



This is a repository copy of *Do online reviews still matter post-purchase?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/150098/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Liu, H., Jayawardhena, C., Osburg, V.-S. et al. (1 more author) (2020) Do online reviews still matter post-purchase? *Internet Research*, 30 (1). pp. 109-139. ISSN 1066-2243

<https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-07-2018-0331>

© 2019 Emerald Publishing. This is an author-produced version of a paper subsequently published in *Internet Research*. This version is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial Licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



Do Online Reviews Still Matter Post-Purchase?

Journal:	<i>Internet Research</i>
Manuscript ID	IntR-07-2018-0331.R4
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Electronic Word-of-Mouth (eWOM), Online reviews, Post-purchase evaluation, Social comparison, Polarisation effects

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Do Online Reviews Still Matter Post-Purchase?

Abstract

Purpose – The influence of eWOM information, such as online reviews, on consumers' decision making is well documented, but it is unclear if online reviews still matter in post-purchase evaluation and behaviours. We therefore examine the extent to which online reviews (aggregate rating and individual reviews) influence consumers' evaluation and post-purchase behaviour by considering the valence congruence of online reviews and consumption experience.

Design/methodology/approach – Following social comparison theory and relevant literature, we conduct an online experiment (pre-test: $n = 180$; main study: $n = 347$). We rely on a 2 (consumption experience valence) \times 2 (aggregated rating valence) \times 2 (individual review valence) between-subjects design.

Findings – Congruence/incongruence between the valences of consumption experience, aggregated rating and individual reviews affects consumers' post-purchase evaluation at the emotional, brand and media levels, and review-writing behaviour. In comparison to aggregated rating, individual reviews are more important in the post-purchase stage. Similarly, consumers have a higher eWOM-writing intention when there is congruence between the valences of consumption experience, aggregated rating and individual reviews.

Practical implications – We demonstrate the importance of service providers continually monitoring their business profiles on review sites to ensure consistency of review information, as these influence consumers' post-purchase evaluation and behaviours. For this reason, we illustrate the utility of why media owners of review sites should support the monitoring process to facilitate the engagement of both businesses and customers.

Originality/value – We break new ground by empirically testing the impact of online review information post-purchase seen through the theoretical lens of social comparison. Our approach

1
2
3 is novel in breaking down and testing the dimensions of post-purchase evaluation and
4 behavioural intentions in understanding the social comparison elicited by online reviews in the
5 post-purchase phase.
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Key words:** Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM), Online reviews, Post-purchase evaluation,
12 Social comparison, Polarisation effects
13
14

15
16
17 **Paper type:** Research paper
18
19

20 21 22 **1. Introduction** 23

24 For over half a century, practitioners and academic literature alike have established word-of-
25 mouth (WOM) as a direct determinant of consumption behaviour. With the advent of electronic
26 platforms, electronic WOM (eWOM) has revolutionised consumers' decision-making
27 processes (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004). In practice, eWOM frequently refers to online reviews
28 (Filieri and McLeay, 2014; Sotiriadis and Van Zyl, 2013). Previous studies have demonstrated
29 that online reviews are important to consumers' purchase decision making, especially for
30 services (e.g. hotels and restaurants) (Tsao et al., 2015; Yen and Tang, 2015). In this context,
31 two types of eWOM are usually distinguished: base rate information (i.e. aggregated rating -
32 AR) and individuating information (i.e. individual reviews - IR), which in combination form a
33 persuasive online environment, and are often jointly provided on review platforms (López-
34 López and Parra, 2016; Qiu et al., 2012). Aggregated rating refers to the rating that reflects
35 former consumers' overall evaluation of a service provider, while individual reviews usually
36 include the rating that a single consumer gives to a service provider, aligned with descriptive
37 texts and, sometimes, images (see the example in Figure 1). These two types of eWOM
38 information in the context of review sites are thought to influence both consumers' decision
39 making and business growth (Luca, 2011; Xun and Guo, 2017).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 <Insert Figure 1 here>
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 eWOM researchers recognise the significance of understanding how different types of eWOM
4 information, specifically AR and IR, on review sites, and the valence congruence/incongruence
5 between them, influence consumer perception and behaviour at different stages of the decision-
6 making process, particularly in service settings (Aggarwal and Singh, 2013; Chen et al., 2015;
7 Qiu et al., 2012). However, the investigation of such effects has largely focused on the pre-
8 purchase stage, leaving the influence of online reviews on the post-purchase period under-
9 explored (López-López and Parra, 2016; Qiu et al., 2012). This is surprising since, due to the
10 ever-popular eWOM media and smart devices, consumers now have opportunities to access
11 and receive an abundant amount of eWOM information across different media at any stage of
12 the decision-making process, including the post-purchase evaluation stage. More importantly,
13 the influence of online reviews post-purchase can be expected to significantly differ from the
14 pre-purchase stage, not least due to the consumption experience customers have formed (Hess
15 and Ring, 2016; Ranaweera and Jayawardhena, 2014). Based on Kardes (1994), Figure 2
16 conceptualises the eWOM information involvement in the consumers' decision-making
17 process from an information-receiving perspective and clarifies the positioning of the current
18 study, i.e. addressing the literature gap on consumer reactions towards online reviews post-
19 purchase.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 <Insert Figure 2 here>
36
37
38
39

40 More precisely, unlike the pre-purchase stage where consumers have limited knowledge and
41 experience about the product/service, consumers have acquired their own consumption
42 experience by the time they encounter online reviews in the post-purchase stage (Carù and
43 Cova, 2003); thus, making the online review reception post-purchase fundamentally different
44 from pre-purchase stages. The involvement of personal consumption experiences creates new
45 dynamics in post-purchase evaluation, together with online review information received (Hess
46 and Ring, 2016). Such new dynamics allow consumers to compare their own experiences with
47 eWOM information on the review sites in which others' experiences with the same company
48 are being shared. Such comparisons might confirm their own beliefs of the consumption
49 experience in the post-purchase phase, or they might trigger the consumers' re-evaluation of
50 multiple aspects related to the consumption (Bearden and Rose, 1990; Dahl, 2013; Smeesters
51 et al., 2009). This unique phenomenon reflects the consumers' social comparison (Liu and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Keng, 2014). Social comparison theory asserts that individuals constantly confirm their
4 understanding and perceptions with those of other people (Festinger, 1954). Nevertheless, the
5 social comparison drawn from the interaction between personal experience and online reviews
6 in the post-purchase stage has not been fully examined in the literature. More specifically,
7 compared to vertical social comparison (i.e. better vs. worse), horizontal social comparison
8 (i.e. similar vs. different) is often neglected (Locke, 2003; 2005). This calls for an
9 understanding of the impact of horizontal social comparison on consumers' post-purchase
10 evaluations.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 With regard to the potential outcomes of social comparisons elicited by eWOM information
18 post-purchase, the literature suggests that consumers not only form cognitive and emotional
19 evaluations towards a product/service at this stage, but also adjust their brand perception (Bigne
20 et al., 2001; Grace and O'Cass, 2004; Kuo et al., 2009). Meanwhile, consumers can also re-
21 evaluate the eWOM platform's credibility based on consistence between the information
22 available on the site and their personal experience (Hood et al., 2015). This creates a media-
23 related dimension in consumers' post-purchase evaluation in the specific context of eWOM.
24 Therefore, assessing interactions between consumption experience and online reviews requires
25 in-depth understanding of consumers' post-purchase evaluation as a multidimensional concept.
26 Additionally, the literature suggests that consumers' post-purchase evaluation also has a
27 significant impact on eWOM-giving behaviour (Jeong and Jang, 2011; Yu et al., 2017).
28 eWOM-giving is media-specific; on review sites it is reflected in consumers' online review
29 writing post-purchase (Yen and Tang, 2015). Therefore, a multidimensional evaluation might
30 influence consumers' eWOM-giving behaviour. Recent service research also recognises that
31 social comparison has a strong impact on consumers' post-purchase evaluation and eWOM
32 behaviour (Allen et al., 2015; Antonetti et al., 2018). Therefore, it is important to explore the
33 dimensionality of post-purchase evaluation triggered by social comparison of the
34 congruence/incongruence between personal experience and eWOM information, and to
35 examine its impact on consumers' eWOM-giving behaviour.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This study therefore contributes to the existing literature on eWOM and consumers' post-
51 purchase evaluations in several ways. First, we push the boundaries of pre-purchase-centred
52 eWOM information studies by uniquely focusing on the eWOM information received in the
53 post-purchase stage and its impact on consumers' evaluations and eWOM-giving behaviour.
54 Second, we employ often-neglected horizontal social comparison instead of vertical
55 comparison and shed new light on the role of social comparison in consumers' post-purchase
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 evaluations. Third, we reconceptualise the post-purchase evaluation as a multidimensional
4 concept and categorise post-purchase evaluation into consumption-related and media-related
5 dimensions, thereby advancing the theoretical understanding of social comparison-triggered
6 post-purchase evaluations.
7
8
9

10 Thus, drawing upon social comparison theory, we specifically examine the interactive effects
11 of aggregated rating (AR), individual reviews (IR) and consumption experience (CE) on post-
12 purchase evaluation and eWOM-giving behaviour on the review site. We present background
13 information on the constructs under examination, before formulating our hypotheses. The
14 research methodology is then detailed. After presenting the data analysis and results, the paper
15 concludes with a discussion of the study's outcomes and its implications for theory and practice,
16 the limitations of the study, and future research directions.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **2. Literature Review**

26
27 In an information age, consumers have opportunities to access different types of information
28 across various media. On the review sites, valence is an important indicator of eWOM
29 information that influences consumers' judgement (Purnawirawan et al., 2015). While different
30 types of eWOM information on review sites (e.g. AR and IR) could reflect different valences
31 (positive vs. negative), one research stream in online reviews has been dedicated to
32 understanding the impact of valence congruence/incongruence of eWOM information on
33 consumers' perceptions (e.g. López-López and Parra, 2016; Qiu et al., 2012). Table 1
34 summarises previous studies that focus on the valence congruence/incongruence between
35 multiple eWOM cues.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 <Insert Table 1 here>
47
48
49

50
51 All these studies emphasise the pre-purchase stage and employ theories related to information
52 processing and risk reduction to explain consumers' evaluation of the related product/service
53 and eWOM information when facing information valence congruence/incongruence. Most
54 emphasise the conflict between AR and IR as they are the most essential eWOM elements on
55 review sites. Since these studies focus on the pre-purchase stage in which consumers are
56 assumed to have no or limited knowledge and experience with the product/service, the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 evaluations of the product/service rely entirely on the eWOM information and its valence
4 congruence/incongruence. However, in the post-purchase stage where the consumer has gained
5 personal experience with a product/service, when different types of eWOM information about
6 the same product/service are present, the post-purchase evaluation no longer depends only on
7 the valence congruence/incongruence of eWOM information but also involves the valence of
8 the personal experience and its congruence/incongruence with the eWOM information. In
9 consumer research, consumption experience usually refers to “the total outcome to the
10 customer from the combination of environment, goods, and services purchased” (Lewis and
11 Chambers, 2000, p. 46) and can be seen as a valence-based construct which has a major
12 influence on post-purchase evaluation (Mano and Oliver, 1993). Hence, we advance the
13 previous eWOM studies’ focus on the valence congruence/incongruence by taking the valence
14 of personal experience into account and examining the interactive effects of valence
15 congruence/incongruence post-purchase. More specifically, when consumers encounter online
16 reviews post-purchase, the influence is bi-directional. More precisely, they can a) use such
17 information to compare with and evaluate their personal consumption experience, or b) use
18 their personal consumption experience as a benchmark to evaluate the online reviews and the
19 medium. In such comparison, the outcome could depend on the valence
20 congruence/incongruence between the consumers’ personal experience and eWOM
21 information provided by other consumers. The interaction of consumption experience and
22 received eWOM information post-purchase results in self-others comparison in terms of the
23 consumption of the same product/service (Andsager and White, 2007). This phenomenon can
24 be explained by using social comparison theory. Figure 3 illustrates the contextualisation of
25 the social comparison in this study.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 <Insert Figure 3 here>
47
48
49

50 **2.1 Social Comparison Theory**

51 **2.1.1 Horizontal Social Comparison**

52 Festinger’s social comparison theory (1954) asserts that individuals evaluate their own
53 opinions and abilities by comparing them with others’. This reduces uncertainty and helps
54 individuals learn more about themselves. Richins (1995) argues that consumers continually
55 desire to learn more about themselves, not least through comparison with others. Social
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 comparison contains two dimensions: vertical (better-worse) and horizontal (similar-different)
4 comparisons (Locke, 2005). Previous research claims that about half of social comparisons are
5 vertical, that is whether the comparison target is better (an upward comparison) or worse (a
6 downward comparison) than the self (e.g. John had a better experience than I did at Hotel A).
7
8 The remaining comparisons are horizontal, focusing on whether the target is similar to (a
9 connective comparison) or different from (a contrastive comparison) the self (e.g. Emma
10 enjoyed her stay at Hotel A and so did I) (Locke, 2003). Most social comparison studies
11 concentrate on the vertical approach and its impact but neglect horizontal comparisons.
12
13 Importantly, the motivation for and outcome of the comparison vary between the vertical and
14 the horizontal dimensions (Locke, 2005). Locke (2003, 2005) also asserts that when one
15 compares oneself horizontally with the target (i.e. the person with whom the self compares)
16 regarding the target attribute (i.e. the feature of the target that is being compared with a
17 corresponding feature of the self), the self's beliefs, attitude, emotional status and cognitive
18 evaluation towards the target attribute will be influenced. Meanwhile, social psychologists
19 assert that when social comparison results in inconsistent beliefs concerning the target attribute,
20 cognitive dissonance occurs (Festinger, 1962; Goethals, 1962). Cognitive dissonance refers to
21 the mental discomfort experienced in holding contradictory beliefs, ideas or values; such
22 contradictions could further shape one's beliefs about the target attribute (Festinger, 1962; Liu
23 and Keng, 2014). In this study, the *target* is peer consumers, and the *target attribute* is the
24 valence of the experience of peer consumers with the same service provider.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 More precisely, building upon previous studies on valence congruence/incongruence of
39 eWOM information (e.g. Qiu et al., 2012; see Table 1), we focus on social comparison that
40 involves two different types of cue post-purchase: base-rating (i.e. aggregated rating; target: all
41 consumers who visited and reviewed the service provider) and individuating (i.e. individual
42 reviews; target: specific consumers who visited and reviewed the service provider). Both are
43 valence-based (positive vs. negative), which offers unified comparison standards by which a
44 consumer can assess whether his/her personal experience is similar to (same-valenced) or
45 different from (differently-valenced) that of others at the specific and general levels (López-
46 López and Parra, 2016). As already explained, horizontal comparison triggers cognitive
47 dissonance and has an impact on one's attitudinal, emotional and evaluative beliefs regarding
48 the target attribute. Thus, the valence congruence/incongruence between consumer's personal
49 consumption experience with a service provider and eWOM information reflecting others'
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experience with the same service provider is expected to influence consumers' evaluations and
4 subsequent behaviours associated with the service provider.
5
6
7

