



1 Received: 27 April 2022 Accepted: 11 July 2022

2 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/tmj.v10i3.2288>

## 4 Online consumer reviews: information adoption and engagement 5 between social media users

6 Konstantinos Papageorgiou<sup>1</sup>, Irene Samanta<sup>2</sup> Panagiotis Kaldis<sup>3</sup>

### 7 Abstract

8 *The purpose of this paper is to examine the adoption and trust of information and reviews posted on social media*  
9 *platforms and simultaneously to examine the engagement of social media users in correlation with Online Consumer*  
10 *Reviews. Consequently, this research approached the subject in a novel way by performing an analysis on each of the*  
11 *most popular social media platforms. Initially by investigating how users adopt information on different platforms and*  
12 *from different sources. While at the same time, exploring the OCRs as a motivational factor for further engagement*  
13 *in the social media environment. Existing literature was examined and subsequently quantitative research was*  
14 *performed within 2022. According to the research findings, the majority of the responders uses their smartphones to*  
15 *access social media. Trust in information such as comments and reviews posted on social media depends on the social*  
16 *platform which this content is posted on. Social media users trust information created by businesses on certain social*  
17 *media. Although, social media users evaluate information posted by other users on different social media such as*  
18 *Facebook and Instagram. Additionally, Online Consumer Reviews have the ability to enhance engagement on certain*  
19 *social media platforms, such as Facebook, Pinterest, and TikTok. Finally, new trends concerning OCRs*  
20 *manipulation were discussed. Sustaining improved levels of trustworthiness in consumer reviews proves to be*  
21 *increasingly crucial since new exploits are invented. The findings can help companies improve their social media*  
22 *marketing strategies and promptly adapt to upcoming developments.*

23 **Keywords:** *Social media; online consumer reviews; engagement; trust; consumers; businesses*

24 JEL codes M3, M31

### 25 Introduction

26 Nowadays, numerous large shopping and social platforms are available over the Internet and  
27 people can access comments and information through them (Abawajy et. al. 2020).  
28 Consumers, usually before purchasing, are taking into account the opinions of previous buyers  
29 which have already purchased a product. In the past, access to information and comments  
30 about commodities was established by face-to-face communication (Sun et. al. 2019). Online  
31 customer reviews can be accessed through social media and electronic commerce platforms.  
32 These sources include useful electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) information for products or  
33 services, which enables firms' business strategy and individual consumers' evaluation  
34 shopping (Sun et. al. 2019). Hence, a significant number of consumers adopt and make use  
35 of online consumer reviews (OCRs). These reviews are considered a type of electronic word-  
36 of-mouth (eWOM) used for the assessment of the quality and perceived value of the products  
37 and services that consumers are expected to purchase (Wern et. al. 2016; Filieri, et. al. 2018).

<sup>1</sup> Konstantinos Papageorgiou, University of West Athens, Greece. E-mail: [kpapageorgiou@uniwa.gr](mailto:kpapageorgiou@uniwa.gr)

<sup>2</sup> Irene Samanta, PhD, University of West Athens, Greece. E-mail: [isamanta@uniwa.gr](mailto:isamanta@uniwa.gr)

<sup>3</sup> Panagiotis Kaldis, PhD, University of West Athens, Greece. E-mail: [pkaldis@uniwa.gr](mailto:pkaldis@uniwa.gr)



1 Exploring eWOM in relation to products which include customer reviews has aroused the  
2 interest of multiple researchers in various fields (Sun et. al. 2019). The analysis of consumer  
3 reviews helps the formation of business strategies for firms as well as comparison shopping  
4 for individual consumers. The impact of online reviews is linked to their trustworthiness. The  
5 added value of online reviews is mainly attributed to their ability to reveal real views expressed  
6 by consumers originated from their purchase experience. Furthermore, online reviews are  
7 considered credible since, unlike traditional advertising, where consumers are aware that they  
8 are trying to be convinced, online reviews are created by consumers which do not expect any  
9 compensation. Therefore, the ratings and reviews uploaded by these consumers are presumed  
10 to be reliable and unprejudiced (Moon et. al. 2020). However, it has been suggested that the  
11 mechanism of online consumer reviews has the disadvantage of being easily manipulated.  
12 Consequently, a large number of reviews, especially the more recent ones, have limited  
13 helpfulness value (Filieri et. al. 2018). Online reviews could be fake as well. This is probably  
14 to happen since some companies pay users to write positive reviews about their brand, and at  
15 the same time to write negative reviews for their competitors (Moon et. al. 2020). As a  
16 consequence of the rising significance of consumer reviews and their effect on influencing  
17 consumer decisions, some sellers on social and commerce platforms motivate or hire  
18 influencers to encourage consumers to post OCRs for the products and services they provide.  
19 The creation of such reviews may disorient consumers attempting to evaluate the quality and  
20 performance of products or services before purchase (Filieri et. al. 2018). Past studies have  
21 explored the connection between online reviews and customer engagement (Thakur, 2018;  
22 Shaheen et. al., 2019). As it was concluded from these studies, there was identified a positive  
23 connection between online consumer reviews and customer engagement. Although there is a  
24 gap in the examined literature since there was no exploration of these results within the  
25 social media platform environment and accordingly this phenomenon was not studied  
26 for each one of the most popular social media platforms. Therefore, through this  
27 research, two objectives will be explored. Initially, this research aims to evaluate Online  
28 Consumer Reviews concerning the perceived factors of trustworthiness and influence  
29 within social media platforms. While secondly, it will be investigated in which social  
30 media platforms the relation of Online Consumer Reviews and engagement is more  
31 intense.

