed in the online world significantly affect the impact of eWOM. To truly understand the dynamics of eWOM, we first need to flesh out how and why eWOM differs from traditional WOM. Our analysis identifies six major characteristics that define the unique nature of eWOM. These characteristics drive the dynamics in our quadrants, as displayed in Fig. 1.

1. Enhanced volume: Given the multi-directional nature of the Internet, eWOM’s volume and reach are unprecedented (Dellarocas 2003). As Liu (2006, p 77) notes, “[the] greater the volume of WOM, the more likely a consumer will be able to hear about a product. Not surprisingly, greater awareness tends to generate greater sales”. Further, eWOM conversations are asynchronous and are able to reach a vast number of people in a short period of time. In other words, both communicators and consumers have considerably more options available for spreading and consuming opinions, respectively, than would be possible with traditional WOM, leading to greater awareness (Kiecker and Cowles 2002). Although the results of many studies echo this finding, there are also examples of studies finding that volume itself is insufficient (Chintagunta, Gopinath, and Venkataraman 2010).

2. Dispersion: A related phenomenon affecting the outcome of eWOM is platform dispersion. Godes and Mayzlin (2004 p 546) define platform dispersion as “the extent to which product-related conversations are taking place across a broad range of communities”. The Internet is a vast and distributed medium and has several different platforms that host online conversations. Dispersion has two specific implications: a) the nature of the platforms could have a significant impact on the incidence and evolution of eWOM (for instance, which products are discussed and how often); and b) from a measurement perspective, it is difficult to narrow down which platforms to target and measure.

3. Persistence and observability: eWOM involves opinions transmitted via the written word. This has important implications. First, eWOM is persistent and remains in public repositories (Dellarocas and Narayan 2007). This information is available ‘on-demand’ to other consumers who are seeking opinions about products and services (Hennig-Thurau et al. 2010). Thus, eWOM enables influence between weak ties as opposed to traditional WOM, which typically occurs (and is influential) only between strong ties. Second, the effort required to transmit eWOM is much greater when compared to traditional WOM that occurs via casual conversations. Consumers have busy lifestyles and thus have limited ‘attention budgets’ to express their opinions online. This leads to a significant under-reporting bias (Hu, Pavlou, and Zhang 2009). Third, given the textual nature of eWOM opinions, both the content of the message and the source characteristics tend to become more salient in consumers’ evaluations of eWOM’s credibility and usefulness. Thus, the way an opinion is written, the type of language used, and other syntactic and semantic properties become highly salient. Fourth, the literature generally agrees that past conversations and ratings impact future WOM (Bowman and Narayandas 2001). Persistence and observability mean that existing eWOM significantly influences future eWOM (e.g., Dellarocas and Narayan 2007). Thus, eWOM is endogenous (Godes and Mayzlin 2004). It not only influences consumer purchase behavior, but is also the outcome of consumer purchases (Duan, Gu, and Whinston 2008).

4. Anonymity and deception: The Internet is a relatively anonymous medium (Ku, Wei, and Hsiao 2012). Self-interested behavior on the part of sellers may reduce both the credibility and the informativeness of eWOM; i.e., when vendors obtain high payoffs for manipulating online opinions (Resnick et al. 2000). For instance, to break through advertising clutter, a firm can sponsor online discussions without identifying the commercial nature of the source. Such covert actions decrease consumers’ trust in eWOM. Given the relative anonymity and potential for deception, an additional variable is introduced into the picture—‘quality’. As eWOM becomes more mainstream and pervasive, now it is time to focus on quality rather than quantity (Mudambi and Schuff 2010). Recently, firms have developed reputation mechanisms that chronicle not only vendor quality but also the reputations of review providers. The ways in which these reputations are built (based on both previous behavior and quality of opinions) have important implications for the generation and consumption of eWOM. With anonymity also comes the possibility of deception for the purpose of harming a competitor, or simply for fun.

5. Salience of valence: This term refers to the positive or negative rating assigned by consumers (typically on 1–5 or 1–7 Likert scales) when they review products. With traditional WOM, the main source of valence in the message is based on the interaction between individuals. The information provided by the sender has the possibility to be misinterpreted, whereas in eWOM with an assigned numerical rating, there is less issue with interpreting the valence of a sender’s opinion (Chevalier and Mayzlin 2006). The findings on the effects of valence have been equivocal at best. Some studies (Chevalier and Mayzlin 2006; Li and Hitt 2008) find a positive relationship between valence and product sales and the external influence propensity of online reviews. Chevalier and Mayzlin (2006) find evidence of confirmatory bias (Klayman and Ha 1987) that drives consumers to look for affirmative evidence supporting an already-made product choice. On the other hand, studies also find evidence for negativity bias (Cui, Lui, and Guo 2012; Mizerski 1982), suggesting that when consumers are neutral, negative reviews tend to be more salient than positive reviews.
6. Community engagement: Consumer engagement is the key to sustainable competitive advantage, profitability, and gaining consumer loyalty (Blazevic et al. 2013). eWOM platforms support collections of people in forming specialized, non-geographically bound consumer communities (De Valck, Van Bruggen, and Wierenga 2009). These platforms provide forums for consumers to discuss products/services and vent their frustrations but more importantly, to learn from other customers how to better use products/services. Considerable research has examined how these communities play an important role in mediating firm–customer relationships in the modern era (e.g., Muniz and Schau 2005; Schau, Muniz, and Arnould 2009; Yeh and Choi 2011). The main result of these studies is that firm–consumer–consumer interactive experiences via online platforms are very useful in enhancing marketers’ customer engagement efforts because those platforms allow the marketers to leverage the influence of a meta-layer of supporters who in turn engage with end consumers. Thus, traditional firm–customer engagement activities are now being mediated by meta-layers of customer communities that bring their own influence and practices to bear (Blazevic et al. 2013; Kozinets 1999). This new layer of influence has several strategic implications for marketers.