9 **2.1.2 Social Comparison on Digital Media**

11 It is argued that consumers utilise information from different media (Smeesters et al., 2009),
12 as well as social capital sources (Argo et al., 2006), to evaluate themselves (Richins, 1991) and
13 product/service information (Hogg et al., 2000). With the growing popularity of social media,
14 consumers' social comparison has also been digitised (Haferkamp and Krämer, 2011). Vogel
15 et al. (2015) suggest that social comparison is a key motivator for social media use. It also
16 influences consumer engagement with brands and peer consumers on social networking sites
17 (Phua et al., 2017). Therefore, social comparison in the online environment has become a major
18 approach for consumers to conduct self-confirmation and evaluate products and services.
19 Previous research also suggests that social comparison that takes place online affects
20 individuals' evaluation of a particular site. For example, online social comparison can
21 contribute to the perceived usefulness and enjoyment of a social shopping website (Shen, 2012),
22 and Shang et al. (2013) argue that satisfaction with a virtual community is an outcome of the
23 individuals' social comparison in that community. We therefore postulate that, in addition to
24 the influence on comparing targets, online social comparison could also affect consumers'
25 judgement regarding the media that facilitated the social comparison.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **2.1.3 Social Comparison in eWOM**

41 Although social comparison has not been used extensively in eWOM research, some
42 pioneering scholars identified eWOM-triggered social comparison and its possible
43 implications, especially in the post-purchase stage. eWOM received post-purchase allows
44 consumers to reform their perception of the consumed product/service, thereby influencing
45 switching behaviour (Wangenheim and Bayón, 2004). Further, Hess and Ring (2016) assert
46 that the valence of WOM information about a service provider received in the post-failure stage
47 affects consumers' satisfaction and trust towards that service provider. Additionally, eWOM
48 information received in the post-purchase stage has been found to influence consumers'
49 eWOM-giving behaviour (Liu and Keng, 2014), triggered by comparison as a social need of
50 consumers (Alexandrov et al., 2013; Choi et al., 2017). Thus, in the post-consumption stage of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a service, social comparison elicited by eWOM information is expected to influence consumers'
4 evaluation of the service provider and further eWOM-giving.
5
6

7 Although researchers employing social comparison theory have suggested that eWOM
8 information might trigger social comparison in the post-purchase phase, almost all focus on a
9 single type of (e)WOM information. Compared to the studies in the pre-purchase stage (see
10 Table 1), multiple information cues should be considered in eWOM-triggered social
11 comparison. Therefore, drawing upon social comparison theory, this study recognises that the
12 review site provides multiple cues for post-purchase comparison, which not only addresses the
13 ambiguity of consumers' attitudes and perceptions towards a particular service, but also
14 influences the consumers' own eWOM-giving. By specifically focusing on the effects of
15 aggregated rating and individual reviews, we conceptualise horizontal social comparison as the
16 fact that a consumer compares the valence of his/her personal experience with a service
17 provider with the valence of other eWOM information at aggregated and individual levels on
18 the review site in the post-purchase stage. These arguments rationalise the potential effects that
19 online social comparison might have on service consumption-related evaluation, media-related
20 evaluation and consumers' eWOM behaviour. We advance the following framework (Figure
21 4) to explain eWOM-triggered social comparison in the post-purchase stage.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

<Insert Figure 4 here>

41 **2.2 Dimensionality of Post-Purchase Evaluation**

42 Consumption experience elicits both cognitive and emotional evaluation in the post-purchase
43 phase (Mano and Oliver, 1983). In service research, cognitive and emotional evaluation usually
44 refers to perceived service quality and consumption emotion. Consumers also evaluate brands
45 through their consumption experience which, in turn, affects the brand image of the service
46 provider (Padgett and Allen, 1997). In addition to consumption-related evaluation, post-
47 purchase eWOM information allows consumers to assess the credibility of eWOM media
48 (Bachleda and Berrada-Fathi, 2016).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.2.1 Emotional Evaluation – Emotional Intensity

Social sharing of emotion is an area peripheral to social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954; Rimé, 2009). It suggests that any emotion can be deconstructed into two dimensions: emotional valence (i.e. positive vs. negative) and emotional intensity (i.e. low vs. high) (Rimé, 2009). More precisely, emotional valence refers to the emotional evaluation of a particular event, object or situation, and emotional intensity measures the strength with which an emotion manifests itself (Catino and Patriotta, 2013). This dual-dimensionality of emotion also applies to consumption emotion (López-López et al., 2014). As the initial emotional response drawn from an event (i.e. consumption experience), emotional valence is relatively unchangeable; whereas emotional intensity can fluctuate over time depending on the intervention of information and interaction with others and can be seen as an indicator of individuals' emotional evaluation in the post-event phase (Rimé, 2009; Rimé et al., 1998). Thus, as a form of interventional information, aggregated rating and individual reviews are likely to influence consumers' emotional intensity and emotional evaluation in the post-purchase stage.

2.2.2 Cognitive Evaluation – Perceived Service Quality

As an important evaluative component in the post-purchase phase, perceived service quality measures the degree and direction of the discrepancies between a service receiver's expectations and perceptions (Grover et al., 1996; Parasuraman et al., 1988). Although early studies assumed that individual expectations are consistent and only relevant pre-consumption (e.g. Oliver, 1977), later research found that expectations change over time (Bhattacharjee and Premkumar, 2004). Expectations during and after consumption may differ from those formed before consumption, since consumers' expectations are shaped by differences between their own and others' experiences (Oliver and Burke, 1999). Hence, when consumers have the opportunity to compare their own experience with others (eWOM - AR and IR), their expectation could be changed. If there is incongruity in the self-others comparison, the self will establish new standards for evaluating the consumption experience (Stayman et al., 1992).

2.2.3 Brand Evaluation – Brand Image

In addition to emotional and cognitive evaluation, consumption experience and received eWOM can also influence brand image. Brand image refers to consumers' perceptions and encompasses the set of beliefs that consumers have about a brand, drawn from both personal

1
2
3 experience and external information (Nandan, 2005). Both aggregated rating and individual
4 reviews affect brand image, in that AR reflects a historical record of how the brand is viewed
5 by former customers, and IR presents details about how former customers form brand
6 perceptions (Cantalops and Salvi, 2014). eWOM among peer consumers has also been shown
7 to influence brand image (Jalilvand and Samiei, 2012). At the same time, consumption
8 experience also has a direct impact upon brand image (Chen et al., 2014; Padgett and Allen,
9 1997). The interaction between consumption experience and received eWOM is, therefore,
10 expected to elicit a re-evaluation of the image of the referred brand.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **2.2.4 Media Evaluation – Perceived Credibility of the Review Site**

21
22 Aggregated rating and individual reviews are known to affect how consumers perceive the
23 credibility of review sites (Fogg et al., 2003). The perceived credibility of a medium generally
24 refers to the message recipient's perception of the credibility of the medium on which the
25 message is presented (Cheung et al., 2008; Gvili and Levy, 2016). Consumers' judgements of
26 information credibility and media credibility are mutually influential (Metzger et al., 2003; Qiu
27 et al., 2012). Therefore, in the post-purchase stage, consumption experience increases
28 consumers' knowledge of the product/service and, as a result, affects the evaluation of the
29 credibility of eWOM information and media (Cheung et al., 2009; Doh and Hwang, 2009).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **3. Hypotheses Development**

38 **3.1 Polarisation Effects in Post-Purchase Evaluation**

39
40
41 Polarisation effects are a social psychological phenomenon. They describe how an emotion
42 and/or attitude becomes more extreme after exposure to, deliberation on, and/or
43 communication about, emotionally and/or attitudinally congruent information (Chan and Cui,
44 2011; Lord et al., 1979; Petty and Krosnick, 2014). Internet-mediated communication fosters
45 interactive and dynamic information exchange, and therefore accelerates the formation of
46 polarisation effects (Parsell, 2008). Previous eWOM studies suggest a polarisation
47 phenomenon in which consumers' disposition, attitude and purchase preferences could be
48 biased by emotional and cognitive tendencies held prior to the effects of the polarisation (Chan
49 and Cui, 2011; Hu et al., 2006; Park and Park, 2013). When consumers experience either
50 positive or negative episodes, they may, through the lens of social comparison, compare the
51 valence of their consumption experience with the eWOM valence, thereby examining
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 congruence between self and others. Since polarisation effects are not valence-biased (Tesser
4 and Conlee, 1975), eWOM information with the same valence (i.e. negative or positive)
5 enables consumers to feel connected with others through consistent service perceptions and
6 emotions. This evokes emotion and cognition polarisation, i.e. an increase in negative/positive
7 evaluation. As described in the literature review, both consumption experience and eWOM
8 information have an influence on the different dimensions of post-purchase evaluation. Thus,
9 congruence between the valences of consumers' consumption experience and received eWOM
10 appears to contribute to attitudinal, emotional and perceptual polarisation.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 *H1. Valence congruence between consumption experience, aggregated rating and*
19 *individual reviews influences (a) emotional intensity, (b) perceived service quality, (c)*
20 *brand image, and (d) perceived credibility of the review site more than incongruence.*
21
22
23
24

25 **3.2 Aggregated Rating vs. Individual Reviews**

26
27 Social comparison (consumption experience – received eWOM) influences consumers' post-
28 purchase evaluation in four dimensions. Festinger (1954) suggests that congruence between a
29 consumer's beliefs and the target has a strong impact on the construction of reality. Hence,
30 congruence between the valence of a consumption experience, aggregated rating and individual
31 reviews enables consumers to confirm their beliefs. However, when there is incongruence
32 between the valence of aggregated rating and individual reviews, the weights of these two types
33 of cue in developing consumers' judgement and evaluation tend to be different (Tsang and
34 Predergast, 2009). Early research on social cognition suggests that individuals tend to
35 emphasise individuating information over base-rate information in decision making when both
36 are available, as individuating information often contains more cues that facilitate the
37 individual's cognition (Borgida and Nisbett, 1977; Locksley et al., 1982; Nisbett and Borgida,
38 1975). Meanwhile, previous eWOM research shows that, compared to aggregated rating,
39 argument-based eWOM (i.e. individual reviews) predominately influences consumers'
40 evaluation of received eWOM information as it contains more informative and diagnostic cues
41 (Chong et al., 2018; Filieri and McLeay, 2014; Ma et al., 2013). More specifically, Tsang and
42 Predergast (2009) argue that when there are incongruent valences between aggregated rating
43 and individual reviews, individual reviews have a stronger impact on consumers' decision
44 making. Therefore, based on this empirical evidence, individual reviews outweigh aggregated
45 rating in consumers' information-processing and evaluative-belief development. In the post-
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 purchase stage, consumers tend to compare the valence of personal experience and the received
4 eWOM information, thereby confirming their beliefs and re-evaluating their consumption
5 experiences (Hess and Ring, 2016; Locke, 2005). When both aggregated rating and individual
6 reviews are available, as the previous studies suggested, consumers are expected to place more
7 emphasis on the congruence between personal experience and individual reviews to confirm
8 and refine their evaluative beliefs.
9

10
11
12
13
14 *H2. Valence congruence between consumption experience and individual reviews (as*
15 *opposed to valence congruence between consumption experience and aggregated*
16 *rating) has a stronger influence on (a) emotional intensity, (b) perceived service*
17 *quality, (c) brand image, and (d) the perceived credibility of the review site.*
18
19
20

21 That both aggregated rating and individual reviews are important for pre-purchase decision
22 making is widely recognised (Camilleri, 2017; Shen et al., 2018). However, we posit that
23 aggregated rating is less important following a purchase (H2), although whether aggregated
24 rating still matters at all remains unknown. Nonetheless, since aggregated rating and individual
25 reviews are used to build the persuasive environment of review sites, aggregated rating should
26 contribute to the evaluation of eWOM media credibility (Qiu et al., 2012). Consumption-
27 related evaluation might be affected differently by aggregated rating post-purchase. As a
28 historical record of how others regard a business/brand, aggregated rating might have limited
29 impact on emotional intensity and perceived service quality, which generally originate from
30 consumption experience (Cantalops and Salvi, 2014). However, consumers' perception and
31 brand image include historical brand reputation and personal experience (So and King, 2010;
32 Xu and Chan, 2010). In other words, consumers take both their own prior experience and how
33 a brand has performed in the market into consideration when judging the image of a particular
34 brand, whereas aggregated rating provides an intuitive indicator of how the brand is considered
35 in the market. Consequently, we posit that AR has a stronger impact on brand image.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 *H3. Aggregated rating has a stronger influence on brand image than emotional intensity*
49 *and perceived service quality.*
50
51
52
53

54 **3.3 eWOM-giving Behaviour**

55
56 eWOM received post-purchase could also influence consumers' eWOM-giving behaviour
57 (Alexandrov et al., 2013; Hess and Ring, 2016; Ranaweera and Jayawardhena, 2014). Review
58 sites include an information pool, in which consumers' opinions gradually form major
59
60

(congruent with most consumers') or minor (incongruent with most consumers') voices. Such congruence/incongruence between a consumer's personal opinion and public opinion could potentially determine how likely he/she is to offer an opinion. The spiral of silence (Noelle-Neumann, 1991) was originally established in political science and mass communication and suggests that, as individuals fear being isolated, they tend to remain silent when their opinion differs from the dominant idea. Individuals are more likely to make their voice heard when their opinion is similar to that of the majority (Glynn et al., 1997). The effects of the spiral of silence were first identified in the offline environment but have also been observed in social media use across different platforms (Chen, 2018; Stoycheff, 2016; Gearhart and Zhang, 2015). Some pioneering studies support the effects of the spiral of silence in online reviews (Askay, 2015; Johnen et al., 2018; Pan et al., 2018; Zerback and Fawzi, 2017). For example, Askay (2015) shows that consumers tend to contribute to the dominant opinion in online review systems and avoid belonging to the minority. In the context of our study, when same-valenced aggregated rating and individual reviews form a majority voice, consumers who hold a congruent view are more likely to offer an opinion. In contrast, incongruence between a consumer's personal opinion and the public view isolates the consumer from the majority and constrains the consumer from giving a different opinion. Thus, comparison of a consumption experience with the eWOM information on review sites helps consumers to identify whether they belong to the majority or the minority, which could, in turn, influence eWOM-giving intentions.