### 32 **Consumer reviews in social media**

33 A review can be described as an open-form brief text comment through which the consumer  
34 expresses the experience of the product or service consumed. This action can provide a useful  
35 reference for potential future consumers and such reviews can influence purchase intentions  
36 (Chen & Chang, 2018). Online Consumer Reviews can be defined as any feedback with  
37 positive, negative, or neutral content concerning a product, service, business, or individual  
38 evidently created by a consumer who purchased or consumed a product or service. Hence,  
39 this consumer shared his experience online with every other potential consumer (Dhahak et.  
40 al. 2020). Online ratings and reviews were transformed into the standard for multiple  
41 consumers using online services, providing useful product and service information to other  
42 potential consumers. In some cases, many online platforms also permit sellers to rate  
43 purchasers as well. Reviews posted on platforms like Google Places, TripAdvisor, Yelp, and  
44 Facebook provide a type of social proof that can inspire consumer confidence, amplify social  
45 media marketing performance, and support online review management strategy (Bassig,



2021). This enables the development of trust and the creation of a feedback mechanism that simplifies forthcoming transactions (Chen & Chang, 2018). Usually a review can include two kinds of content, the first one is emotional content, which contains reviewers' emotional perceptions for products or services, and the second one is non emotional content, which describes product advantages and disadvantages (Guo, et. al., 2020). Overall, emotions can be distinguished into three different categories including positive, negative, and neutral. Latest findings unveiled that this kind of emotion is possible to be displayed by using digital communications. Therefore, users are able to feel the emotions of the review authors with verbal and nonverbal communication, this could be achieved through emoticons and icons that may be included within a review (Salehan & Kim, 2016). Regarding nonverbal elements like emoticons, some research findings mention that emoticons used in User Generated Reviews sometimes are much more enlightening compared to the actual text, since they vividly and colourfully represent the emotional state of a writer, while readers can understand these emotions very clearly (Eslami, et. al., 2018). Consumption experiences as well as product usage can cause customers' emotional responses throughout the purchase process and during consumption. These emotions control consumers' purchase decisions and post purchase behaviours (Guo et. al. 2020). Review monitoring software platforms offer review management features, helping businesses and users to view social reviews on multiple channels, respond to feedback, and the ability to search for specific reviews (Bassig, 2021). An effective auxiliary method is the analysis of mass online product reviews, which can be achieved through data mining and sentiment analysis of the review text. While the traditional sentiment analysis for online reviews for products is conducted mainly at the sentence level, the satisfaction level of consumers regarding a product is achieved with data mining. This method includes techniques like lexicon research, which examines the semantic orientation of words or phrases and machine learning techniques (Abawajy et. al., 2020). Application of above-mentioned techniques to study Online Consumer's Reviews, could help to understand the perceived helpfulness of these reviews by the consumers.

## 28 **Review helpfulness**

29 The review helpfulness has widely been used as an index to measure consumers' discerned  
30 value of the quality concerning a product or service. A helpful User Generated Review has  
31 the ability to provide an increased value for consumers by supplying suitable information  
32 concerning the quality of a product or service. More specifically, a helpful UGR can be  
33 described as "User Generated Review within a community which supports customers to  
34 make better buying decisions, while supporting organizations to improve their market  
35 offerings." (Kaufmann, 2015). Recent literature identified various exogenous variables which  
36 have an impact on the helpfulness of User Generated Reviews (UGR). For instance, many  
37 studies investigated the length of the review as an impact factor and how this contributes to  
38 review helpfulness. As some studies have revealed, reviews which contain longer text are  
39 assumed to contain additional details and information regarding the product, its usage, and  
40 total experience. Consequently, these reviews are more likely to be perceived more helpful  
41 (Lutz et. al. 2019; Srivastava & Kalro 2019). Furthermore, many studies have explored the  
42 impact of review rates in comparison with review helpfulness. Numerical review rates, which  
43 are available in a Likert scale form, ranging from one to five, represent positive, neutral, or  
44 negative assessments from previous consumers about a product or service (Dai & Zhang  
45 2019). Findings from these studies suggest that numerical ranks placed at both ends of the

1 scale appear to be more helpful than neutral ones (Eslami et. al. 2018). Another aspect of User  
 2 Generated Reviews that affect sales is valence (positive/negative) as well as the volume of  
 3 product reviews. These two parameters have a direct impact on the sales of a product. It has  
 4 also been found that helpful reviews appear to influence the decision of a potential customer  
 5 more than the reviews which are not perceived as helpful (Ahmad & Laroche 2015).