We now examine each quadrant in Fig. 1 in more depth to discuss: a) what we know from the current state of research; b) which of the six eWOM characteristics are relevant to the quadrant(s); and c) which specific research questions apply to each quadrant to provide guidance for what we need to know.

Quadrant 1: Antecedents of eWOM Senders (Why Do People Talk Online?)

What We Know

Previous research has examined ‘why consumers talk online’ (i.e., antecedents of senders). The extant research identifies several factors that motivate consumers to engage in eWOM: self-enhancement (Angelis et al. 2011; Fiske 2002; Wojnicki and Godes 2008), innovativeness and opinion leadership (Sun et al. 2006), ability and self-efficacy (Grunen, Osmonbekov, and Czaplewski 2006; Huang, Lin, and Lin 2009), individuation, (Ho and Dempsey 2010), neuroticism (Picazo-vela et al. 2010) and altruism (Dellarocas, Gao, and Narayan 2007; Hennig-Thurau et al. 2004). Interestingly, Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) find that self-interested consumers form the biggest segment that generates eWOM. Although some of these factors are common to traditional WOM, the unique nature of eWOM leads to several interesting dynamics.

Relevant eWOM Characteristics — C1, C3, C6

Enhanced volume, persistence and observability, and community engagement are the characteristics that determine how and why people generate and transmit eWOM.

The strength of the Internet is that it enables weak ties, i.e., connections between sources that previously would have been isolated and impossible to connect. eWOM primarily enables extended social connections and community engagement that drive both the incidence and type of eWOM messages. In traditional WOM, the connections between the sender and receiver would have to be pre-existing to have any meaning, but with eWOM, the ties can be weaker and still have a major impact. For instance, Sohn (2009) conducts an experiment to understand how network strength and the valence of messages affect consumers’ propensity to transmit eWOM. He finds that consumers are more likely to transmit messages to strong ties than to weak ties. Interestingly, this effect is moderated by the perceived value or quality of information, i.e., a communicator’s perception as to how much the other group values that information. Consumers are also more likely to pass on only negative messages to weak ties, whereas they share both positive and negative messages with strong ties. Chu and Kim (2011) also find that tie strength is positively associated with overall eWOM behavior.

The evidence seems to suggest that volume of messages seems to minimize the crowding-out effect (Andreoni 1989) that is typically observed in public goods, such as online conversations. The ready visibility and high (low) volume of eWOM messages seems to encourage (discourage) others to provide their opinions. For instance, Moe and Schweidel’s (2012) analysis of data from Bazaarvoice.com finds that products with a greater number of positive reviews tend to attract even more reviews. However, there is a certain variation related to who posts the reviews. More experienced reviewers tend to post reviews that are slightly divergent from existing opinions, whereas less experienced reviews tend to go with popular opinions (Purnawirawan, Dens, and De Pelsmacker 2012). One negative fall-out of this phenomenon is the ‘rich get richer’ effect—i.e., a few products and services tend to attract substantial amount of messages whereas the majority attract few to no messages. This creates a significant self-selection bias that has several implications for marketers (Hu and Li 2011). On the contrary, Khare, Labrecque, and Asare (2011) find that individuals with a high desire to be different from others will avoid following the majority. Thus, volume has apparent third-variable effects that are ripe for future research to determine differential effects based on personality types.

Observability and the aggregate effects of valence also affect the generation and transmission of eWOM. Dellarocas and Narayan (2006) conduct an interesting analysis of movie reviews on Yahoo.com with the goal of understanding which product-specific attributes explain variance in consumers’ propensity to generate eWOM. One of the key findings of this study is that consumers typically post reviews for either very good or very bad movies (in other words, there is a U-shaped relationship). Dellarocas, Gao, and Narayan (2010) find similar effects. Consumers’ propensity to post reviews is positively correlated with the level of disagreement among professional critics, i.e., the greater the disagreement, the greater the motivation for expert consumers to step in and break the tie. This reflects a desire to help other consumers in the decision-making process (Yoo, Sanders, and Moon 2013).
Although previous research does help to advance our knowledge in this arena, there are several aspects that warrant greater examination. Below, we pose several research questions that are relevant to our first quadrant—the supply side of eWOM.