H4a. Valence congruence between consumption experience and eWOM information (aggregated rating and individual reviews) leads to the highest eWOM-giving intention, compared to any other congruence/incongruence.

H4b. Valence incongruence between consumption experience and eWOM information (aggregated rating and individual reviews) leads to the lowest eWOM-giving intention compared to any other congruence/incongruence.

Post-purchase evaluations also affect eWOM-giving behaviour. Social sharing of emotion as the extension of social comparison theory with a particular emphasis on emotion, suggests that emotional intensity is a strong predictor of social sharing (Rimé et al., 1998). In the offline environment, according to social sharing of emotion effects, the more intense the emotion drawn from an event, the more frequently the event will be shared (Rimé et al., 1998; Rimé, 2009). A recent study also suggests a positive association between emotional intensity and eWOM-giving intention on different platforms (Liu and Jayawardhena, 2018). In the post-

1
2
3 event stage, emotional intensity may change over time as information and interaction intervene,
4
5 whereas residual emotional intensity still has a positive influence on the sharing of an
6
7 experience (Rimé, 2009). Therefore, emotional intensity in the post-purchase phase is expected
8
9 to affect consumers' eWOM-giving intention.

10
11 *H5. Emotional intensity positively influences eWOM-giving intention.*

12
13 We postulate that positive consumption experience, combined with eWOM received, facilitates
14
15 the formation of a positive brand image of the service provider. During social comparison,
16
17 consumers who draw upon positive emotion and evaluation generate a sense of superiority,
18
19 whereas the sense of superiority drawn from self-others comparison is expected to lead to
20
21 motivational self-enhancement (Andsager and White, 2007; Xie and Johnson, 2015), which is
22
23 a central driver of eWOM-giving when based on positive experience (Chawdhary and
24
25 Dall'Olmo Riley, 2015; Islam et al., 2017). Similarly, appreciation of a premium service drawn
26
27 from social comparison motivates consumers to express positive feelings and evokes the desire
28
29 to help and support the service provider and its brand (Jeong and Jang, 2011; Kim and Lee,
30
31 2017). In the service setting, research suggests that **consumers' perception of the service quality**
32
33 **is a key evaluative indicator** and is positively associated with consumers' WOM- and eWOM-
34
35 giving (Iffe et al., 2018; Jun et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2015). Thus, when the perceived service
36
37 quality is high, consumers are more likely to share positive eWOM (Cantalops and Salvi,
38
39 2014).

37
38 *H6. Brand image positively influences eWOM-giving intention.*

39
40 *H7. Perceived service quality positively influences eWOM-giving intention.*

41
42 With the ongoing evolution of online media, consumers have become increasingly selective
43
44 when choosing media for active use and engagement (Kang, 2010). This effect has also been
45
46 observed in eWOM media (Sotiriadis and Van Zyl, 2013). To maintain consumers'
47
48 engagement, eWOM media have been striving to build a trustworthy online environment,
49
50 allowing consumers to seek and share information with minimum concern, and establish a
51
52 reputable media brand (Park and Lee, 2009). Previous studies have claimed that the perceived
53
54 credibility of a review site contributes positively to consumers' engagement with that site and
55
56 to the site's reputation (Chu and Kamal, 2008; Tsai and Men, 2013), whereas, in the post-
57
58 purchase phase, consumers judge the credibility of a site based on self-others comparison. In
59
60 this case, consumers' engagement with review sites could be reflected in eWOM-giving
intention.

1
2
3 *H8. Perceived credibility of a review site positively influences eWOM-giving intention.*
4
5
6
7

8 **4. Methodology**

9 **4.1 Experimental Design**

10
11
12 We conducted an online experiment, following a 2 (consumption experience valence: positive
13 vs. negative) × 2 (aggregated rating valence: positive vs. negative) × 2 (individual reviews
14 valence: positive vs. negative) between-subjects design. The study implemented a scenario-
15 based approach, which is frequently used for research into negative consumption experiences
16 and the service industry (Kim and Jang, 2014; Liao, 2007; Roschk and Kaiser, 2013).
17 Specifically, the hotel industry was selected as the research context, for its prominence in
18 eWOM research (e.g. Baka, 2016; Chong et al., 2018).
19

20
21 To best serve the research purpose and recruit appropriate participants that can relate
22 themselves to the scenarios, we set up a series of screening questions at the beginning of the
23 experiment (Hunt and Scheetz, 2018; Nieto-García et al., 2017). We first asked the participants
24 about their recent hotel-staying experience, holiday experience and number of visits in Orlando,
25 i.e. the destination used in our experimental stimuli. We screened out the participants who had
26 not stayed in a hotel in the previous 12 months or had not gone on a holiday in the previous 24
27 months. We also screened out participants who live in Orlando or have been to Orlando several
28 times to avoid the local knowledge bias. Participants were then asked about their online review
29 reading, with frequency on a 7-point scale, from never to every time (i.e. *how often do you read*
30 *online reviews before booking hotels?* and *how often do you give online reviews about your*
31 *hotel-staying experience?*). Participants who were inexperienced with online review reading
32 and giving (i.e. frequency below *sometimes*) were filtered out. After the screening process, we
33 asked the participants to imagine they had gone on a holiday and stayed in a hotel for four
34 nights. To enhance the realism of the scenario, we chose Orlando in Florida as the hotel location.
35 Orlando was the first destination to receive more than 60 million visitors in the US and is also
36 one of the most popular holiday destinations for both domestic and international markets
37 (Gollan, 2015).
38
39

40
41 We recruited all study participants from the US through Mechanical Turk. We then provided
42 the respondents with a statement describing the criteria of a 3-star hotel for them to read and
43 complete a comprehension question, which aimed to standardise their expectations in the
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experimental setting (*according to the criteria above, please select which of the following*
4 *facilities or items a 3-star hotel does not have to provide: towels, a colour TV, a chocolate bar*
5 *or a hot beverage*). We then manipulated the consumption experience valence by randomly
6 assigning participants to reading about either a positive or negative 3-star hotel stay. We further
7 checked the participants' attention and comprehension of the scenarios by asking them which
8 heading was not used in the scenario (*building/room, furniture/equipment, food or services*)
9 and the hotel's name in the scenario (*Emerald Hotel, Ruby Hotel, Diamond Hotel and Platinum*
10 *Hotel*). Finally, the participants received fictitious TripAdvisor eWOM about the hotel. The
11 eWOM information presented included an aggregated rating (randomly assigned: positive or
12 negative) and three recent individual reviews (randomly assigned: three positive or three
13 negative). In line with previous studies, we used TripAdvisor as an actual brand in the scenario
14 to avoid consumers' first impression bias of an unknown review site and its credibility;
15 randomisation neutralised the impact of participants' prior knowledge of TripAdvisor on the
16 results (López-López and Parra, 2016; Tsao et al., 2015). The study also aims to examine the
17 congruent/incongruent valences of aggregated rating and individual reviews and their
18 interactive effects with the valence of personal experience on the consumers' post-purchase
19 evaluation. To ensure realism, we chose to use 4 out of 5 ("very good" based on TripAdvisor
20 criteria) and 2 out of 5 ("poor" based on TripAdvisor criteria) to present the positive and
21 negative aggregated rating rather than extreme cases (i.e. 5 out of 5 and 1 out of 5). It might be
22 unrealistic for a high- (low-) rated hotel to provide low (high) quality services and receive
23 multiple negative (positive) individual reviews. Meanwhile, the number of hotels and the
24 hotel's ranking in the local area and distributions of TripAdvisor 5-point rating scale were
25 adopted from TripAdvisor's real data in Orlando. An example of a hotel-stay scenario is
26 provided in Appendix 1. A questionnaire followed, including the scales of all dependent
27 variables hypothesised in this study. To ensure the validity of the responses, we inserted three
28 attention-checking questions in the middle of the scales (e.g. *please select neither agree nor*
29 *disagree*). Figure 5 demonstrates the steps in the experimental design and the rationales of each
30 step.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 <Insert Figure 5 here>
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.2 Manipulation and Realism Checks (Pilot and Pre-Test)

We initially ran a pilot with 12 university postgraduate research students to test the readability and accuracy of the experimental design and questionnaire wording, and to estimate the duration of the experiment. The students were first invited to participate in the online experiment in a lab setting, make short notes about the issues identified and provide their completion time. The average completion time (including short note-taking) was about 18 minutes, with the quickest case being 12 minutes. A focus group discussion session then followed. The identified issues, including wording, number of attention-checking questions and font use in scenarios were discussed. We then revised the experimental stimuli and questionnaire by incorporating the suggestions drawn from the pilot. After the pilot, a pre-test was conducted with 180 respondents to ensure the scenarios were realistic and were accurately manipulated based on the experimental design. Consumption experience valence measures were adapted from Duprez et al. (2015) and aggregated rating and individual reviews valence measures from Antheunis et al. (2010). Realism checks (Table 2) showed that the situations in the scenarios were experimentally (*how realistic the scenario was*) and mundanely (*how likely it was that the situation could happen in real life*) realistic (Liao, 2007). Meanwhile, the results support the effectiveness of the valence of the Consumption Experience manipulation: $M_{\text{positive}} = 8.90$, $SD = 1.13$ vs. $M_{\text{negative}} = 1.72$, $SD = 1.72$; $t(178) = 44.37$, $p < .001$. The Aggregated Rating and Individual Reviews valences were successfully manipulated: $M_{\text{positive}} = 5.25$, $SD = 1.61$ vs. $M_{\text{negative}} = 2.11$, $SD = 1.53$; $t(178) = 12.34$, $p < .001$; and $M_{\text{positive}} = 5.31$, $SD = 1.87$ vs. $M_{\text{negative}} = 1.98$, $SD = 1.40$; $t(178) = 13.75$, $p < .001$, respectively.

<Insert Table 2 here>

5. Data Analysis and Results

For the main study, 671 participants using Mechanical Turk attempted to complete the online experiment. 239 were filtered out due to insufficient hotel staying and holiday experience or limited engagement with online reviews, or over much local knowledge about Orlando. 47 participants failed to correctly answer the comprehension and attention-checking questions and were screened out during the experiment. Additionally, 21 participants waived their participation in the middle of the experiment, representing incomplete responses. Furthermore,

1
2
3 using the quickest case as a benchmark (12 minutes), we eliminated 17 responses that were
4 completed within 10 minutes (the participants were still paid). After the elimination, the
5 average completion time was 14 minutes 32 seconds, which is close to the estimated time from
6 the pilot (i.e. 18 minutes, including note making). The final sample was therefore 347
7 participants (demographic details are shown in Table 3). The following constructs were
8 assessed in the questionnaire following the experimental conditions: emotional intensity (α
9 = .83; López-López et al., 2014), perceived service quality (α = .91; Brady and Cronin, 2001;
10 Liu and Jang, 2009), brand image (α = .85; Chiang and Jang, 2007), perceived credibility of
11 the review site (α = .89; Cheung et al., 2009), and eWOM-giving intention (α = .95; Leung et
12 al., 2015). Appendix 2 presents the scale items for all the variables.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 <Insert Table 3 here>
24
25
26
27

28 Our hypotheses refer to the congruence/incongruence of the valences between three
29 independent variables: Consumption Experience, Aggregated Rating and Individual Reviews.
30 The eight experimental conditions were divided into four groups (i.e. levels of the independent
31 variables' valence congruence/incongruence, in H1, H2 and H4) for hypothesis testing, and
32 coded in the statistical system before the analysis, as shown in Table 4.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 <Insert Table 4 here>
40
41
42
43