## 6 **Implications of trusting Online Consumer Review**

7 Credibility of information was always a key issue concerning WOM. Following the large scale  
 8 spread of the internet and social media in daily life, the credibility issue concerning  
 9 information remained at a digital level. Nowadays, the digital revolution that ensued removed  
 10 the barriers for everyone and enhanced the diffusion of information to the general public.  
 11 eWOM may appear in multiple digital channels like online consumer communities, social  
 12 platforms as well as on photo and video platforms (Dwivedi et.al. 2020). As mentioned  
 13 previously, Online Consumer Reviews is a type of eWOM (Wern et. al. 2016; Filieri et. al.  
 14 2018). While consumers are searching for information regarding a product over the Internet,  
 15 they may find many reviews and experiences about the desired product, although they are not  
 16 able to decide the level of trustworthiness for this information. Consumers often use as a  
 17 credibility factor the number of similar opinions (Motyka et. al. 2018). However, this fact is  
 18 not supported in another research where users searching for online recommendations  
 19 perceive it as more credible and can relate to online reviews if the creators of information  
 20 display authoritarian qualities (Yang & Yecies, 2019). However, in many cases, consumers do  
 21 not personally know the users who initially wrote these online reviews. Therefore, it is not  
 22 easy for them to decide the level of trustworthiness or usefulness of these online reviews.  
 23 Additionally, the selection of online platforms is one of the factors that consumers appraise  
 24 when determining whether to adopt the information available on these platforms (Jeong &  
 25 Koo, 2015). There has been a considerable number of researches specifically focused to  
 26 understand source credibility. An eWOM message is perceived as credible when it is authentic,  
 27 accurate, or realistic to the consumer (Chih et.2020). Within the study of Zhao and Huang,  
 28 it was revealed that consumers consider more trustworthy product information generated by  
 29 other consumers than the information provided by businesses (Zhao & Huang, 2019).  
 30 Therefore, consumers tend to evaluate the source and origin of the information (Yan et. al.  
 31 2018). Online reviews become the designated way for consumers to source for information  
 32 regarding products or services and their success is mainly due to the facts that are considered  
 33 reliable and beneficial (Dwivedi et. al. 2020). The main components that affect the recipient's  
 34 approval of information rely on two variables. The first one is the source, which can be  
 35 considered as an expert about valuable information on a specific subject. The second one is  
 36 the trustworthiness, which concerns the sincerity and credibility of a source. Source credibility  
 37 is a key element of eWOM and consequently in OCRs, since expert sources have a great  
 38 impact on usefulness, information acceptance, and purchase intention (Filieri et. al., 2018;  
 39 Dwivedi, et. al., 2020). Therefore, this study proposes the formation of the hypothesis:

40 H1: Trust in information, such as comments and reviews posted on social media depending  
 41 on the social network which this content is posted on.

42 As another research states, trust in eWOM and social media can be considered as an  
 43 interactive relationship and as a communication concept. While at the same time, consumer  
 44 reviews can be considered as an indivisible part of online shopping and social commerce.



1 Therefore, Online Consumer Review is a critical part of eWOM. As a consequence, the usage  
2 and adoption of eWOM information may include trust in product experience, description,  
3 reviews, and recommendations (Popkova & Ostrovskaya, 2019). A consumer while he is  
4 selecting and purchasing a product, he usually interacts with a social group so that some  
5 individuals may have bought this product. Consequently, in order for social exchange to be  
6 enabled and grow, a unique relationship between the potential consumer and the social group  
7 has to be developed. This relationship intergrades trust in user-created information (Weitzl et.  
8 al., 2018).