**What We Need to Know**

**(RQ1) How can firms foster higher quality reviews and reviewers in a relatively anonymous online environment?**

eWOM platforms face the typical ‘public goods’ problems (Dellarocas 2003). Because most of these platforms are available freely, anyone can benefit at no cost. This problem is exacerbated by the relatively anonymous and impersonal nature of the online world. Consequently, marketers face two major problems. The first problem is the need to elicit balanced and informative feedback (not just rants and raves) that benefits all stakeholders, and more importantly, to elicit honest feedback. Firms still struggle to understand which factors are important to consumers seeking eWOM, and how to find better ways to facilitate an increase in helpful reviews. The second problem involves managing under-reporting bias. Recent studies (e.g., Chevalier and Mayzlin 2006; Hu, Pavlou, and Zhang 2009) suggest that there is considerable under-reporting bias in the case of eWOM. Under-reporting creates a scenario wherein only those consumers who are either extremely happy or extremely unhappy with a product/service will volunteer to articulate their thoughts online—thus creating a skewed picture.

To some extent, we know what drives consumers to provide eWOM. For instance, consumers react to specific issues, such as usage experiences, business practice issues, and post-transaction services, such as delivery accuracy and ease of returning products (Andreassen and Streukens 2009; Qu, Zhang, and Haizheng 2008). Furthermore, it is now possible for marketers to explicitly engage consumers to generate eWOM. For instance, Picazo-Vela et al. (2010) find that one of the reasons that consumers generate eWOM is due to perceived pressure—i.e., the degree of push in the form of follow-up invitations or calls from sellers and/or intermediaries. Economic incentives also encourage consumers to actively transmit eWOM. Leaving aside the ethical implications, incentives definitely motivate consumers to go the extra mile in generating and transmitting eWOM messages (Hennig-Thurau et al. 2004; Wang, Teo, and Wei 2009).

As firms rely more on consumers as volunteer opinion leaders, it is important to uncover various antecedents of review-writing behavior. Furthermore, under-reporting is still prevalent and can be problematic going forward because it introduces several issues related to the ways in which firms collect and aggregate eWOM information for consumers’ benefit (Hu, Pavlou, and Zhang 2009). To solve this problem, firms have been experimenting with many methods (e.g., Amazon’s verified purchase reviews or paid reviews at opinions.com). Future research should investigate this phenomenon and assess the effectiveness of initiatives to enhance consumers’ propensity to write online reviews. This helps firms to focus their efforts on providing better experiences for those who have valuable information to relay and add to the discussion about current products and future product development, along with rich insights on bettering the customer experience.

**(RQ2) What is the potential of visual eWOM?**

An emerging area of interest that has received no attention is visual eWOM. This can be either a product review or the increasingly popular “unboxing” video that is posted online via either a blog or a video-sharing site, such as YouTube or Vimeo. Though not as popular currently, Twitter’s new “Vine” platform is offering six-second videos that also have the potential to be beneficial to marketers. Vine’s possible benefits include searchable terms making it easier to find information, quick turnaround because the information is instantly available once it has been recorded, and other benefits that have as-yet untapped potential.

Surprisingly, limited research has gone into understanding the effects of eWOM generation/transmission on its senders—i.e., communicators’ post-eWOM behavior and the intervening processes that drive that behavior. The few studies that delve into this important phenomenon use both extended netnographic methods and surveys that track the behavior of active contributors in online forums. From these studies, the three key outcomes for eWOM communicators are: a) learning and enhanced use of focal brands (Muniz and Schau 2005); b) impression management (Kozinets 2001; Muniz and Schau 2005); and c) social capital and reputation (Chen et al. 2010; Dholakia et al. 2009; San-José-Cabezudo and Camarero-Izquierdo 2012). Online environments drive some unique post-eWOM behaviors that differ from those typically not observed offline.

**Relevant eWOM Characteristics — C3, C4, C6**

Persistence and observability, anonymity and deception, and community engagement are the characteristics relevant to understand senders’ post-communication dynamics.
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For instance, the fact that consumers can engage with an extended community of users means that they can draw significant benefits from the ‘crowd’, as opposed to a limited set of individuals (Dellarocas 2003). Evidence from several studies in this genre (e.g., Muniz and Schau 2005) show that contributors/communicators actively seek to benefit from collective creativity, which occurs when social interactions help them to develop new interpretations and discoveries that thinking alone would not have generated (Hargadon and Bechky 2006). ‘Consumer colleagues’ help contributors’ idea processes through active variation and selection processes (Simonton 1999) that are supported by diverse ideas and experiences brought to the forefront by others.

Furthermore, the relatively anonymous and goal-directed nature of online environments means that for active contributors, reputation is the only resource that can be developed and used to achieve an end. As Kollok (1999, p 228) suggests, “...high quality information, impressive technical details in one’s answers, a willingness to help others, and elegant writing can all work to increase one’s prestige in the community” (in the offline world, status and reputation are buttressed by other resources, such as income and possessions). A positive outcome of this desire to maintain reputation is better online citizenship and a greater effort to provide valuable information to eWOM seekers. Several studies have found evidence of this positive reinforcing mechanism. For instance, Cheung and Lee (2012) found that reputation, a sense of belonging, and enjoyment of helping other consumers are the main drivers of intentions to generate eWOM. In addition, Chen et al. (2010) conducted a field experiment involving members of movielens.org, a movie recommendation website. Their findings show that members who receive other members’ contribution statistics show a remarkable increase in the number of monthly review postings. On the other hand, members who are provided with outcome information (e.g., contributors’ net benefit scores, that is, time spent and votes received from readers) tend to post better-quality reviews aimed at helping others to make good choices. More recently, Racherla and Friske (2012) found that reviewers (on Yelp.com) with better reputations (in terms of number of friends and useful votes) tend to write longer and more balanced reviews that are intended to benefit consumers. On the whole, evidence shows that even in anonymous and goal-directed environments, the provision of information is viewed as an interactive communication with real-world benefits.