44 Our initial analysis addressed polarisation effects on emotional intensity, brand image,
45 perceived service quality and perceived credibility of the review site (e.g. Situation A should
46 have a stronger impact on these variables than on the other scenarios). Although emotional
47 intensity and perceived credibility of the review site are not valence-based, perceived service
48 quality and brand image depend on consumption experience. Therefore, the analyses for
49 perceived service quality (H1b) and brand image (H1c) were divided into positive and negative
50 cases. Additionally, ANOVA was employed in examining H1, H2 and H4 as these hypotheses
51 emphasise testing the mean differences of a dependent variable among four groups with
52 different congruence/incongruence combinations among CE, AR and IR.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In testing H1a, the ANOVA results suggested that congruence/incongruence between CE, AR
4 and IR has a significant influence on emotional intensity ($F(3,343) = 14.10; p < .001$). A
5 pairwise comparison test using the Bonferroni method confirmed the mean differences between
6 the first (Situation A) and second (Situation C) highest points ($M_{\text{Situation A}} = 5.06$ and $SE = .23$,
7 $M_{\text{Situation C}} = 4.44$ and $SE = .23$, and $p < .05$; see Figure 6 in Appendix 3). Therefore, H1a was
8 supported. Further, the results suggest that congruence/incongruence only influences service
9 quality perception in a positive case ($F(3,166) = 6.23; p < .001$) (negative case: $F(3,173) = .58$;
10 $p > .05$). As the post hoc test did not support the significance of polarisation in the positive case
11 ($M_{\text{Situation A}} = 6.23$ and $SE = .32$; $M_{\text{Situation C}} = 5.84$ and $SE = .32$, and $p > .05$; see Figure 7 in
12 Appendix 3), H1b was rejected. Congruence/incongruence also significantly influenced brand
13 image in both the positive ($F(3,166) = 12.85; p < .001$) and negative ($F(3,173) = 8.17; p$
14 $< .001$) cases. The polarisation effects were significant in both cases (positive: $M_{\text{Situation A1}} =$
15 6.51 and $SE = .18$, $M_{\text{Situation C1}} = 5.58$ and $SE = .18$, and $p < .05$; negative: $M_{\text{Situation A2}} = 2.00$ and
16 $SE = .17$, $M_{\text{Situation C2}} = 2.76$ and $SE = .17$, and $p < .005$; see Figure 8 in Appendix 3), supporting
17 H1c. Similar to the statistical approach used in testing H1a, we found congruence/incongruence
18 also significantly influenced the perceived credibility of the review site ($F(3,343) = 30.49; p$
19 $< .001$), and the polarisation effects were also significant ($M_{\text{Situation A}} = 5.60$ and $SE = .24$;
20 $M_{\text{Situation C}} = 4.42$ and $SE = .24$, and $p < .001$), confirming H1d (see Figure 9 in Appendix 3).

21
22 To determine the impact of AR and IR on post-purchase evaluation, we compared the effects
23 of CE-AR congruence with CE-IR congruence. According to the analysis for H1,
24 congruence/incongruence between CE, AR and IR significantly influenced emotional intensity,
25 brand image and the perceived credibility of the review site, whereas perceived service quality
26 was not affected by congruence/incongruence. Therefore, H2b was rejected. Comparing the
27 impact of CE-AR and CE-IR on emotional intensity, the results from a Bonferroni test
28 supported H2a ($M_{\text{Situation C}} = 4.44$ and $SE = .23$, $M_{\text{Situation B}} = 3.75$ and $SE = .23$, and $p < .05$).
29 Further, the effects of CE-AR and CE-IR on brand image were compared for both positive and
30 negative cases. Congruence between CE and IR had a stronger influence on brand image
31 compared with CE and AR congruence (positive: $M_{\text{Situation C1}} = 5.58$ and $SE = .18$, $M_{\text{Situation B1}} =$
32 4.84 and $SE = .18$, and $p < .05$; negative: $M_{\text{Situation C2}} = 2.76$ and $SE = .17$, $M_{\text{Situation B2}} = 3.65$,
33 and $SE = .17$, and $p < .05$). Hence, H2c was supported. Further, CE-IR valence congruence had
34 a stronger influence on the perceived credibility of the review site than did CE-AR congruence
35 ($M_{\text{Situation C}} = 4.42$ and $SE = .24$, $M_{\text{Situation B}} = 3.67$ and $SE = .24$, and $p < .05$), confirming H2d.

1
2
3 H3 emphasises the differences between the effects of aggregated rating valence on multiple
4 dependent variables (i.e. brand image, emotional intensity and perceived service quality). We
5 therefore employed MANOVA instead of ANOVA to conduct the analysis. The results of the
6 MANOVA show that AR had a stronger impact on brand image ($F(1,345) = 4.20; p < .05$)
7 compared with emotional intensity ($F(1,345) = .46; p > .05$) and perceived service quality (F
8 ($1,345) = .021; p > .05$). This is in line with H3. Further ANOVA suggested that
9 congruence/incongruence significantly influenced eWOM-giving intention ($F(3,343) = 3.76;$
10 $p < .001$). By comparing the difference between the highest and second-highest mean values
11 through a post hoc test, the results indicated that three-way congruence leads to significantly
12 higher eWOM-giving intention ($M_{\text{Situation A}} = 5.46$ and $SE = .19$, $M_{\text{Situation C}} = 4.97$ and $SE = .19$,
13 and $p < .005$; see Figure 10 in Appendix 3). Hence, H4a was supported. As to whether
14 consumers avoid giving eWOM when the valence of their consumption experience is opposite
15 to the valences of IR and AR, a pairwise comparison revealed an insignificant impact ($M_{\text{Situation D}}$
16 $= 4.66$ and $SE = .19$, and $M_{\text{Situation B}} = 4.60$ and $SE = .19$, and $p > .05$; see Figure 10 in Appendix
17 3). H4b was rejected.

18
19 To examine the association between the post-evaluation dimensions and eWOM-giving
20 intention, we employed regression analysis in testing H5 to H8. The results indicated that
21 emotional intensity ($F(1,345) = 48.15, p < .001, R^2 = .12$), perceived service quality ($F(1,345)$
22 $= 25.58, p < .001, R^2 = .07$), brand image ($F(1,345) = 17.17, p < .001, R^2 = .05$) and the
23 perceived credibility of the review site ($F(1,345) = 14.89, p < .001, R^2 = .04$) positively
24 influence eWOM-giving intention. Therefore, hypotheses 5 to 8 were supported. To identify
25 any potential mediation effects of post-purchase evaluation in consumption experience-eWOM
26 information interaction and eWOM-giving intention, we also tested the moderated moderated
27 mediation (i.e. CE/IR/AR three-way interaction mediation) of each evaluative construct using
28 SPSS PROCESS (Hayes, 2013). We find that only brand image mediates CE, IR and AR
29 interaction and eWOM-giving intention (total effects model: $F = 39.91, p < .001$; moderated
30 moderated mediation: $\beta = 0.234$; $CI_{\text{Boot}} = 0.0010, 0.0544$; $SE_{\text{Boot}} = 0.0140$) but the mediation
31 effects are not significant for emotional intensity (total effects model: $F = 6.49, p < .001$;
32 moderated moderated mediation: $\beta = 0.0238$; $CI_{\text{Boot}} = -0.0207, 0.0717$; $SE_{\text{Boot}} = 0.234$),
33 perceived service quality (total effects model: $F = 101.48, p < .001$; moderated moderated
34 mediation: $\beta = 0.0160$; $CI_{\text{Boot}} = -0.0221, 0.0525$; $SE_{\text{Boot}} = 0.0190$) and the perceived credibility
35 of the site (total effects model: $F = 19.20, p < .001$; moderated moderated mediation: $\beta = 0.0040$;
36 $CI_{\text{Boot}} = -0.0082, 0.0221$; $SE_{\text{Boot}} = 0.0073$).

1
2
3 In sum, the results support H1 (a, c, d), H2 (a, c, d), H3, H4a, H5, H6, H7 and H8, but H1b,
4 H2b and H4b were not supported.
5
6
7
8

9 **6. Discussion**

10
11 Based on the foundations of social comparison theory and information processing, we
12 examined the impact of eWOM information on consumers' post-purchase evaluation and
13 behaviour. Given our unique approach, we are able to highlight psychological mechanisms of
14 the consumption experience and eWOM information in the post-purchase phase, and we thus
15 offer the following.
16
17
18
19

20
21 First, according to social comparison theory and polarisation effects, the interactive effects of
22 consumption experience and eWOM received post-purchase lead to emotional, cognitive and
23 behavioural polarisation. More precisely, when the valences of consumption experience,
24 aggregated rating and individual reviews are congruent, consumers experience stronger
25 emotions, develop more extreme perceptions of the brand and consolidate their trust in the
26 eWOM media. This result is important because it shows that consumers not only judge the
27 service received based on their consumption experience, but also consider the experience of
28 others when evaluating the service. Review sites provide platforms for comparison with other
29 consumers in order to seek similarities and actualise self-confirmation. Through emotional
30 polarisation, consumers feel better when they have a positive experience and worse when they
31 have a negative one, which suggests that the emotional judgement is no longer objective. As
32 consumption emotion significantly influences consumer satisfaction (Westbrook and Oliver,
33 1991), this finding reveals that consumption emotion could vary in light of any information
34 intervention in the post-purchase stage. Brand image is also subject to polarisation effects. This
35 suggests that brand image combines "what I think about the brand" and "what others think
36 about the brand" (Cantalops and Salvi, 2014). Hence, congruence in self-others comparison
37 helps consumers to confirm their beliefs about the brand. From a managerial perspective,
38 service providers need to maintain a consistent service standard and monitor eWOM, thereby
39 more efficiently developing a good reputation. Further, media evaluation is a specific
40 dimension of consumers' social comparison in the eWOM context. In the post-purchase stage,
41 consumers have a stronger voice when judging the credibility of eWOM media. Therefore,
42 media owners need to carry out regular monitoring of the information disclosed via eWOM
43 media and actively assist in the investigation of any cases of defamation reported. If consumers
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 continue to find inconsistencies between their own experience and eWOM, they might distrust
4 the medium and discontinue its use. Additionally, in a consumption-related evaluation,
5 perceived service quality is not influenced by consistency between personal experience and
6 received eWOM. This could be explained by the suggestion that perceived service quality
7 represents the cognitive evaluation of the service received, and cognition is more objective than
8 other types of evaluation in which emotions predominate (e.g. emotional intensity and brand
9 image) (DePaula and Dourish, 2005). In other words, perceived service quality is largely
10 dependent on personal consumption experience and cannot be changed significantly, regardless
11 of what others say (namely, eWOM).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Second, our findings suggest that eWOM information influences consumers' evaluation in the
20 post-purchase stage, although individual reviews seem to be relatively more important than
21 aggregated rating. When consumers compare themselves with others based on personal
22 experience and eWOM received post-purchase, they pay more attention to individual reviews
23 than to aggregated rating, because individual reviews appear to be more relevant and seem to
24 provide more meaningful cues for engaging in social comparison. Therefore, consumers are
25 more attuned to whether their personal experience is consistent with the individual reviews of
26 other consumers. Such a tendency in processing eWOM information is reflected in the
27 evaluation of emotion, brand and media. However, similar to polarisation effects, perceived
28 service quality is not influenced, due to the objective nature of service quality judgements.
29 Nonetheless, this study indicates that, in terms of consumption-related evaluation, aggregated
30 rating has a greater influence on brand image than have consumption emotion and perceived
31 service quality. Brand image is a coalition of how a brand is perceived based on subjective
32 experience and objective opinions. Therefore, it is essential that, as business entities, service
33 providers make an effort in developing a positive aggregated rating for themselves on review
34 sites. Even if in situations in which consumers have a negative experience with the service
35 provider, a positive aggregated rating could potentially rescue the damaged brand image and
36 result in a second chance for the service provider.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Third, we shed light on the dynamics of personal experience and received eWOM in eWOM-
52 giving behaviour. We proposed spiral of silence effects to explain the eWOM mechanism when
53 receiving eWOM information in the post-purchase stage. However, the spiral of silence is
54 reflected in consumers "conforming with the majority", rather than "avoiding being in the
55 minority". In other words, consumers have a higher eWOM-giving intention when there is
56 congruence between the valences of consumption experience, aggregated rating and individual
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reviews. This is similar to the attitudinal/emotional polarisation identified before. Consumers
4 are also more motivated to perform the behaviour that is widely acknowledged by others (Yeh
5 and Choi, 2011). However, they do not seem to be over-cautious about being isolated from the
6 majority in terms of voicing their perspectives through eWOM (Wetzer et al., 2007). This could
7 be explained by the minimum impact of aggregated rating in the post-purchase stage. More
8 specifically, since consumers pay little attention to aggregated rating, there is very little
9 difference between personal experience being incongruent with aggregated rating and
10 individual reviews and personal experience only being congruent with aggregated rating.
11 Therefore, such insignificant effects resulting from congruence/incongruence are also reflected
12 in eWOM-giving intention. Furthermore, we identified a positive association between the
13 dimensions of post-purchase evaluation and eWOM-giving. The positive relationship between
14 emotional intensity and eWOM suggests that eWOM-giving needs to be triggered by
15 sufficiently strong consumption emotions, in both positive and negative cases. Although
16 emotional intensity fluctuates when eWOM information intervenes, the residual emotional
17 intensity still positively affects eWOM-giving intention. Perceived service quality and brand
18 image also positively influence eWOM-giving, which reveals a positivity bias in eWOM-
19 giving. This tendency has been identified in previous eWOM studies, suggesting that
20 consumers are more likely to talk about a positive than a negative consumption experience
21 (Lee-Won et al., 2014; Utz, 2015). Moreover, the positive relationship between the perceived
22 credibility of eWOM media and eWOM-giving intentions emphasises that review sites need to
23 maintain information authenticity. Otherwise, consumers could easily switch to similar review
24 sites if they are perceived as more credible. Contributing to authentic and credible sites could
25 be seen as the embodiment of consumer ethics in eWOM media consumption (Hassan et al.,
26 2013; Sebastiani et al., 2013).