9 Deceptive or fake reviews destabilize consumer assurance concerning online reviews,  
10 resulting in consumer detriment. Consumer reviews, which include fake content, are  
11 considered one of the most distorting factors in the e-commerce sector (Valant, 2015). As  
12 stated in some researches, business owners try to create optimistic reviews regarding their  
13 businesses by offering incentives to consumers to write their own positive experiences. This  
14 is a common approach and may vary from free products, discount or gift-card reward (Fileri  
15 et. al. 2018; Weitzl et. al. 2018). To handle this issue regarding fake online reviews, quite a  
16 few strategies were adopted by consumer regulatory authorities and other stakeholders in the  
17 EU as well as internationally (Valant, 2015). Amazon is one e-commerce platform which is  
18 trying to decrease the number of fake reviews by employing a combination of human  
19 moderators and artificial intelligence (West, 2021). According to a research, the final stage of  
20 the purchase decision is satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This stage will affect if the consumer  
21 will proceed again to a similar purchase. Instagram includes high possibilities for brand  
22 awareness creation by employing users to create a true reflection of the product. Social media  
23 revolution altered consumers' preference towards specific products since consumers have an  
24 inclination to get influenced by other persons in their social network, which ultimately may  
25 lead them to select a specific brand to another (Chivandi, et. al., 2020). Consequently, this  
26 study will try to examine if trust on information including online consumer reviews is  
27 differentiated between different social media platforms.

## 28 **Characteristics of communication and engagement in social communities**

29 Social media has transformed to a communication tool with a significant role. People  
30 worldwide access social media to connect and engage with users or businesses. These users  
31 are at the same time consumers as well. Hence, as consumers, they share product reviews,  
32 exchange information about personal matters or health, express their experiences regarding  
33 services, and warn other consumers about certain products. People have a lot of friends on  
34 social media, consequently User Created Content can reach many users. This transforms to a  
35 source of information for consumers and can impact their buying behaviour. People depend  
36 on the information and reviews posted in social media to provide guidance and to plan their  
37 future purchases. Social media has expanded in terms of its engagement and impact (Shawky  
38 et. al. 2019). According to a research conducted by Nielsen (Nielsen Annual Marketing  
39 Report, 2020), 92% of responding consumers trust more recommendations from friends or  
40 family in contrast to other forms of advertising. The American Marketing Association  
41 (Whitler, 2014), to determine more details about what businesses are doing about this issue,  
42 conducted a study where 64% of marketers replied that they consider word of mouth as one  
43 of the most constructive forms of marketing. Nonetheless, only 6% replied that they are  
44 successfully employing this technique (Lisjak et. al. 2021). Researchers argued that  
45 questionable placement of information and unappealing sources can be less convincing in

1 influencing the opinion making mechanism. In some particular cases, consumer behaviour  
2 and buying decision procedures may be undesirably affected by negative reviews and posts  
3 about products (Weisstein et. al., 2017). Even more, negative feedback is more influential than  
4 the positive one. As stated, negative expressions have a stronger influence on customers than  
5 positive ones, particularly if the majority of the reviews are negative. However, positive  
6 eWOM can attract more attention during the purchase investigation process (Ngarmwongnoi  
7 et. al. 2020). Online consumer reviews can be considered as a type of electronic word-of-  
8 mouth, which provides product information and recommendations from other consumers  
9 (Lee et. al. 2008; Wern et. al. 2016). Hence, the same attitude can be observed in Online  
10 Consumer Reviews. Additionally, as other studies mentioned, the establishment of online  
11 relationships between businesses and consumers may lead to trust in the long run. This type  
12 of relationship can create a positive attitude towards online reviews both directly and by  
13 influencing consumers, provoking in them the intention to engage in online reviews (Thakur,  
14 2018; Shaheen et. al. 2019). Therefore, resulting from above, the following hypothesis is  
15 formed.

16 H2: Online Consumer Reviews can be used to influence consumers and enhance their  
17 engagement in social media

18 As another study suggests, convincing positive or negative reviews could lead other potential  
19 consumers to evaluate a product or service as more favourable or unfavourable. Therefore,  
20 consumers' product evaluations are likely to variate after exposure to positive and negative  
21 reviews (Huang et. al. 2018). Studies on User Generated Content like Online Consumer  
22 Reviews suggest that this kind of content has the ability to enhance engagement. More  
23 specifically, while increasing the users' functional and emotional values, they will be motivated  
24 to engage with an online brand (Kitirattarkarn et. al. 2019; Mohammad et. al. 2020).  
25 Concluding from above, this study will try to evaluate the connection between Online  
26 Consumer Reviews and engagement within the most popular social media platforms.

## 27 **Research Methodology**

28 This research paper examines the adoption of Online Consumer Reviews as an influence  
29 parameter of consumer's purchasing intentions as well as in social media platforms, the  
30 relation of Online Consumer Reviews and engagement is more intense.