What We Need to Know

(RQ3) How does eWOM affect consumer engagement?

It is now well accepted that in today’s interactive and dynamic business environments, customer engagement is a strategic imperative that determines sustainable competitive advantage (Brodie et al. 2011; Marketing Science Institute 2010). By definition, customer engagement behaviors “go beyond transactions, and may be specifically defined as a customer’s behavioral manifestations that have a brand or firm focus, beyond purchase, resulting from motivational drivers” (Van Doorn et al. 2010, p 254). Customer engagement is a dynamic, iterative process that has a basis in various contexts and sometimes is even removed from product/service experiences. As consumers shift from a traditional, passive role to a more active role, eWOM and consumer–consumer (c2c) communities become central to the development of marketing strategies (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004). Several studies, especially those involving brand communities (e.g., Algesheimer et al. 2010; Nam and Baron 2007; Schau and Muniz 2002), show that extended c2c interactions heighten participants’ engagement and loyalty. It is also known that individuals who seek eWOM have a greater propensity to post their own reviews and participate in eWOM (Punj 2013), thus further engaging the consumer. Although there is a wealth of research in this area, not much is known about how firms should engage with senders, i.e., are there specific mechanisms that can help firms to better engage with the generators of eWOM?

There are several issues of interest in this area. It is critical for firms to encourage a selected few to generate high-value content and engage in interactions (both are the central currencies of eWOM platforms). However, given that participants are heterogeneous and participation changes over time, deciding what types of community governance models best work in a particular context is a non-trivial matter that determines the long-term health of these communities (O’Mahony and Ferraro 2007). Are reputation-based mechanisms more powerful in driving engagement behaviors (e.g., eBay and Yelp.com) or are hierarchical structures (e.g., Wikipedia, open-source communities) more effective? As recent accounts in the popular press have suggested, both mechanisms have their pitfalls. What are the specific contexts that determine the success of such mechanisms?

Quadrant 3: The Antecedents of the Receiver (Why do people listen?)

What We Know

The original area of interest to researchers of eWOM was to understand why consumers seek eWOM. Considering the fact that there are attitudinal and motivational issues, it is not surprising that most of the studies have primarily used either qualitative exploratory techniques or surveys and experiments (see the Appendix A). These studies apply the tenets of consumer information search theories (Bettman and Park 1980; Petty and Cacioppo 1986) to explicate key antecedents and moderators.

The extant research finds that the key factors that drive consumers to seek eWOM include: a) to reduce search and evaluation efforts (e.g., Dabholkar 2006; Goldsmith and Horovitz 2006) in both pre- and post-purchase evaluations (Bronner and de Hoog 2010; Hennig-Thurau and Walsh 2003); b) to reduce risk (Bettman and Park 1980; Kim, Mattila, and Baloglu 2011; Sweeney, Soutar, and Mazzarol 2008); c) to find social assurance/reassurance (Bailey 2005); d) to enact negativity bias (O’Reilly and Marx 2011). Researchers have also focused on message- and source-related factors, such as relevance and empathy generation (Bickart and Schindler 2001; Rabjohn, Cheung, and Lee 2008), helpfulness (Mudambi and Schuff 2010) and information value (Weiss, Lurie, and MacInnis 2008).
Relevant eWOM Characteristics — C1, C2, C3, C4

The way consumers seek and evaluate eWOM, and the ways in which researchers study these aspects, are radically different due to several unique characteristics of eWOM that are relevant to this quadrant—enhanced volume, dispersion, persistence and observability, and anonymity and deception.

For instance, given the anonymous nature of the online environment, consumers use the communicators’ prior activities as a metric to assess credibility and quality of information. Mudambi and Schuff (2010) analyze the ‘perceived helpfulness’ of product reviews from Amazon.com with the dependent variable being the proportion of helpful votes individual reviews receive from other consumers. They find that moderately valenced reviews (with 3-ratings) and the amount of text (a proxy for information extensiveness) positively correlate with the perceived helpfulness of those reviews. Weiss, Lurie, and MacInnis (2008) investigate the factors that lead to consumers’ perceptions of value and the subsequent adoption of information/advice in online communities. They find that both a provider’s response speed and the extent to which its previous responses (within a focal domain) have been positively evaluated by others affect judgments of information value. Interestingly, consumers find expertise depth (providing valuable information in a focal domain) more credible than expertise breadth (a provider’s tendency to respond to questions across different domains). Consumers with a decision-making orientation view expertise depth more positively, whereas consumers in learning domains. Consumers with a decision-making orientation view expertise depth more positively, whereas consumers in learning mode give more importance to expertise breadth.