27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

7. Conclusions

7.1 Theoretical Contributions

We take an innovative perspective in examining the impact of eWOM information on the post-purchase stage that revolutionises the tradition of investigating the power of pre-purchase eWOM. eWOM received and its interactions with personal consumption experiences have a significant impact upon post-purchase evaluation and eWOM-giving behaviour, and highlight polarisation effects at the emotional, brand and behavioural levels. Our findings refresh the

1
2
3 understanding of the role that eWOM plays in the decision-making process and confirm that
4 purchase is not the last stage at which eWOM matters. Reconceptualising post-purchase
5 evaluation as a multidimensional concept and categorising post-purchase evaluation into
6 consumption-related and media-related dimensions allow us to offer further insights. The
7 multidimensionality of post-purchase evaluation emphasises the digital nature of eWOM and
8 reflects the modernity of consumer behaviour in the information age. By comparing
9 consistency between a personal consumption experience and the eWOM available on review
10 sites, consumers re-evaluate the review sites and adjust their engagement level with eWOM
11 media. Unlike other evaluative dimensions that are related to consumption and a particular
12 service provider, media evaluation adds a new domain to consumers' post-purchase evaluation
13 when eWOM is involved. More importantly, most studies employing social comparison theory
14 in service research focus on consumers' vertical social comparison, namely, whether they are
15 in a better or worse situation through self-others comparison. We push the boundaries of the
16 application of social comparison theory in the eWOM context by emphasising horizontal
17 comparison and examining the similarity of valences of the consumption experience and
18 eWOM information. We also highlight the impact of social comparison elicited by eWOM
19 received on multiple dimensions of post-purchase evaluation. It therefore follows that the
20 effects of social comparison might influence consumers' cognitive, emotional and behavioural
21 levels in the post-purchase stage. Moreover, by comparing AR and IR, our study suggests that
22 individual reviews are the main driver in the post-purchase stage. Although aggregated rating
23 is no longer as important as it is in the pre-purchase stage, it still plays an irreplaceable role in
24 constructing a positive brand image, even in the post-purchase stage. We thus pave the way for
25 a whole new understanding of how consumers evaluate eWOM information pre-purchase,
26 when both AR and IR are important to decision-making.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **7.2 Managerial Implications**

49 From a managerial perspective, we offer fresh insights. First, service providers, in general,
50 should keep in mind that online reviews not only provide important cues to ease consumers'
51 decision-making in the pre-purchase stage but also act as references for consumers and shape
52 their post-purchase evaluations. Therefore, service providers need to make effort in
53 maintaining service standards, so as to ensure that consumers reach a consensus on shared
54 eWOM information, thereby consolidating the positive evaluations and enhancing the chance
55 of consumers' positive eWOM-giving. Second, our findings offer separate guidelines for
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 service providers that are in different circumstances of establishing online their reputation.
4 More precisely, for businesses that usually enjoy a good reputation on eWOM media, when
5 negative reviews are produced, they ought to conduct an internal review promptly and
6 eliminate the possibility of negative reviews caused by lowered service standards. Service
7 providers also need to provide superior service and encourage consumers to share positive
8 reviews, thereby neutralising or reducing the effects of negative feedback. This needs to be
9 done in a timely manner, as consumers' perceptions and emotions could be polarised. Once
10 negative reviews gain momentum, it takes longer to regain a consistent standard and this might
11 damage the brand image in the long run. On the other hand, we are able to offer guidance to
12 underperforming companies on review sites. Such companies should strive to stimulate the
13 generation of positive reviews, so as to create a positive trend. Once such a trend is established,
14 consumers are more likely to empathise with positive reviews; this, in turn, could lead to more
15 positive eWOM. Ultimately, in the post-purchase stage, consumers pay little attention to
16 aggregated rating. Therefore, although a business's aggregated rating might not be overly
17 positive, consumers could still potentially share positive individual reviews in the presence of
18 other positive individual reviews. Needless to say, it is imperative that firms provide consistent
19 good-quality service. Third, since post-purchase evaluation contributes to eWOM-giving,
20 service providers also need to endeavour to maintain a high standard of service to facilitate
21 consumers' positive evaluation. At an emotional level, service providers could strive to delight
22 (and surprise in a positive manner) customers (e.g. by providing a personalised welcome card
23 and complimentary gifts at the check-out stage), thereby maximising the positive emotional
24 intensity when consumers are still on the site and increasing the opportunity of having those
25 consumers share their positive experiences via eWOM. For firms seeking to build their brands,
26 there is value in ensuring the consistency of content that the firm receives on review sites. After
27 all, the brand image captures both the short-term and long-term performances of the service
28 provider. Meanwhile, service providers need to use online reviews as a diagnostic tool for
29 gauging the service quality and take prompt restorative action when negative online reviews
30 occur. Fourth, service providers need to work closely with third-party infomediaries to conduct
31 regular monitoring and to control the authenticity and credibility of information about the
32 service provider. While eWOM media owners need to actively cooperate with service providers
33 and investigate the suspicious smears to ensure that the eWOM information available on their
34 media is credible and fair. This will lead to a win-win situation in which both service providers
35 and eWOM media achieve sustainable development and maintain the interactivity of the
36 platform.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

7.3 Limitations and Future Research

Although this study adopted a pioneering angle when investigating the role of eWOM information on review sites in the post-purchase stage, it has some limitations. First, it focuses on horizontal social comparison (i.e. similarity comparison) between eWOM received and the consumption experience in the post-purchase stage. Future research could further explore the effects of vertical comparison (i.e. whether personal experience was better or worse than others') in the eWOM setting and better understand consumers' psychological mechanisms in making self-others comparison. Second, we manipulated and standardised consumption experience through a scenario-based approach. Future research could employ the techniques of field experiment and examine effects of actual consumption experience at different satisfaction levels (e.g. highly satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, unsatisfactory and highly unsatisfactory) on post-purchase evaluation and eWOM-giving behaviour. Comparing to scenario-based approach, field experiment is particularly useful in capturing nuanced differences in emotional evaluation (e.g. emotional intensity). Meanwhile, as we manipulated different service variations (e.g. equipment, facilities and services) to represent the overall consumption experience valence, future research could further examine the social comparison triggered by different service attributes and its effects on consumers' evaluation in different dimensions. Third, the single-service setting on only one eWOM platform limits the generalisability of the findings, specifically as social comparison could be highly platform-specific due to differences in the available social capital (Phua et al., 2017). Future studies should test different research settings, since product categories and customer involvement could influence social comparison, and extend the research to other eWOM platforms, such as social networking sites (Mudambi and Schuff, 2010; Wangenheim and Bayón, 2004). Fourth, this study focuses on the interaction between consumers and eWOM information on review sites in the post-purchase stage. Review sites have started to allow service providers to communicate with eWOM-givers directly, although differentiated responses (i.e. whether the service provider gives similar or distinctive responses to different consumers) from the service provider could potentially trigger another round of social comparison (Liu et al., 2019). Future research could explore the social comparison elicited by the interpersonal interaction of eWOM-givers and business representatives on review sites and the implications for subsequent consumer evaluation (Yang et al., 2004). Fifth, eWOM-giving intention was only measured through a scenario-based experiment, which opens the possibility of future research bridging

1
2
3 the intention-behaviour gap through other methods (e.g. using real data, memory recall and a
4 large-scale survey) (Quan-Haase and Sloan, 2017).
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **References**

- 17
18 Aggarwal, R. and Singh, H. (2013), "Differential influence of blogs across different stages of
19 decision making: The case of venture capitalists", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 37 No. 4,
20 pp.1093-1112.
21
22 Alexandrov, A., Lilly, B. and Babakus, E. (2013), "The effects of social-and self-motives on
23 the intentions to share positive and negative word of mouth", *Journal of the Academy
24 of Marketing Science*, Vol. 41 No. 5, pp. 531-546.
25
26 Allen, A. M., Brady, M. K., Robinson, S. G. and Voorhees, C. M. (2015), "One firm's loss is
27 another's gain: capitalizing on other firms' service failures", *Journal of the Academy of
28 Marketing Science*, Vol. 43 No. 5, pp. 648-662.
29
30 Andsager, J. L. and White, H. A. (2007), *Self versus others: Media, messages, and the third-
31 person effect*, Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
32
33 Antheunis, M. L., Valkenburg, P. M. and Peter, J. (2010), "Getting acquainted through social
34 network sites: Testing a model of online uncertainty reduction and social
35 attraction", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 100-109.
36
37 Antonetti, P., Crisafulli, B. and Maklan, S. (2018), "Too good to be true? Boundary conditions
38 to the use of downward social comparisons in service recovery", *Journal of Service
39 Research*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 438-455.
40
41 Argo, J. J., White, K. and Dahl, D. W. (2006), "Social comparison theory and deception in the
42 interpersonal exchange of consumption information", *Journal of Consumer
43 Research*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 99-108.
44
45 Askay, D.A., (2015). "Silence in the crowd: The spiral of silence contributing to the positive
46 bias of opinions in an online review system", *New Media & Society*, Vol. 17 No. 11,
47 pp. 1811-1829.
48
49 Bachleda, C. and Berrada-Fathi, B. (2016), "Is negative eWOM more influential than negative
50 pWOM?", *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 109-132.
51
52 Baka, V. (2016), "The becoming of user-generated reviews: Looking at the past to understand
53 the future of managing reputation in the travel sector", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 53,
54 pp. 148-162.
55
56 Bearden, W. O. and Rose, R. L. (1990), "Attention to social comparison information: An
57 individual difference factor affecting consumer conformity", *Journal of Consumer
58 Research*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 461-471.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Bhattacharjee, A. and Premkumar, G. (2004), "Understanding changes in belief and attitude toward information technology usage: A theoretical model and longitudinal test". *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 229-254.
- Bigne, J.E., Sanchez, M.I. and Sanchez, J., (2001), "Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: inter-relationship", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp.607-616.
- Borgida, E. and Nisbett, R.E., (1977), "The differential impact of abstract vs. concrete information on decisions", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp.258-271.
- Brady, M.K. and Cronin Jr, J.J., (2001), "Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: a hierarchical approach", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65 No. 3, pp.34-49.
- Camilleri, A.R., (2017), "The presentation format of review score information influences consumer preferences through the attribution of outlier reviews", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 39, pp.1-14.
- Cantalops, A.S. and Salvi, F., (2014), "New consumer behavior: A review of research on eWOM and hotels", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 36, pp.41-51.
- Carù, A. and Cova, B., (2003), "Revisiting consumption experience: A more humble but complete view of the concept", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp.267-286.
- Catino, M. and Patriotta, G. (2013), "Learning from errors: Cognition, emotions and safety culture in the Italian air force", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 437-467.
- Chakravarty, A., Liu, Y. and Mazumdar, T. (2010), "The differential effects of online word-of-mouth and critics' reviews on pre-release movie evaluation", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol.24 No.3, pp.185-197.
- Chan, H. and Cui, S. (2011), "The contrasting effects of negative word of mouth in the post - consumption stage", *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 324-337.
- Chawdhary, R. and Dall'Olmo Riley, F., (2015), "Investigating the consequences of word of mouth from a WOM sender's perspective in the services context", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 31 No. 9-10, pp.1018-1039.
- Chen, C. H., Nguyen, B., Klaus, P. P. and Wu, M. S. (2015), "Exploring electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) in the consumer purchase decision-making process: the case of online holidays—evidence from United Kingdom (UK) consumers", *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 32 No. 8, pp.953-970.
- Chen, H. T. (2018), "Spiral of silence on social media and the moderating role of disagreement and publicness in the network: Analyzing expressive and withdrawal behaviors", *New Media & Society*, Vol. 20 No. 10, pp. 3917-3936.
- Chen, H.B., Yeh, S.S. and Huan, T.C., (2014), "Nostalgic emotion, experiential value, brand image, and consumption intentions of customers of nostalgic-themed restaurants" *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 67 No. 3, pp.354-360.
- Cheung, C. M., Lee, M. K. and Rabjohn, N. (2008), "The impact of electronic word-of-mouth: The adoption of online opinions in online customer communities", *Internet research*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 229-247.

- 1
2
3 Cheung, M.Y., Luo, C., Sia, C.L. and Chen, H., (2009), "Credibility of electronic word-of-
4 mouth: Informational and normative determinants of on-line consumer
5 recommendations", *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, Vol. 13 No. 4,
6 pp.9-38.
7
- 8 Chiang, C.F. and Jang, S.S., (2007), "The effects of perceived price and brand image on value
9 and purchase intention: Leisure travellers' attitudes toward online hotel booking",
10 *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp.49-69.
11
- 12 Choi, Y. K., Seo, Y. and Yoon, S. (2017), "E-WOM messaging on social media: social ties,
13 temporal distance, and message concreteness", *Internet Research*, Vol. 27 No. 3, pp.
14 495-505.
15
- 16 Chong, A. Y. L., Khong, K. W., Ma, T., McCabe, S. and Wang, Y. (2018), "Analyzing key
17 influences of tourists' acceptance of online reviews in travel decisions", *Internet*
18 *Research*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 564-586.
19
- 20 Chu, S.C. and Kamal, S., (2008), "The effect of perceived blogger credibility and argument
21 quality on message elaboration and brand attitudes: An exploratory study", *Journal of*
22 *Interactive Advertising*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp.26-37.
23
- 24 Dahl, D. (2013), "Social influence and consumer behaviour", *Journal of Consumer*
25 *Research*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp.iii-v.
26
- 27 DePaula, R. and Dourish, P., (2005), *Cognitive and cultural views of emotions*. Proc. HCIC.
28
- 29 Doh, S.J. and Hwang, J.S., (2009), "How consumers evaluate eWOM (electronic word-of-
30 mouth) messages", *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp.193-197.
31
- 32 Duprez, C., Christophe, V., Rime, B., Congard, A. and Antoine, P. (2015), "Motives for the
33 social sharing of an emotional experience", *Journal of Social and Personal*
34 *Relationships*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 757-787.
35
- 36 Festinger, L. (1962), "*A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*", Stanford University Press, Stanford,
37 CA.
38
- 39 Festinger, L., (1954), "A theory of social comparison processes", *Human Relations*, Vol. 7 No.
40 2, pp.117-140.
41
- 42 Field, A. (2009), *Discovering Statistics using SPSS*, 3rd ed., Sage, London.
43
- 44 Filieri, R. and McLeay, F., (2014), "E-WOM and accommodation: An analysis of the factors
45 that influence travelers' adoption of information from online reviews", *Journal of*
46 *Travel Research*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp.44-57.
47
- 48 Fogg, B.J., Soohoo, C., Danielson, D.R., Marable, L., Stanford, J. and Tauber, E. (2003),
49 "How do users evaluate the credibility of web sites? A study with over 2,500
50 participants", *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference on Designing for User*
51 *Experiences*, San Francisco, CA, pp. 1 - 15.
52
- 53 Gearhart, S. and Zhang, W. (2015), ""Was it something I said?" "No, it was something you
54 posted!" A study of the spiral of silence theory in social media
55 contexts", *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 208-
56 213.
57
- 58 Glynn, C.J., Hayes, A.F. and Shanahan, J., (1997), "Perceived Support for One's Opinions and
59 Willingness to Speak Out: A Meta-Analysis of Survey Studies on the" Spiral of
60 Silence", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 61 No. 3, pp.452-463.