31 Therefore, quantitative research was conducted within the online environment to achieve  
32 optimum levels of validity (McCay-Peet & Quan-Haase, 2017; Kozinets, 2019). A two-stage  
33 procedure was implemented. Initially, the literature was reviewed to create a specific model  
34 for this study. To investigate the validity of hypotheses derived from the literature review  
35 among social media members, quantitative research was conducted using a structured  
36 questionnaire. The questionnaire was in an electronic format and the answers were stored  
37 automatically in a database, After the creation of the questionnaire, it was distributed through  
38 social media to users located in Greece and responders were encouraged to complete it. The  
39 questionnaire used in this research study consisted from 17 questions which were used to  
40 examine the trust and purchasing behaviour of consumers through interaction as well as the  
41 effect of online product and service reviews in social media. The survey examined the most  
42 popular social media networks, including Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and TikTok. Finally,  
43 once the data collection process was completed, all received responses were checked and  
44 incomplete responses were removed. For the data analysis, SPSS software was used. The



1 survey was conducted between October 2021 and January 2022 and gathered in total 615  
 2 responses, which were used for further statistical analysis. The main aim of this research was  
 3 to study multiple issues including communication and trust in information within online social  
 4 communities and investigate the engagement in social media platforms.

## 5 Results

6 The questionnaire's consistency was evaluated using Alpha-Cronbach's. The value of the  
 7 result was equal to 0.731, representing an increased rate of internal consistency and valid  
 8 question structure. According to the collected replies from the questionnaire, the largest  
 9 percentage of respondents 74.6% were women, while the remaining 25.4% were men. As  
 10 reported by the received responses, 55.5% of the users are accessing their social media account  
 11 from their smartphone, while 23.1% prefer their laptop, 13.6% their desktop, and only 7.9%  
 12 use their tablet. Additionally, responders hold accounts in a plethora of social media like  
 13 Facebook (24.8%), Instagram (21%), YouTube (19.3%), Twitter (7.9%), TikTok (9.2%),  
 14 LinkedIn (8.3%) and Pinterest (9.6%).

15 To examine the first hypothesis H1 Trust in information, such as comments and reviews  
 16 posted on social media depends on the social network which this content is posted on, Anova  
 17 analysis was applied. The factor variable was the trust that users have on information created  
 18 by businesses in social media. By examining Table 1, the value of F in the Between Groups  
 19 suggests that this reaches significance, therefore there is a significant result. We can see that  
 20 the significance (Sig.) value is  $p < 0.001$ . This appears to apply for Facebook and Instagram.  
 21 Concerning TikTok, Pinterest, and LinkedIn, a fluctuation in significance between 0.01-0.03  
 22 can be observed. However, this is considerably lower than our significance threshold of  
 23  $P < 0.05$ . Consequently, we should reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative  
 24 hypothesis, so the effects would be statistically significant. Although the significance (Sig.)  
 25 value for Twitter is  $p < 0.86$ , which is considerably higher than our significance threshold of  
 26  $P < 0.05$ . In this case, the null hypothesis is valid. As it can be concluded, responders show the  
 27 tendency to adopt information sourcing from businesses on social media platforms like  
 28 Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, LinkedIn, Pinterest, and less on Twitter.

29 **Table 1.** Trust on information created by businesses in social media

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Trust information on Facebook	Between Groups	36.789	4	9.197	11.667	.000
	Within Groups	480.892	610	.788		
	Total	517.681	614			
Trust information on Instagram	Between Groups	37.713	4	9.428	10.016	.000
	Within Groups	574.183	610	.941		
	Total	611.896	614			
Trust information on Twitter	Between Groups	9.436	4	2.359	2.051	.086
	Within Groups	701.660	610	1.150		
	Total	711.096	614			
Trust information on TikTok	Between Groups	12.552	4	3.138	4.100	.003
	Within Groups	466.912	610	.765		
	Total	479.463	614			
	Between Groups	24.881	4	6.220	4.061	.003

Trust information on LinkedIn	Within Groups	934.377	610	1.532		
	Total	959.259	614			
Trust information on Pinterest	Between Groups	20.959	4	5.240	4.688	.001
	Within Groups	681.844	610	1.118		
	Total	702.803	614			

1 To further examine the first hypothesis H1 Trust in information, such as comments and  
 2 reviews posted on social media depends on the social network which this content is posted  
 3 on, a second Anova analysis was applied. The factor variable this time was the trust that users  
 4 have on information created by consumers in social media. By examining Table 2 the value  
 5 of F in the Between Groups suggests that this reaches significance, therefore there is a  
 6 significant result. We can see that the significance (Sig.) value is  $p < 0.001$ . This appears to  
 7 apply for Facebook and Instagram. While for Twitter, the significance (Sig.) value is  $p < 0.01$ .  
 8 This is considerably lower than our significance threshold of  $P < 0.05$ . Consequently, we  
 9 should reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, so the effects would  
 10 be statistically significant. Although, the significance (Sig.) value for TikTok is  $p < 0.490$ , for  
 11 LinkedIn the significance (Sig.) value is  $p < 0.049$  and for Pinterest significance (Sig.) value is  
 12  $p < 0.18$  these values are considerably higher than our significance threshold of  $P < 0.05$ . In  
 13 this case, the null hypothesis is valid.