Similarly, given the volume and dispersion of eWOM, consumers use certain heuristics to evaluate messages. Ba and Pavlou (2002) find that in the presence of a large number of positive reviews (which is typical of the case), negative reviews have a greater influence on trust (β = 0.856) than positive reviews (β = 0.541). However, negative reviews are also found to have less informational value because consumers may find negative emotions to be irrational (Kim and Gupta 2012). Although the effects of dispersion across communities are obvious, the same effects can also be observed within the same community. Sun (2012) found that when book reviews vary markedly, the instance of a low rating with high variance will lead to an increase in perceptions of product quality, whereas a low variance in a highly rated product will be high, as one would expect. This is also found in an experimental setting where conflicting reviews have decreased a review’s credibility (Qiu, Pang, and Lim 2012). Thus, not only does eWOM find benefits and drawbacks from different channels but also from differences in the same channel.

What We Need to Know

(RQ4) Are there latent or counterintuitive motivations to eWOM seeking?

Previous research considers antecedents to eWOM seeking as simple and apparent, based on the fact that consumers are rational and that they seek information to maximize social and economic utility during the purchasing process. However, as some recent studies have shown, this assumption is not always true. Consumers seek eWOM not only during the evaluation stage of the decision-making process but also when there is not even a recognized need for a product. eWOM conversations occur throughout the decision-making process and can be initiated upon exposure to an intriguing advertising message or even traditional WOM (Mangold, Miller, and Brockway 1999). Many times, eWOM consumption may be serendipitous and not goal-directed (Bailey 2005; Goldsmith and Horovitz 2006). When promotion consumption goals are present, positive reviews are more persuasive than negative ones, and when prevention consumption goals are present, then negative reviews are more persuasive than positive reviews (Zhang, Cracium, and Shin 2010). In their study of venture financing, Aggarwal et al. (2012) found that negative eWOM has a much greater impact than positive, with the main driving force being loss prevention.

Such evidence must lead marketers to question whether there are unintended and seemingly contradictory goals to eWOM seeking. For instance, Hung and Li (2007) uncover two interesting antecedents—social capital and reflexivity. The authors analyze consumers’ conversations in a Chinese online community dedicated to beauty products and conduct interviews with some of the active participants in that community. They find that gaining social capital (Nahapiet and Ghosal 1998) is the main reason why consumers seek eWOM. The authors find that eWOM exchange eventually leads to narrow targeting (i.e., a self-selection of consumers who are deeply interested in specific types of cosmetics and skin care (cognitive capital). Additionally, the forums enable members with similar socio-demographic backgrounds to congregate and form social structures and hierarchies dominated by members who have a greater ability and motivation to build reputations in the online world (structural capital). Simply put, consumers who are centrally positioned in social networks tend to seek out more eWOM than their peers. The study also finds that consumers seek eWOM to balance their informational disadvantage. This leads to increased reflexivity (Askegaard, Gertsen, and Langer 2002) that enables consumers to resist firms’ persuasion attempts and consume responsibly (which in many cases means either less or controlled consumption).

(RQ5): How do consumers process the textual content in the eWOM messages?

Only a few studies have focused on the importance of semantics and narratives in eWOM messages. Most notably, Kozinets et al. (2010) provided a comprehensive analysis of blog postings by bloggers who are deemed to be ‘influencers’. The objective of the study was to understand the networked coproduction of narratives, i.e., how communication and narratives in blog postings related to specific products evolve due to repeated interactions between eWOM generators and consumers. Their study found that the types of communication and rhetorical strategies used by bloggers, in addition to respecting community norms (e.g., evaluation vs. endorsement), have varying impacts on how consumers react to and act upon
the information in the messages. Archak, Ghose, and Ipeirotis (2011), using data from Amazon.com, find that writing styles and language used in reviews determine both how consumers perceive those messages and the subsequent impact of those messages. Reviews that confirm the information contained in the product description are more important for feature-based products, whereas reviews that give a more subjective point of view are more important for experiential goods, such as music and movie DVDs. Similarly, they find that the style of a review reflects consumer sentiment and can also influence the sales and pricing power of the listed merchants. Conversely, Pan and Zhang (2011) find that a review’s valence and length have an effect on its helpfulness. Their study also notes that utilitarian and experiential products moderate this effect, with a greater benefit going to experiential goods than to utilitarian products.

Although numerical ratings allow consumers to communicate product performance related to various attributes, it is the actual text that provides them with the opportunity to articulate the nuances of their overall experience and convey useful information. For instance, Ludwig et al. (2013) find that linguistic styles can positively affect source perceptions and lead to higher conversion rates. Li and Zhan (2011) have also found that reviews are most helpful when they are comprehensive and easy to read, communicate usage experience, provide argument support, are information positive, and possibly contain strong emotions. The use of strong negative emotions in a review is not beneficial to recipients. Although the abovementioned studies have provided a strong foundation for the research, there are still many unanswered questions. Textual content analysis provides marketers with an opportunity to answer certain important questions such as: What do consumers talk about in the textual portion of eWOM messages?; How do these issues relate to the numerical ratings?; Is there a collective language that spreads across messages—especially given the strong influence of communities, is it possible to identify shared language styles to identify small niche/interest groups and their effects?; and What is the impact of sentiment and narratives on various firm and consumer outcomes?

(RQ6) How does eWOM differ cross-culturally?