- 1
2
3 Goethals, G. R. (1986), "Social comparison theory: Psychology from the lost and
4 found", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp.261-278.
- 6 Gollan. D. (2015), "Luxury lifts Orlando to record 62 million visitors", R/OL, April 10,
7 available at: [http://www.forbes.com/sites/douggollan/2015/04/10/orlando-tops-in-](http://www.forbes.com/sites/douggollan/2015/04/10/orlando-tops-in-visitors-with-62-million-mayoral-bliss/#69bd604c25a7)
8 [visitors-with-62-million-mayoral-bliss/#69bd604c25a7](http://www.forbes.com/sites/douggollan/2015/04/10/orlando-tops-in-visitors-with-62-million-mayoral-bliss/#69bd604c25a7).
- 10 Grace, D. and O'Cass, A., (2004), "Examining service experiences and post-consumption
11 evaluations", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 6, pp.450-461.
- 13 Grover, V., Cheon, M.J. and Teng, J.T., (1996). "The effect of service quality and partnership
14 on the outsourcing of information systems functions". *Journal of Management*
15 *Information Systems*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp.89-116.
- 17 Gvili, Y. and Levy, S. (2016), "Antecedents of attitudes toward eWOM communication:
18 differences across channels", *Internet Research*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 1030-1051.
- 19 Haferkamp, N. and Krämer, N.C., (2011), "Social comparison 2.0: Examining the effects of
20 online profiles on social-networking sites" *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social*
21 *Networking*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp.309-314.
- 23 Hassan, L., Shaw, D., Shiu, E., Walsh, G. and Parry, S., (2013), "Uncertainty in ethical
24 consumer choice: a conceptual model", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, Vol. 12 No.
25 3, pp.182-193.
- 27 Hayes, A.F. (2013), *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation and Conditional Process*
28 *Analysis*, The Guilford Press, New York, NY.
- 30 Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K.P., Walsh, G. and Gremler, D.D., (2004), "Electronic word-
31 of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: what motivates consumers to articulate
32 themselves on the internet?", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp.38-
33 52.
- 35 Hess, R. L. and Ring, L. (2016), "The influence of the source and valence of word-of-mouth
36 information on post-failure and post-recovery evaluations", *Service Business*, Vol. 10
37 No. 2, pp.319-343.
- 39 Hogg, M.K., Cox, A.J. and Keeling, K., (2000), "The impact of self-monitoring on image
40 congruence and product/brand evaluation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 34
41 No. 5/6, pp.641-667.
- 43 Hood, K.M., Shanahan, K.J., Hopkins, C.D. and Lindsey, K.K., (2015), "The influence of
44 interactivity on visit and purchase frequency: the moderating role of website
45 informational features", *Journal of Internet Commerce*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp.294-315.
- 47 Hu, N., Pavlou, P.A. and Zhang, J. (2006), "Can online reviews reveal a product's true
48 quality?: empirical findings and analytical modeling of online word-of-mouth
49 communication", in Feigenbaum, J., Chuang, J. and Pennock, D. (Eds),
50 *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce*, ACM
51 Press, New York, NY, pp. 324-330.
- 53 Hunt, N. C. and Scheetz, A. M. (2018), "Using MTurk to distribute a survey or experiment:
54 Methodological considerations", *Journal of Information Systems*.
- 56 Ifie, K., Simintiras, A. C., Dwivedi, Y. and Mavridou, V. (2018), "How service quality and
57 outcome confidence drive pre-outcome word-of-mouth", *Journal of Retailing and*
58 *Consumer Services*, Vol. 44, pp. 214-221.
- 60

- 1
2
3 Islam, J. U., Rahman, Z. and Hollebeek, L. D. (2017), "Consumer engagement in online brand
4 communities: A solicitation of congruity theory", *Internet Research*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp.
5 23-45.
6
7 Jalilvand, M.R. and Samiei, N., (2012), "The effect of electronic word of mouth on brand image
8 and purchase intention: An empirical study in the automobile industry in
9 Iran", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp.460-476.
10
11 Jeong, E. and Jang, S. S. (2011), "Restaurant experiences triggering positive electronic word-
12 of-mouth (eWOM) motivations", *International Journal of Hospitality*
13 *Management*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 356-366.
14
15 Johnen, M., Jungblut, M. and Ziegele, M. (2018), "The digital outcry: What incites
16 participation behavior in an online firestorm?", *New Media & Society*, Vol. 20 No. 9,
17 pp. 3140-3160.
18
19 Jun, J., Kang, J. and Hyun, S. S. (2017), "Effects of third-party certification on patrons' service
20 quality evaluation in the luxury-restaurant industry", *British Food Journal*, Vol. 119
21 No. 4, pp.771-789.
22
23 Kang, M. (2010), "Measuring social media credibility: A study on a Measure of Blog
24 Credibility", *Institute for Public Relations*, pp.59-68.
25
26 Kardes, F. (1994), "Consumer Judgment and Decision Processes," in Wyer., R.S. and Srull.
27 T. K. (Eds.) *Handbook of Social Cognition*, pp.399-466.
28
29 Kim, D., Jang, S. and Adler, H. (2015), "What drives café customers to spread eWOM?
30 Examining self-relevant value, quality value, and opinion leadership", *International*
31 *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 261-282.
32
33 Kim, J. H. and Jang, S. S. (2014), "A scenario-based experiment and a field study: A
34 comparative examination for service failure and recovery", *International Journal of*
35 *Hospitality Management*, Vol. 41, pp. 125-132.
36
37 Kim, M. and Lee, M. (2017), "Brand-related user-generated content on social media: the roles
38 of source and sponsorship", *Internet Research*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 1085-1103.
39
40 Kuo, Y.F., Wu, C.M. and Deng, W.J., (2009), "The relationships among service quality,
41 perceived value, customer satisfaction, and post-purchase intention in mobile value-
42 added services", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp.887-896.
43
44 Lee-Won, R.J., Shim, M., Joo, Y.K. and Park, S.G., (2014), "Who puts the best "face" forward
45 on Facebook?: Positive self-presentation in online social networking and the role of
46 self-consciousness, actual-to-total Friends ratio, and culture", *Computers in Human*
47 *Behavior*, Vol. 39, pp.413-423.
48
49 Leung, X.Y., Bai, B. and Stahura, K.A., (2015), "The marketing effectiveness of social media
50 in the hotel industry: A comparison of Facebook and Twitter2", *Journal of Hospitality*
51 *& Tourism Research*, Vol. 39 No.2, pp.147-169.
52
53 Lewis, R. C. and Chambers, R. E. (2000), *Marketing Leadership in Hospitality*, John Wiley,
54 New York, NY.
55
56 Liao, H. (2007), "Do it right this time: The role of employee service recovery performance in
57 customer-perceived justice and customer loyalty after service failures", *Journal of*
58 *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92 No. 2, pp.475-489.
59
60 Liu, H. and Jayawardhena, C (2018), "Consumption Emotion in eWOM and Media Choice: A
Social Sharing of Emotion Perspective", *Proceedings of 2018 American Marketing*

- 1
2
3 *Association (AMA) Winter Academic Conference, New Orleans, LA, February 23-25,*
4 *pp. D-11.*
5
- 6 Liu, H., Jayawardhena, C., Dibb, S. and Ranaweera, C. (2019), "Examining the trade-off
7 between compensation and promptness in eWOM-triggered service recovery: A
8 restorative justice perspective", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 75, pp.381-392.
9
- 10 Liu, Y. and Jang, S.S., (2009), "Perceptions of Chinese restaurants in the US: what affects
11 customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions?", *International Journal of Hospitality*
12 *Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp.338-348.
13
- 14 Liu, Y. L. and Keng, C. J. (2014), "Cognitive dissonance, social comparison, and disseminating
15 untruthful or negative truthful eWOM messages", *Social Behavior and Personality: An*
16 *International Journal*, Vol. 42 No.6, pp.979-995.
17
- 18 Locke, K. D. (2003), "Status and solidarity in social comparison: Agentic and communal values
19 and vertical and horizontal directions", *Journal of Personality and Social*
20 *Psychology*, Vol. 84 No. 3, pp. 619-631.
21
- 22 Locke, K. D. (2005), "Connecting the horizontal dimension of social comparison with self-
23 worth and self-confidence", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 31 No.
24 6, pp. 795-803.
25
- 26 Locksley, A., Hepburn, C. and Ortiz, V. (1982), "Social stereotypes and judgments of
27 individuals: An instance of the base-rate fallacy", *Journal of Experimental Social*
28 *Psychology*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 23-42.
29
- 30 López-López, I. and Parra, J. F. (2016), "Is a most helpful eWOM review really helpful? The
31 impact of conflicting aggregate valence and consumer's goals on product
32 attitude", *Internet Research*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 827-844.
33
- 34 López-López, I., Ruiz-de-Maya, S. and Warlop, L., (2014), "When sharing consumption
35 emotions with strangers is more satisfying than sharing them with friends", *Journal of*
36 *Service Research*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp.475-488.
37
- 38 Lord, C. G., Ross, L. and Lepper, M. R. (1979), "Biased assimilation and attitude polarization:
39 The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence", *Journal of*
40 *Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 37 No. 11, pp. 2098-2109.
41
- 42 Luca, M. (2011), "Reviews, Reputation, and Revenue: The Case of Yelp.com", working paper
43 [No. 12-016], Harvard Business School, Boston, September.
44
- 45 Ma, X., Khansa, L., Deng, Y. and Kim, S.S., (2013), "Impact of prior reviews on the subsequent
46 review process in reputation systems", *Journal of Management Information*
47 *Systems*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp.279-310.
48
- 49 Mano, H. and Oliver, R.L., (1993), "Assessing the dimensionality and structure of the
50 consumption experience: evaluation, feeling, and satisfaction", *Journal of Consumer*
51 *Research*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp.451-466.
52
- 53 Metzger, M. J., Flanagin, A. J., Eyal, K., Lemus, D. R. and McCann, R. M. (2003), "Credibility
54 for the 21st century: Integrating perspectives on source, message, and media credibility
55 in the contemporary media environment", *Annals of the International Communication*
56 *Association*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 293-335.
57
- 58 Mudambi, S.M. and Schuff, D., (2010), "Research note: What makes a helpful online review?
59 A study of customer reviews on Amazon.com", *MIS Quarterly*, pp.185-200.
60

- 1
2
3 Nandan, S. (2005), "An exploration of the brand identity–brand image linkage: A
4 communications perspective", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 264-
5 278.
6
7 Nieto-García, M., Muñoz-Gallego, P. A. and González-Benito, Ó, (2017), "Tourists'
8 willingness to pay for an accommodation: The effect of eWOM and internal reference
9 price", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 62, pp.67-77.
10
11 Nisbett, R.E. and Borgida, E., (1975), "Attribution and the psychology of prediction", *Journal*
12 *of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp.932.
13
14 Noelle-Neumann, E. (1991), "The theory of public opinion: the concept of the spiral of
15 silence", in Anderson, J.A. (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 14*, Sage, Newbury
16 Park, CA, pp. 256-287.
17
18 Oliver, R. L. (1977), "Effect of expectation and disconfirmation on postexposure product
19 evaluations: An alternative interpretation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 62 No.
20 4, pp. 480-486.
21
22 Oliver, R. L. and Burke, R. R. (1999), "Expectation processes in satisfaction formation: A field
23 study", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 1 No. 3, ppt. 196-214.
24
25 Padgett, D. and Allen, D., (1997), "Communicating experiences: A narrative approach to
26 creating service brand image", *Journal of Advertising*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp.49-62.
27
28 Pan, X., Hou, L., Liu, K. and Niu, H., (2018), "Do reviews from friends and the crowd affect
29 online consumer posting behaviour differently?", *Electronic Commerce Research and*
30 *Applications*, Vol. 29, pp. 102-112.
31
32 Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L., (1988), "SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale
33 for measuring consumer perception", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 64 No. 1, pp.12-40.
34
35 Park, C. and Lee, T. M. (2009), "Information direction, website reputation and eWOM effect:
36 A moderating role of product type", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 62 No. 1, pp.
37 61-67.
38
39 Park, S.B. and Park, D.H., (2013), "The effect of low versus high variance in product reviews
40 on product evaluation", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 7, pp.543-554.
41
42 Parsell, M. (2008), "Pernicious virtual communities: Identity, polarisation and the Web
43 2.0", *Ethics and Information Technology*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 41-56.
44
45 Petty, R. E. and Krosnick, J. A. (2014), *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*,
46 Psychology Press, New York, NY.
47
48 Phua, J., Jin, S.V. and Kim, J.J., (2017), "Gratifications of using Facebook, Twitter, Instagram,
49 or Snapchat to follow brands: The moderating effect of social comparison, trust, tie
50 strength, and network homophily on brand identification, brand engagement, brand
51 commitment, and membership intention", *Telematics and Informatics*, Vol. 34 No.1,
52 pp.412-424.
53
54 Purnawirawan, N., De Pelsmacker, P. and Dens, N. (2012), "Balance and sequence in online
55 reviews: How perceived usefulness affects attitudes and intentions", *Journal of*
56 *Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp.244-255.
57
58 Purnawirawan, N., Eisend, M., De Pelsmacker, P. and Dens, N. (2015), "A meta-analytic
59 investigation of the role of valence in online reviews", *Journal of Interactive*
60 *Marketing*, Vol. 31, pp.17-27.