14 **Table 2** Trust on information created by consumers in social media

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Trust information on Facebook	Between Groups	45.640	4	11.410	14.745	.000
	Within Groups	472.041	610	.774		
	Total	517.681	614			
Trust information on Instagram	Between Groups	21.255	4	5.314	5.488	.000
	Within Groups	590.641	610	.968		
	Total	611.896	614			
Trust information on Twitter	Between Groups	22.588	4	5.647	5.003	.001
	Within Groups	688.508	610	1.129		
	Total	711.096	614			
Trust information on TikTok	Between Groups	2.676	4	.669	.856	.490
	Within Groups	476.788	610	.782		
	Total	479.463	614			
Trust information on LinkedIn	Between Groups	14.851	4	3.713	2.398	.049
	Within Groups	944.407	610	1.548		
	Total	959.259	614			
Trust information on Pinterest	Between Groups	13.532	4	3.383	2.994	.018
	Within Groups	689.272	610	1.130		
	Total	702.803	614			

15 Concluding from the above analysis of the statistical information H1 Trust in information,  
 16 such as comments and reviews posted on social media depends on the social network which  
 17 this content is posted to is valid.

18 Continuing with the second hypothesis H2 *Online Consumer Reviews can be used to influence*  
 19 *consumers and enhance their engagement in social media*, Anova analysis was applied. The factor  
 20 variable was the frequency that users read or post reviews and comments about products and  
 21 services on social media platforms. By examining Table 3, we can see that the dependent





1 variables concerning the connection frequency on different popular social media platforms.  
 2 Connection frequency on Facebook has a significance (Sig.) value  $p < 0.002$ . While for TikTok  
 3 the connection frequency has a significance (Sig.) value  $p < 0.005$ . Finally, for Pinterest the  
 4 connection frequency has a significance (Sig.) value  $p < 0.001$ . These values are considerably  
 5 lower or equal to our significance threshold of  $P < 0.05$ . Consequently, we should reject the  
 6 null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, so the effects would be statistically  
 7 significant. Accordingly, Online Consumer Reviews may enhance engagement with these  
 8 social media platforms. On the other hand, Instagram, Twitter, and LinkedIn have  
 9 significance (Sig.) values higher than our significance threshold of  $P < 0.05$ . Therefore, online  
 10 consumer reviews do not have a strong connection with engagement on these social media  
 11 platforms.

12 **Table 3** Content creation and influence of consumers

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Connection frequency on Facebook	Between Groups	10.825	4	2.706	4.343	.002
	Within Groups	380.102	610	.623		
	Total	390.927	614			
Connection frequency on Instagram	Between Groups	15.682	4	3.921	1.881	.112
	Within Groups	1271.219	610	2.084		
	Total	1286.901	614			
Connection frequency on Twitter	Between Groups	2.079	4	.520	.418	.796
	Within Groups	758.604	610	1.244		
	Total	760.683	614			
Connection frequency on TikTok	Between Groups	30.869	4	7.717	3.810	.004
	Within Groups	1235.661	610	2.026		
	Total	1266.530	614			
Connection frequency on LinkedIn	Between Groups	10.793	4	2.698	2.478	.043
	Within Groups	664.222	610	1.089		
	Total	675.015	614			
Connection frequency on Pinterest	Between Groups	17.551	4	4.388	4.821	.001
	Within Groups	555.219	610	.910		
	Total	572.771	614			

## 13 Discussion

14 Results from this study suggest that users are frequently getting engaged in social media. The  
 15 majority of the users are using their smartphone to access their social media accounts and to  
 16 interact with each other. Most of the responders hold accounts in Facebook, Instagram, and  
 17 YouTube and less in other social media platforms like TikTok, Pinterest, etc. As previous  
 18 studies suggested (Yan et. al. 2018; Filieri et. al. 2018; Zhao et.al. 2019; Dwivedi et. al. 2020),  
 19 consumers tend to trust more information created by other consumers instead of information  
 20 supplied from businesses concerning products or services. This phenomenon was also  
 21 observed in this study as well. Although it was considered appropriate to further investigate  
 22 this, therefore in-depth research was conducted between popular social media platforms.  
 23 According to the responses, consumers are cautious concerning the adoption of information  
 24 derived from businesses in social media. They tend to consider more credible information

1 posted from businesses in social media like Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, and LinkedIn,  
 2 while they have some doubts about information posted in Twitter. However, social media  
 3 users are also cautious concerning the adoption of information derived from other consumers  
 4 as well. They tend to consider more credible information posted by other consumers in social  
 5 media platforms like Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter. While on social media platforms like  
 6 TikTok, LinkedIn, and Pinterest, users have some doubts about information posted from  
 7 other consumers. Previous studies revealed that Online Consumer Reviews are likely to  
 8 provoke the intention of users for further engagement (Thakur, 2018; Shaheen et. al. 2019).  
 9 As the results of this study suggested, users are more likely to get motivated and to further  
 10 interact with Facebook, TikTok, and Pinterest. While on social media platforms like  
 11 Instagram, Twitter, and LinkedIn, users are less likely to get motivated by Online Consumer  
 12 Reviews and enhance their engagement.