Another area that is ripe for investigation is 'culture differences' in the transmission and consumption of eWOM. Previous research has established that culture affects consumers’ decision-making processes and in particular, the extent of information seeking (Mangold and Smith 2012; McGuinness, Campbell, and Leontides 1991). Few studies (e.g., Fong and Burton 2008; Park and Lee 2009) have investigated how consumers from different cultures (and nations) seek and process eWOM information. Even those studies have essentially confined their analysis to cursory differences, such as individualism versus collectivism (e.g., Chu and Choi 2011; Lai et al. 2013) or uncertainty avoidance, and do not explore the structural differences in depth. As online commerce becomes global in nature, more and more retailers are expanding beyond the boundaries of the Western hemisphere into such countries as China and India, which are promising the next wave of consumerism. Still, it is not well understood how consumers from different cultures seek and use eWOM information and what that means for marketers. For instance, most marketers now consider Amazon’s decision to allow consumer reviews a masterstroke that differentiated it from all other online retailers and significantly enhanced consumer stickiness and loyalty. In their investigation of the different Amazon websites, Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al. (2009, p 149) find that there are “noticeable differences between reviews” in average helpfulness ratio and review variance for reviewers in the U.K., Japan, Germany and the U.S. Understanding these differences and being able to adapt the review process to meet these needs are critical to retailers so that they can design systems that provide this information in the best manner possible.

Quadrant 4: The Consequences to the Receiver (The Power of eWOM)

What We Know

One popular thesis regarding the effects of eWOM is that it allows more informed purchase decisions because ready access to information helps consumers better determine which products from which vendors best meet their needs and preferences (Dellarocas 2003). More information reduces consumer uncertainty and search costs, leading to a greater willingness to pay for products (Brynjolfsson and Smith 2000). From the vendors’ perspective, eWOM enables better sorting and matching between products and consumers so that vendors may be able to charge higher prices (Clemons and Gao 2008). Researchers have always been on a quest to quantify the positive and negative effects of eWOM on a wide range of outcomes that marketers truly value. It is no surprise that this topic accounts for the largest number of studies in our database. These studies apply a variety of methods in varied contexts to delineate the key dimensions and scale of eWOM (see Appendix A).

Several studies find that eWOM significantly affects several individual-level outcomes: a) Consumers’ spending/willingness-to-pay in a product category (e.g., Bickart and Schindler 2001; Pavlou and Dimoka 2006); b) levels of trust and loyalty (Awad and Ragowsky 2008; Ba and Pavlou 2002; Gauri, Bhatnagar, and Rao 2008); and c) consumer engagement (e.g., Algesheimer et al. 2010; Nambisan and Baron 2007; Schau and Muniz 2002).

Consequently, eWOM also affects several firm-level outcomes, such as product sales, revenues and stock prices (e.g., Chevalier and Mayzlin 2006; Trusov, Bucklin, and Pauwels 2009).

Relevant eWOM Characteristics—C1, C2, C3, C5

Enhanced volume, dispersion, persistence and observability, and salience of valence are key characteristics that are relevant to eWOM effects and more importantly, determine how these effects are measured or quantified.
Pavlou and Dimoka (2006) examine the relationship between consumer reviews and the ability of sellers to conduct business on eBay.com. Their main conjecture is that consumers express their opinions via not only numerical ratings but also written text. In many cases, the nuances expressed in the written portion of an opinion may not be reflected in crude numerical ratings. This in turn affects consumers’ trust and their willingness to purchase and to pay premium prices. The authors find that feedback text comments create price premiums for reputable sellers by engendering buyers’ trust in the sellers’ benevolence and credibility (controlling for the impact of numerical ratings). It is worth noting that with eWOM, consumers cannot directly examine source credibility, as they can with traditional WOM (Huang, Hsiao, and Chen 2012).

The fact that eWOM is endogenous means that eWOM effects cannot be linearly computed. Rather, it is important to apply sophisticated methods to control for this characteristic. For instance, Duan, Gu, and Whinston (2008) examine the dynamic relationship between online movie reviews (from Yahoo.com) and box office revenues. To account for the unique nature of the movie life cycle and eWOM, they construct a set of log-linear models (Liu 2006) that account for: a) the dynamic and interdependent link between daily box office revenue and WOM volume; and b) a multi-stage model of consumer decision-making. The analysis shows that the star ratings have no significant impact on movies’ box office revenues after accounting for endogeneity. On the other hand, the volume of online postings (the importance-of-awareness effect) significantly influences box office sales. More recently, Sonnier, McAllister, and Rutz (2011) applied innovative methods to account for the unique nature of online communications. For instance, to work around the problems of aggregation, they used automated sentiment analysis to extract both the valence and the numerical ratings related to online reviews. Furthermore, they use the latent instrumental variable method (Zhang, Michel, and Pieters 2009) to account for the dynamic and endogenous nature of online communications. Their analysis of data from an online durable goods vendor suggests that daily changes in the number of positive, negative and neutral comments has a significant impact on daily product sales. More importantly, from an estimation perspective, it is important to measure not only the volume but also the coefficients and correlations of the effects.