- 1
2
3 Qiu, L., Pang, J. and Lim, K.H., (2012), "Effects of conflicting aggregated rating on eWOM
4 review credibility and diagnosticity: The moderating role of review valence", *Decision*
5 *Support Systems*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp.631-643.
6
- 7 Quan-Haase, A. and Sloan, L. (2017) "Introduction to the Handbook of Social Media Research
8 Methods: Goals, Challenges and Innovations", in Sloan, L. and Quan-Haase, A. (Ed.),
9 *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media Research Methods*, SAGE Publications, London,
10 pp. 1-9.
11
- 12 Quaschnig, S., Pandelaere, M. and Vermeir, I. (2014), "When consistency matters: The effect
13 of valence consistency on review helpfulness", *Journal of Computer-Mediated*
14 *Communication*, Vol.20 No. 2, pp.136-152.
15
- 16 Ranaweera, C. and Jayawardhena, C., (2014), "Talk up or criticize? Customer responses to
17 WOM about competitors during social interactions", *Journal of Business*
18 *Research*, Vol. 67 No. 12, pp.2645-2656.
19
- 20 Richins, M.L., (1991), "Social comparison and the idealized images of advertising" *Journal of*
21 *Consumer Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp.71-83.
22
- 23 Richins, M.L., (1995), "Social comparison, advertising, and consumer discontent", *American*
24 *Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp.593-607.
25
- 26 Rimé, B., (2009), "Emotion elicits the social sharing of emotion: Theory and empirical review",
27 *Emotion Review*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp.60-85.
28
- 29 Rimé, B., Finkenauer, C., Luminet, O., Zech, E. and Philippot, P., (1998), "Social sharing of
30 emotion: New evidence and new questions", *European Review of Social Psychology*,
31 Vol. 9 No. 1, pp.145-189.
32
- 33 Rimé, B., Finkenauer, C., Luminet, O., Zech, E. and Philippot, P. (1998), "Social sharing of
34 emotion: New evidence and new questions", *European Review of Social*
35 *Psychology*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 145-189.
36
- 37 Roschk, H. and Kaiser, S. (2013), "The nature of an apology: An experimental study on how
38 to apologize after a service failure", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 293-309.
39
- 40 Sebastiani, R., Montagnini, F. and Dalli, D., (2013), "Ethical consumption and new business
41 models in the food industry. Evidence from the Eataly case", *Journal of Business*
42 *Ethics*, Vol. 114 No. 3, pp.473-488.
43
- 44 Shang, R. A., Chen, Y. C. and Chen, C. J. (2013), "The social and objective value of
45 information in virtual investment communities", *Online Information Review*, Vol. 37
46 No. 4, pp. 498-517.
47
- 48 Shen, J. (2012), "Social comparison, social presence, and enjoyment in the acceptance of social
49 shopping websites", *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, Vol 13 No. 3, pp. 198-
50 212.
51
- 52 Shen, Y., Shan, W. and Luan, J., (2018), "Influence of aggregated ratings on purchase decisions:
53 an event-related potential study" *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52 No. 1/2,
54 pp.147-158.
55
- 56 Smeesters, D., Mussweiler, T. and Mandel, N., (2009), "The effects of thin and heavy media
57 images on overweight and underweight consumers: Social comparison processes and
58 behavioral implications", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp.930-949.
59
60

- 1
2
3 So, K. K. F. and King, C., (2010). "When experience matters": building and measuring hotel
4 brand equity: The customers' perspective", *International Journal of Contemporary*
5 *Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp.589-608.
6
7 Sotiriadis, M. D. and Van Zyl, C. (2013), "Electronic word-of-mouth and online reviews in
8 tourism services: the use of twitter by tourists", *Electronic Commerce Research*, Vol.
9 13 No. 1, pp. 103-124.
10
11 Stayman, D. M., Alden, D. L. and Smith, K. H. (1992), "Some effects of schematic processing
12 on consumer expectations and disconfirmation judgments", *Journal of Consumer*
13 *Research*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 240-255.
14
15 Stoycheff, E. (2016), "Under surveillance: Examining Facebook's spiral of silence effects in
16 the wake of NSA internet monitoring", *Journalism & Mass Communication*
17 *Quarterly*, Vol. 93 No. 2, pp. 296-311.
18
19 Tesser, A. and Conlee, M. C. (1975), "Some effects of time and thought on attitude
20 polarization", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 262-
21 270.
22
23 Tsai, W.H.S. and Men, L.R., (2013), "Motivations and antecedents of consumer engagement
24 with brand pages on social networking sites" *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, Vol.
25 13 No. 2, pp.76-87.
26
27 Tsang, A. S. and Prendergast, G. (2009), "Is a "star" worth a thousand words? The interplay
28 between product-review texts and rating valences", *European Journal of*
29 *Marketing*, Vol. 43 No. 11/12, pp.1269-1280.
30
31 Tsao, W. C., Hsieh, M. T., Shih, L. W. and Lin, T. M. (2015), "Compliance with eWOM: The
32 influence of hotel reviews on booking intention from the perspective of consumer
33 conformity", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 46, pp. 99-111.
34
35 Utz, S., (2015), "The function of self-disclosure on social network sites: Not only intimate, but
36 also positive and entertaining self-disclosures increase the feeling of
37 connection", *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 45, pp.1-10.
38
39 Vogel, E. A., Rose, J. P., Okdie, B. M., Eckles, K., & Franz, B. (2015), "Who compares and
40 despairs? The effect of social comparison orientation on social media use and its
41 outcomes", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 86, 249-256.
42
43 Wangenheim, F. and Bayón, T., (2004), "The effect of word of mouth on services switching:
44 Measurement and moderating variables", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 No.
45 9/10, pp.1173-1185.
46
47 Westbrook, R.A. and Oliver, R.L., (1991), "The dimensionality of consumption emotion
48 patterns and consumer satisfaction", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1,
49 pp.84-91.
50
51 Wetzer, I. M., Zeelenberg, M. and Pieters, R. (2007), "“Never eat in that restaurant, I did!”:
52 Exploring why people engage in negative word - of - mouth
53 communication" , *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol.24 No. 8, pp. 661-680.
54
55 Xie, G.X. and Johnson, J.M.Q., (2015), "Examining the Third - Person Effect of Baseline
56 Omission in Numerical Comparison: The Role of Consumer Persuasion Knowledge",
57 *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp.438-449.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Xu, J. B. and Chan, A., (2010), "A conceptual framework of hotel experience and customer-
4 based brand equity: Some research questions and implications", *International Journal*
5 *of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp.174-193.
6
7 Xun, J. and Guo, B. (2017), "Twitter as customer's eWOM: an empirical study on their impact
8 on firm financial performance", *Internet Research*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 1014-1038.
9
10 Yang, Z., Jun, M. and Peterson, R. T. (2004), "Measuring customer perceived online service
11 quality: scale development and managerial implications", *International Journal of*
12 *Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 24 No. 11, pp. 1149-1174.
13
14 Yeh, Y. H. and Choi, S. M. (2011), "MINI-lovers, maxi-mouths: An investigation of
15 antecedents to eWOM intention among brand community members", *Journal of*
16 *Marketing Communications*, Vol.17 No. 3, pp. 145-162.
17
18 Yen, C. L. A. and Tang, C. H. H. (2015), "Hotel attribute performance, eWOM motivations,
19 and media choice", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 46, pp.79-
20 88.
21
22 Yu, X., Roy, S. K., Quazi, A., Nguyen, B. and Han, Y. (2017), "Internet entrepreneurship and
23 "the sharing of information" in an Internet-of-Things context: The role of interactivity,
24 stickiness, e-satisfaction and word-of-mouth in online SMEs' websites", *Internet*
25 *Research*, Vol. 27 No.1, pp. 74-96.
26
27 Zerback, T. and Fawzi, N. (2017), "Can online exemplars trigger a spiral of silence? Examining
28 the effects of exemplar opinions on perceptions of public opinion and speaking
29 out", *New Media & Society*, Vol.19 No. 7, pp. 1034-1051.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figures and Tables





Figure 1: Examples of aggregated rating and individual reviews in this study




 : Positioning of the current study

Figure 2: eWOM information receiving in consumer's decision-making process and research positioning

Internet Research




Figure 3: Research contextualisation

Internet Research

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 4: Conceptual framework

et Research




Figure 5: Experimental design and procedure

1
2
3 *Table 1: Information valence congruence/incongruence in eWOM studies*
4

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Authors	Theory	Valence congruence/incongruence	Findings
Chakravarty et al. (2010)	Persuasion theory	WOM vs. individual review	When receiving incongruent WOM and online reviews about a pre-release movie, frequent moviegoers are more influenced by online reviews while infrequent moviegoers are more influenced by WOM.
López-López and Parra (2016)	Signalling theory	Aggregated rating vs. most helpful individual review	Incongruent valence between the most helpful individual review and aggregated rating influences the consumers' attitude towards the product.
Purnawirawan et al. (2012)	Conformity tendency theory	First individual review vs. last individual review	Congruence between first and last reviews in a list of online reviews leads to consumers' impression bias in the same valence.
Qiu et al. (2012)	Attribution theory	Aggregated rating vs. individual review	Incongruent aggregated rating decreases review credibility and diagnosticity for the positive individual reviews but not for negative ones.
Quaschnig et al. (2014)	Dual-process theory	Multiple individual reviews	Congruent valence of multiple reviews is perceived as more helpful than any incongruences, regardless of them being positive or negative.
Tsang and Predergast (2009)	Prospect theory	Aggregated rating vs. individual review	Individual reviews have a stronger impact on purchase intention, interest and trustworthiness of the review. Congruent valence in general leads to higher trustworthiness.

Table 2: Results of realism checks

<i>Scenario</i>	<i>Experimental realism (mean)</i>	<i>t-Value</i>	<i>Mundane realism (mean)</i>	<i>t-Value</i>
Positive CE				
Positive AR x Positive IR (n = 20)	5.65	7.91*	5.70	8.23*
Positive AR x Negative IR (n = 27)	4.70	2.38*	5.48	6.00*
Negative AR x Positive IR (n = 26)	4.77	2.81*	5.31	4.64*
Negative AR x Negative IR (n = 20)	5.40	3.62*	6.10	14.65*
Negative CE				
Positive AR x Positive IR (n = 26)	5.15	4.19*	5.31	4.94*
Positive AR x Negative IR (n = 21)	5.24	3.23*	5.19	3.41*
Negative AR x Positive IR (n = 20)	5.50	4.81*	5.70	5.67*
Negative AR x Negative IR (n = 20)	5.50	6.94*	5.90	10.72*

Note: * = t-values > 1.96; p < .05 (Field, 2009); CE = consumption experience; AR = aggregated rating; IR = individual reviews

Table 3: Demographic distribution of the participants

	<i>n</i>		<i>n</i>
Age		Education	
18-20	6	Less than high school	1
21-30	108	High school or equivalent	30
31-40	136	Some college but no degree	75
41-50	59	Associate degree	45
51-60	30	Bachelor's degree	139
Above 60	8	Graduate degree	57
Gender		Employment	
Female	196	Employed, full-time	255
Male	151	Employed, part-time	46
		Unemployed	40
		Retired	3
		Disabled, not able to work	3

Table 4: Summary of experimental conditions

	<i>Positive AR *</i> <i>Positive IR</i>	<i>Positive AR *</i> <i>Negative IR</i>	<i>Negative AR *</i> <i>Positive IR</i>	<i>Negative AR *</i> <i>Negative IR</i>
Positive CE	A1	B1	C1	D1
Negative CE	D2	C2	B2	A2
Situation A	When the valences of consumption experience, aggregated rating and individual reviews are congruent.			
Situation B	When the valences of consumption experience and aggregated rating are congruent but opposite to the valence of individual reviews.			
Situation C	When the valences of consumption experience and individual reviews are congruent but opposite to the valence of aggregated rating.			
Situation D	When the valences of aggregated rating and individual reviews are congruent but opposite to the valence of consumption experience.			

Appendix 1: Examples of Experimental Scenarios

3* Hotel Standard in Scenarios

Imagine that you are going to **Orlando** for a **5-day** (4 nights) holiday with your partner (or best friend) during the summer time and staying in a hotel called Diamond Hotel that you booked about **6 weeks in advance**. Diamond Hotel is recognized as a **3-star hotel** on major hotel booking sites (e.g. Expedia, Hotels.com and Booking.com). You booked the hotel at the average price rate of **\$100/per night** for a standard room.

A brief of key standards for a 3-star hotel*

Building/rooms

Clean, hygienic, and all mechanisms and equipment are functional in a faultless condition.

Furniture/equipment

Toothbrush tumbler, soap or body wash, bath essence or shower gel, shampoo, cleansing tissue, and towels are available in the private bathroom. Double beds are a minimum of 1.80 m x 1.90 m. Color TV with a remote control and telephone. Internet access in the public area or in the rooms.