### 13 **Conclusion**

14 Through the above analysis, strong evidence was provided and useful information was added  
 15 to the theory for measuring consumers' trust and adoption of Online Consumer Reviews.  
 16 While then, at the same time it was examined whether Online Consumer Reviews can further  
 17 enhance engagement in social media platforms. From a managerial standpoint, it is imperative  
 18 for marketers to create an environment that is encouraging and inspires trust in e-WOM and  
 19 to expand this feeling in OCRs as well, while at the same time decreasing negative comments.  
 20 Although companies cannot directly control consumer -to- consumer messages, they are still  
 21 in a position to influence the conversations among consumers (Whitler, 2014). The reliability  
 22 of reviews in the coming years is expected to become even more important. Social media  
 23 platforms to keep up with the upcoming developments are important to maintain increased  
 24 levels of trustworthiness in consumers' reviews by employing mechanisms to secure against  
 25 the growth of fake reviews (Valant 2015). Consumers may be less likely to spread negative  
 26 reviews if they have an opportunity to express their comments or dissatisfaction (Cheng et.  
 27 al., 2019). Moreover, the increase of incentives for posting positive reviews will most probably  
 28 increase. Hence, the attention of social media platforms should also increase to prevent this  
 29 phenomenon from expanding (Badir & Andjarwati, 2020).

### 30 **Funding Acknowledgement**

31 The publication of this article was financially supported from ELKE – University of West Attica.

### 32 **References**

- 33 Abawayj, J. H., Choo, K.-K. R., Islam, R., Xu, Z., & Atiquzzaman, M. (Eds.). (2020). International  
 34 Conference on Applications and Techniques in Cyber Intelligence ATCI 2019. Advances in  
 35 Intelligent Systems and Computing. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-25128-4  
 36 Ahmad, S. N., & Laroche, M. (2015). How Do Expressed Emotions Affect the Helpfulness of a  
 37 Product Review? Evidence from Reviews Using Latent Semantic Analysis. *International Journal of*  
 38 *Electronic Commerce*, 20(1), 76–111. doi:10.1080/10864415.2016.1061471  
 39 Badir, M., & Andjarwati, A. L. (2020). The Effect of E-WOM, Ease of Use and Trust on Purchase  
 40 Decisions (Study on Tokopedia Application Users). *Jurnal Minds: Manajemen Ide Dan Inspirasi*, 7(1),  
 41 39-52.  
 42 Ball, H. L. (2019). About Research: Conducting Online Surveys. *Journal of Human Lactation*, 0890334419  
 43 84873. doi:10.1177/0890334419848734