Salience of valence is another key characteristic of eWOM effects, although previous research findings have been equivocal at best. One set of studies (Chevalier and Mayzlin 2006; Li and Hitt 2008) finds a positive relationship between valence and product sales and the external influence propensity of online reviews. Clemons and Gao (2008) find that star ratings do not accurately predict sales, and even if they do, the reviews in the upper quartile (4 and 5 ratings) tend to be more accurate predictors than the reviews in the lower quartile. On the other hand, studies also find evidence for negativity bias (Mizerski 1982), i.e., when consumers are neutral, negative reviews tend to become more salient than positive reviews (Ba and Pavlou 2002).

Although various numerical features of eWOM have been studied extensively, it is only recently that researchers have started paying attention to the moderating effects of eWOM quality. As Mudambi and Schuff (2010) note, as eWOM becomes more mainstream and pervasive, it is now time to focus on quality rather than quantity. It is a well-accepted notion in traditional WOM literature that both the content of a message and the reputation of the communicator are important factors that determine a messenger’s persuasiveness (Cialdini 2001). Some of the eWOM quality dimensions that have been examined in the eWOM literature include argument quality (Cheung et al. 2009; Racherla, Mandviwalla, and Connolly 2012), overall quality (Awad and Ragowsky 2008; Lee, Park, and Han 2008), and review helpfulness (Forman, Ghose, and Wiesenfeld 2008; Mudambi and Schuff 2010).

What We Need To Know

(RQ7) What are the disaggregate effects on receivers?

The analysis in most studies assumes the aggregate effects of eWOM with the underlying assumption that all eWOM messages are equal in regard to consumer impact. However, as numerous studies have shown, consumers carefully assess both the quality of information (depending on how important the purchase is) and the source characteristics and then decide which eWOM messages to adopt and which ones to reject. Consequently, some eWOM messages have a bigger impact than others. As Resnick et al. (2000, p 47) note: “...simple numerical ratings fail to convey important subtleties of online interactions. For example, what were the reputations of the people providing the feedback?” Therefore, it is important to measure eWOM effects not in aggregation but ‘disaggregation’. Some studies (Chen, Dhanasobhon, and Smith 2008; Forman, Ghose, and Wiesenfeld 2008) find evidence to this effect. However, due the nature of their data, these studies consider only the hard characteristics of eWOM messages, such as valence and volume, and do not carefully delineate their socio-psychological aspects (such as source characteristics and reputation effects, source–consumer demographic similarity, etc.). For instance, in a situation of perceived ambiguity of a review, consumers use egocentric anchors as a basis for their decisions (Naylor, Lambert, and Norton 2011).

The extent to which community evaluations of individual reviews and individual reviewers influence consumer purchase decisions online remains an open question. It is possible that the sources of these eWOM messages might be key opinion leaders that firms must first engage using various channels and then use to spread the good word to other impressionable consumers. Consequently, it is imperative for future research to identify and quantify the disaggregate effects of eWOM in various online forums.

(RQ8) How does trust change the power of eWOM?

One of the greatest advantages to eWOM compared to traditional WOM is the ability to speak one’s mind without fear of recourse. The ability to speak candidly about a product or
store is beneficial because it alleviates issues that can arise from a lack of information, such as only posting positive online reviews and not being able to see negative reviews. This anonymity may also be the biggest drawback. Anonymity is a problem because: (1) It is more difficult to identify and catch criminals; (2) It creates an environment that allows users to say what they think; and (3) It makes it difficult to discern what is correct and incorrect (Johnson 1997). These issues lead the way for new areas of research into how people must learn to properly assign trust when searching for information. Fake online reviews are a large enough problem that companies have been advised to take notice and put into place regulatory systems to address the issues that they can cause (Malbon 2013). It is well known that sellers and book publishers can and have manipulated product reviews to boost sales (Chen, Xu, and Whinston 2011). If consumers are looking for new methods of interaction or signaled cues from users, then there needs to be an understanding of why they find them useful. Characteristics of online communication, such as social-network characteristics (Logsdon and Patterson 2009), may be the key to effectively finding true eWOM transmissions.

(RQ9) How does eWOM change the consumer decision journey?

Although it is well accepted that eWOM significantly affects consumers’ decision-making, we still do not know how consumers actively consume and process eWOM information during different stages of the decision process. The few studies that have studied this aspect have considered two broad stages: pre- and post-purchase. However, a recent study by McKinsey (Court et al. 2009) suggests that the ease of access and ubiquity of eWOM might have significantly altered how consumers collect information during various stages of the decision-making process. The traditional understanding is that the decision journey is a linear process (the funnel) and consumers go through each step while systematically narrowing down brand choices.

However, the McKinsey study suggests that the decision journey is now a continuous loop in which consumers keep adding and deleting brands based on significant information from online c2c sources, such as online reviews and interactions with family and friends via social media. The power of non-marketer sources, such as eWOM, is such that brands that are not included in the original evaluation set might enter consumers’ final consideration set if they are associated with positive eWOM. In addition, for many products, consumers actively seek eWOM in lieu of after-sales service to understand what other consumers are experiencing, and these actions could significantly affect loyalty. This dynamic nature of the decision journey is in stark contrast to what is universally accepted in the marketing literature. It is important for future research to examine how consumers incorporate eWOM into this dynamic decision-making journey related to various products and services.