Services

Daily room cleaning. Breakfast buffet or equivalent breakfast menu card that includes at least one hot beverage, a fruit juice, fruit or a fruit salad, a choice of bread and rolls with butter, jam, cold cuts, and cheese. Most offer 24-hour reception service.

* *Adopted from the criteria for Hotelstars Union and Expedia Star Ratings (hotel class).*

Hotel Staying Experience

Positive Consumption Experience

Building/room

The hotel looked magnificent from the outside. The whole building was neat and smelled fresh all the time. The hotel room was very bright, clean, and spacious.

Furniture/equipment

The wardrobe had a large built-in full-length mirror with separate luggage space in the closet. The bed was fairly big and comfortable. Different types of pillow were available for you to choose based on your preference. The sheet and duvet cover felt supple with attractively textured fabric. There were over 100 TV channels available on the flat-screen TV in the room.

1
2
3 The free Wi-Fi worked well. The bathroom was very clean, spacious, and was provided with
4 branded toiletries.
5
6
7

8 Service 9

10 The room was cleaned daily. A wide range of tea and coffee with a selection of biscuits were
11 supplemented daily. The breakfast buffet was served from 6:00 am to 11:00 am, offering a
12 number of choices. Reception service was accessible 24/7 by phone. The hotel staff were polite,
13 friendly, and very helpful, and always had a smile on their face. The reception staff worked
14 professionally and you were served almost immediately at check-in and check-out.
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Negative Consumption Experience**

21 Building/room 22

23 The hotel looked dirty and poorly maintained from the outside. The whole building seemed
24 damp and there was a lot of mould visible. The hotel room felt pretty small and the carpet was
25 covered with dust and hair.
26
27
28
29

30 Furniture/equipment 31

32 One corner of the built-in dressing mirror on the wardrobe was cracked. The bed size looked
33 smaller than the standard double-bed size and the mattress was quite hard. The pillows that the
34 hotel provided were too soft and the hotel claimed that they did not have alternative pillows
35 after you asked about this. The texture of the sheet and duvet cover was quite rough and they
36 had light-coloured stains on them. A small TV was installed in the room but did not function
37 at all. The Wi-Fi was available in public areas, but not in the room. The hotel provided no
38 toiletries in the bathroom.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Service 47

48 The room was cleaned on the first two days. On the second two days, the room was only cleaned
49 if required. Only a couple of tea bags and instant coffee sachets were available in the room and
50 these were not supplemented after being consumed. The breakfast buffet was served from 7:00
51 am to 10:00 am with a very limited choice. A call to reception was not answered on the third
52 night. A request to change the room was rejected out of hand. The reception staff worked rather
53 inefficiently and check-in and check-out took about 15 minutes.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Aggregated Rating

After your stay, you come across the Diamond Hotel’s profile on TripAdvisor as below.

Positive


Diamond Hotel

●●●●○ 713 Rviews

Reviews

173 of 375 hotels in Orlando

●●●●○ 713 Reviews



Negative


Diamond Hotel

●●○○○ 713 Rviews

Reviews

#319 of 375 hotels in Orlando

●●○○○ 713 Reviews



Research

Individual Reviews

You also noticed the recent individual reviews left by other consumers for Diamond Hotel.

Positive

“Could not be better”



I stayed in that hotel with my friend. The room seemed recently refurbished and was spacious and clean with a very good view. All the furniture was brand new. The bedding was very soft and comfy. Highly recommended!

“Great hotel”



Staff at the reception were welcoming, patient, and very helpful. They worked efficiently and helped me and my friends check-in within 5 minutes even though there was a long queue. Great room conditions. Breakfasts were yummy and fresh.

“Brilliant”



Great experience. Beautiful room with great view. Wi-Fi was easily accessed with a good speed. Staff were nice and helpful. That was a smart choice to book the hotel.

Negative

“Terrible”



I stayed in that hotel with my friend. The room was dark, tiny, and unclean. All the furniture was very old. The bedding was damp. A total disaster. Not recommended at all!

“Could be better”



Only two people worked at the reception. It took ages for me and my friend to do the check-in and check-out. The staff tried to help but seemed to be very inexperienced. Bad room conditions. But the breakfast was fine.

“Worst hotel ever”



Awful experience. Wi-Fi broke down every few minutes. TV acted like an audio with no pictures. Staff worked ineffectively. Just can't regret more about booking this hotel.

Appendix 2: The scales

Emotional Intensity (López-López et al., 2014)

After experiencing the scenario, I feel a sense of...

Anger (negative)/enjoyment (positive)

Sadness (negative)/pleasantness (positive)

Irritation (negative)/euphoria (positive)

Disappointment (negative)/fun (positive)

Frustration (negative)/entertainment (positive)

Resentment (negative)/happiness (positive)

Indignation (negative)/enthusiasm (positive)

Disgust (negative)/fascination (positive)

Service Quality (Brady and Cronin Jr., 2001; Liu and Jang, 2009)

The service of Diamond Hotel is dependable and consistent.

I would say that Diamond Hotel provides superior service.

I believe Diamond Hotel offers excellent service.

Brand Image (Chiang and Jang, 2007)

Overall, I think this hotel brand is:

Unfavourable to Favourable

Unattractive to Attractive

Worthless to Valuable

Bad Reputation to Good Reputation

eWOM Giving Intention (Leung et al., 2015)

My willingness of writing a review about this staying experience on TripAdvisor is very high.

The probability that I would consider writing a review about this hotel staying experience on TripAdvisor is very high.

The likelihood of writing a review about this hotel staying experience to others on TripAdvisor is very high.

Perceived Credibility of the Review Site (Cheung et al., 2009)

I think the information on TripAdvisor in the scenario is factual.

1
2
3 I think the information on TripAdvisor in the scenario is accurate.
4

5 I think the information on TripAdvisor in the scenario is credible.
6
7

8 *Valence of Consumption Experience* (Duprez et al., 2015)
9

10 Using the rating scale below, please rate how positive/negative the scenario was for you
11
12 (strongly negative/strongly positive, 10-point Likert scale).
13
14

15 *Perceived Valence of Aggregated Rating* (Antheunis et al., 2010)
16

17 How would you think about the aggregated rating of Diamond Hotel on TripAdvisor left by
18
19 other consumers? (Strongly negative/strongly positive, 7-point Likert scale)
20
21

22 *Perceived Valence of Individual Reviews* (Antheunis et al., 2010)
23

24 How would you think about the individual reviews of Diamond Hotel on TripAdvisor left by
25
26 other consumers? (Strongly negative/strongly positive, 7-point Likert scale)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Appendix 3: Statistical Figures




Figure 6: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on emotional intensity




Figure 7: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on service quality (clustered by the valence of CE)




Figure 8: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on brand image (clustered by the valence of CE)




Figure 9: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on perceived credibility of the review site




Figure 10: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on eWOM-giving intention

Response to Guest Editor's and Editorial Office's Comments

We would like to thank the Guest Editors and editorial office for their comments. Modifications based on the editorial office's suggestions are presented in the following table and highlighted throughout the manuscript. We hope that we have addressed all issues to the satisfaction of the editorial team.

Guest Editors	
<p>Manuscript ID IntR-07-2018-0331.R3 entitled "Do Online Reviews Still Matter Post-Purchase?" which you submitted to Internet Research, has been returned by the journal's editorial office with the comments below. Please thoroughly address these comments and resubmit your manuscript on or before 14 Aug 2019.</p>	<p>Thank you very much for your support and giving us the opportunity of revising and resubmitting the paper and providing us specific comments that help us to improve the readability of the paper.</p> <p>We have responded to all the identified issues below and made specific revisions to the paper based on the comments that we have been given. To ensure the readability of this response table, we specify the page numbers of changes that we have made.</p> <p>The current version has been proofread by a professional proofreader. All references have been checked and formatted to fit in with house style. Additionally, we also provided all tables and figures in the manuscript, as well as uploaded them individually in the manuscript centre. We strongly believe that your support and the reviewers' suggestions helped to improve the manuscript significantly.</p> <p>Once again, we would like to thank you for this valuable opportunity of resubmission and hope that the new version meets your expectation.</p>

Editorial Office's Comments	
<p>Manuscript ID IntR-07-2018-0331.R3 has room for improvement:</p> <p>1. There is a grammatical mistake (i.e., "consumers' perceptions of the service quality is...").</p>	<p>Thank you very much for spotting this. We have changed it to "consumers' perception of the service quality is" on page 15.</p>
<p>2. For "perceptual polarisation", do you mean "perceptual polarisation"?</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. Yes, we meant perceptual here. We have made the change on page 12.</p>
<p>3. The key in Figure 2 should be a rounded-corner rectangle instead of a dotted line.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback on Figure 2. We have now used rounded-corner rectangle instead of dotted line as suggested. The Figure 2 can be found on page 39.</p>
<p>4. As suggested before, the rationale in Figure 2 under "need recognition" (i.e., "eWOM information triggered consumer needs") can be changed to gerund like its counterparts (e.g., "eWOM information searching for risk reduction" under "Information search") for better readability. Please revise the manuscript accordingly and submit again. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your suggestion. We have now unified gerund use in explaining the rationales in all stages. We hope Figure 2 reads well to you.</p> <p>Thank you very much again for all your insightful suggestions. The readability of the paper has been significantly improved based on your suggestions in this and the previous rounds. We hope the new version meets your expectation.</p>

Diamond Hotel

●●●●○ 179 Reviews

Reviews

173 of 375 hotels in Orlando




→ Aggregated Rating



→ Individual Reviews

Figure 1: Examples of aggregated rating and individual reviews in this study




 : Positioning of the current study

Figure 2: eWOM information receiving in consumer's decision-making process and research positioning




Figure 3: Research contextualisation




Figure 4: Conceptual framework

Internet Research




Figure 5: Experimental design and procedure

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Table 1: Information valence congruence/incongruence in eWOM studies

Authors	Theory	Valence congruence/incongruence	Findings
Chakravarty et al. (2010)	Persuasion theory	WOM vs. individual review	When receiving incongruent WOM and online reviews about a pre-release movie, frequent moviegoers are more influenced by online reviews while infrequent moviegoers are more influenced by WOM.
López-López and Parra (2016)	Signalling theory	Aggregated rating vs. most helpful individual review	Incongruent valence between the most helpful individual review and aggregated rating influences the consumers' attitude towards the product.
Purnawirawan et al. (2012)	Conformity tendency theory	First individual review vs. last individual review	Congruence between first and last reviews in a list of online reviews leads to consumers' impression bias in the same valence.
Qiu et al. (2012)	Attribution theory	Aggregated rating vs. individual review	Incongruent aggregated rating decreases review credibility and diagnosticity for the positive individual reviews but not for negative ones.
Quaschnig et al. (2014)	Dual-process theory	Multiple individual reviews	Congruent valence of multiple reviews is perceived as more helpful than any incongruences, regardless of them being positive or negative.
Tsang and Predergast (2009)	Prospect theory	Aggregated rating vs. individual review	Individual reviews have a stronger impact on purchase intention, interest and trustworthiness of the review. Congruent valence in general leads to higher trustworthiness.

Table 2: Results of realism checks

<i>Scenario</i>	<i>Experimental realism (mean)</i>	<i>t-Value</i>	<i>Mundane realism (mean)</i>	<i>t-Value</i>
Positive CE				
Positive AR x Positive IR (n = 20)	5.65	7.91*	5.70	8.23*
Positive AR x Negative IR (n = 27)	4.70	2.38*	5.48	6.00*
Negative AR x Positive IR (n = 26)	4.77	2.81*	5.31	4.64*
Negative AR x Negative IR (n = 20)	5.40	3.62*	6.10	14.65*
Negative CE				
Positive AR x Positive IR (n = 26)	5.15	4.19*	5.31	4.94*
Positive AR x Negative IR (n = 21)	5.24	3.23*	5.19	3.41*
Negative AR x Positive IR (n = 20)	5.50	4.81*	5.70	5.67*
Negative AR x Negative IR (n = 20)	5.50	6.94*	5.90	10.72*

Note: * = t-values > 1.96; p < .05 (Field, 2009); CE = consumption experience; AR = aggregated rating; IR = individual reviews

Table 3: Demographic distribution of the participants

	<i>n</i>		<i>n</i>
Age		Education	
18-20	6	Less than high school	1
21-30	108	High school or equivalent	30
31-40	136	Some college but no degree	75
41-50	59	Associate degree	45
51-60	30	Bachelor's degree	139
Above 60	8	Graduate degree	57
Gender		Employment	
Female	196	Employed, full-time	255
Male	151	Employed, part-time	46
		Unemployed	40
		Retired	3
		Disabled, not able to work	3

Table 4: Summary of experimental conditions

	<i>Positive AR *</i> <i>Positive IR</i>	<i>Positive AR *</i> <i>Negative IR</i>	<i>Negative AR *</i> <i>Positive IR</i>	<i>Negative AR *</i> <i>Negative IR</i>
Positive CE	A1	B1	C1	D1
Negative CE	D2	C2	B2	A2
Situation A	When the valences of consumption experience, aggregated rating and individual reviews are congruent.			
Situation B	When the valences of consumption experience and aggregated rating are congruent but opposite to the valence of individual reviews.			
Situation C	When the valences of consumption experience and individual reviews are congruent but opposite to the valence of aggregated rating.			
Situation D	When the valences of aggregated rating and individual reviews are congruent but opposite to the valence of consumption experience.			




Figure 6: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on emotional intensity




Figure 7: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on service quality (clustered by the valence of CE)




Figure 8: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on brand image (clustered by the valence of CE)




Figure 9: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on perceived credibility of the review site




Figure 10: The effects of CE, AR and IR congruence/incongruence on eWOM-giving intention