Future research should focus on trying to determine which individual factors are activated at what points in the decision process to better build eWOM theory. For instance, Jang, Prasad, and Ratchford (2012) found that consumers use product reviews in the consideration stage more than in the choice stage. Further, Gupta and Harris (2010) found that the time spent considering products could alter the decision process and lead to suboptimal choices, depending on the consumer’s motivation.

We see two specific areas of inquiry with respect to firm-level interests:

(RQ10) How does eWOM affect service delivery modes and costs?

As evidenced above, considerable progress has been made in understanding the ‘hard’ effects of eWOM on several consumer and firm-related outcomes. However, it is time to focus our attention on the ‘soft’ outcomes that are of significant importance to modern organizations. For instance, how can eWOM reduce firms’ costs of service delivery? At this stage, it is well established that eWOM directly affects product sales and revenues.

However, not much is known about the direct effects of eWOM on companies’ costs related to delivering customer service. Several studies, mainly in the ‘online communities’ genre, have investigated how customers band together in product- or company-focused online communities and help each other by sharing information about product functionalities and troubleshooting. Dholakia et al. (2009) term this phenomenon as communal service delivery. It is also well known, via both the popular press and academia (Rosenbaum 2008), that companies, by encouraging c2c exchanges in online communities, not only cut the costs of servicing customers but also obtain innovative ideas for improving company offerings and building customer equity. Successful examples of such communities include ‘Dell IdeaStorm’ and ‘myStarbucksIdea’. These savings and revenue additions should be taken into account when calculating the effects of eWOM.

An important yet unknown variable in this context is firms’ response actions. As eWOM has become more pervasive and mainstream, firms have devised strategies not only to actively use online feedback but also to actively engage eWOM providers. For example, such sites as TripAdvisor.com, Yelp.com, and Hotels.com give managers of reviewed businesses the opportunity to contact the review writers both to resolve any problems and to publicly respond/rebut to feedback—essentially, a form of service recovery. It is not known whether such actions have a positive effect not only on the communicators but also on other consumers who view such interactions. Do responses from firms affect consumers’ future engagements with a product or brand? Does this change with different product categories or channels (Dholakia et al. 2010)? These are some of the interesting questions that future researchers should consider.

(RQ11) How can firms utilize eWOM’s inherent endogeneity?

Endogeneity is an important factor to consider when measuring eWOM influences. An important task for researchers is to identify and apply (as discussed earlier) sophisticated techniques that help parse the effects of endogeneity. However, from
a strategic perspective, an interesting question arises: Can marketers positively utilize the endogenous nature of eWOM? For instance, recent studies observe a significant change in valence of reviews over time i.e., valence decreases both overtime and in sequence (Godes and Silva 2012). To mitigate this sequential effect, should firms judiciously generate positive conversations from loyal and satisfied customers in a given platform? Or even seed eWOM without crossing ethical and legal boundaries? If yes, what are the outcomes? More importantly, what are the dynamics of such tactics over the course of a product lifecycle?

Another question of interest to marketers is: Does eWOM’s inherent endogeneity alter consumers’ choices to both consume and participate in eWOM? Research suggests that when dissonance exists between an individual and a group, individuals seek to reduce the dissonance by altering or adding cognitions (Festinger 1957). In the case of eWOM, this means consumers might contribute their opinions to a discussion regarding a product in an attempt to reduce disagreement and lessen the impact of opinions that differ from their own. Such disagreements cause higher levels of arousal that drive greater participation in online discussions and articulation of opinions (Berger and Milkman 2012). Could these psychological drivers be put to good use to drive generation and transmission of quality eWOM? Could this be used to solve the under reporting bias that exists in the online environment? For instance, instead of merely requesting a customer to write a review, would it be more effective if a marketer provides targeted statistics regarding previous reviews (number as well as valence) that will create greater arousal? These are some of the important questions that should drive more research in this arena.

### Summary

In this study, we present a framework that synthesizes the eWOM literature. We examine the unique characteristics of eWOM, how these differentiating characteristics drive the dynamics of eWOM and provide directions for future research. Our framework identifies four dimensions that can be used by researchers to focus their efforts in a more precise manner. These dimensions are the antecedents and consequences for both the sender and receiver of eWOM. Each dimension has its own relevant characteristics and research questions that must be explored to better understand the implications of eWOM for future research and theory development. As the eWOM literature continues to evolve, it will enable a better understanding of how the theory of eWOM can be utilized by managers to build, grow, and maintain their firms’ brands and products. Only in this continued pursuit of insight can we provide better customer value and a meaningful business impact for managers.
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### Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics and methodologies: representative articles</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Archival/panel</th>
<th>Survey/experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social factors (norms, interactions, and relational benefits)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Wang, Teo, and Wei (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 Consequences to the senders

| Impression Management | Schau and Muniz (2002) | N/A |
| Greater Learning | Schau and Muniz (2002) | N/A |

---
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Table B

Topics and methodologies: representative articles — consumption and eWOM effects on consumer behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Antecedents of the receiver</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Archival/panel</th>
<th>Survey/experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other factors</td>
<td>Hung and Li (2007)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bailey (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Consequences to the Receiver</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Archival/Panel</th>
<th>Survey/Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase intention</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Park and Kim (2008), Senecal and Nantel (2004), Xia and Bechwati (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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