- 44 Bassig, M., (2021) Sharing Customer Reviews on Social Media: 4 Tools to Use + Best Practices  
45 <https://www.reviewtrackers.com/blog/reviews-on-social-media/>, Accessed on 14/2/2022
- 46 Chen, C.-C., & Chang, Y.-C. (2018). What drives purchase intention on Airbnb? Perspectives of  
47 consumer reviews, information quality, and media richness. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(5),  
48 1512–1523. doi:10.1016/j.tele.2018.03.019
- 1 Cheng, X., Fu, S., Sun, J., Bilgihan, A., & Okumus, F. (2019). An investigation on online reviews in  
2 sharing economy driven hospitality platforms: A viewpoint of trust. *Tourism Management*, 71, 366–  
3 377.
- 4 Chih, W. H., Hsu, L. C., & Ortiz, J. (2020). The antecedents and consequences of the perceived positive  
5 eWOM review credibility. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*.
- 6 Chivandi, A., & Samuel, M. O. & Muchie, M. (2020). "Social Media, Consumer Behavior, and Service  
7 Marketing," Chapters, in: Matthew G. Reyes (ed.), *Consumer Behavior and Marketing*, IntechOpen.  
8 <https://ideas.repec.org/h/ito/pchaps/175520.html>
- 9 Dai, Q., & Zhang, J. (2019). Interaction between satisfaction and incentives on online reviews. *Asia  
10 Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*.
- 11 Dhahak, Kalthoum & Huseynov, Farid. (2020). The Impact of Online Consumer Reviews (OCR) on  
12 *Online Consumers Purchase Intention*. 12. 990-1005. 10.20491/isarder.2020.889.
- 13 Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., ... Wang, Y. (2020).  
14 Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research  
15 propositions. *International Journal of Information Management*, 102168. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.  
16 102168
- 17 Eslami, S. P., Ghasemaghaci, M., & Hassanein, K. (2018). Which online reviews do consumers find  
18 most helpful? A multi-method investigation. *Decision Support Systems*, 113, 32–42.  
19 doi:10.1016/j.dss.2018.06.012
- 20 Filieri, R., McLeay, F., Tsui, B., & Lin, Z. (2018). Consumer perceptions of information helpfulness  
21 and determinants of purchase intention in online consumer reviews of services. *Information &  
22 Management*. doi:10.1016/j.im.2018.04.010
- 23 Guo, J., Wang, X., & Wu, Y. (2020). Positive emotion bias: Role of emotional content from online  
24 customer reviews in purchase decisions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 52, 101891.  
25 doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101891
- 26 Huang, Y., Li, C., Wu, J., & Lin, Z. (2018). Online customer reviews and consumer evaluation: The  
27 role of review font. *Information & Management*, 55(4), 430–440. doi:10.1016/j.im.2017.10.003
- 28 Jeong, H. J., & Koo, D. M. (2015). Combined effects of valence and attributes of e-WOM on consumer  
29 judgment for message and product: The moderating effect of brand community type. *Internet  
30 Research*, 25(1), 2–29.
- 31 Kaufmann, H. (Ed.). (2015). *Handbook of Research on Managing and Influencing Consumer Behavior*. IGI  
32 Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6547-7>
- 33 Kitirattarkarn, G. P., Araujo, T., & Neijens, P. (2019). Challenging Traditional Culture? How Personal  
34 and National Collectivism-Individualism Moderates the Effects of Content Characteristics and  
35 Social Relationships on Consumer Engagement with Brand-Related User-Generated Content.  
36 *Journal of Advertising*, 1–16. doi:10.1080/00913367.2019.1590884
- 37 Kozinets, R. V. (2019). *Netnography: The essential guide to qualitative social media research*. Sage.
- 38 Lee J., Park D.H. and Han, I. (2008). The Effect of Negative Online Consumer Reviews on Product  
39 Attitude: An Information Processing View. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*. 7 (3),  
40 341–352
- 41 Lisjak, M., Bonezzi, A., & Rucker, D. D. (2021). How Marketing Perks Influence Word of Mouth.  
42 *Journal of Marketing*, 85(5), 128–144. doi:10.1177/0022242921991798
- 43 Lutz, Bernhard & Pröllochs, Nicolas & Neumann, Dirk. (2019). The Longer the Better? The Interplay  
44 Between Review Length and Line of Argumentation in Online Consumer Reviews.
- 45 McCay-Peet, L., & Quan-Haase, A. (2017). What is social media and what questions can social media  
46 research help us answer. *The SAGE handbook of social media research methods*, 13-26.
- 47 Mohammad, J., Quoquab, F., Thurasamy, R., & Alolayyan, M. N. (2020). The effect of user-generated

- 578 *Online consumer reviews: information adoption and engagement between social media users*  
48 content quality on brand engagement: The mediating role of functional and emotional values.  
49 *Journal of Electronic Commerce Research*, 21(1), 39-55.
- 1 Moon, S., Kim, M.-Y., & Iacobucci, D. (2020). Content analysis of fake consumer reviews by survey-  
2 based text categorization. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2020.  
3 08.001
- 4 Motyka, S., Grewal, D., Aguirre, E., Mahr, D., De Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (2018). The emotional  
5 review–reward effect: how do reviews increase impulsivity?. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*,  
6 46(6), 1032-1051.
- 7 Ngarmwongnoi, C., Oliveira, J. S., AbedRabbo, M., & Mousavi, S. (2020). The implications of eWOM  
8 adoption on the customer journey. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*.
- 9 Popkova, E. G., & Ostrovskaya, V. N. (2019). *Perspectives on the use of New Information and Communication*  
10 *Technology (Ict) in the modern economy*. Springer International Publishing. (pp. 282-288). ISBN: 978-3-  
11 319-90834-2
- 12 Salehan, M., & Kim, D. J. (2016). Predicting the performance of online consumer reviews: A sentiment  
13 mining approach to big data analytics. *Decision Support Systems*, 81, 30–40. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2015.10.  
14 006
- 15 Shaheen, M., Zeba, F., Chatterjee, N., & Krishnankutty, R. (2019). Engaging customers through  
16 credible and useful reviews: the role of online trust. *Young Consumers*, 21(2), 137–153. doi:10.1108/  
17 yc-01-2019-0943
- 18 Shawky, S., Kubacki, K., Dietrich, T., & Weaven, S. (2019). Using social media to create engagement:  
19 a social marketing review. *Journal of Social Marketing*. doi:10.1108/jsocm-05-2018-0046
- 20 Srivastava, V., & Kalro, A. D. (2019). Enhancing the Helpfulness of Online Consumer Reviews: The  
21 Role of Latent (Content) Factors. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 48, 33–50. doi:10.1016/j.intmar.  
22 2018.12.003
- 23 Sun, Q., Niu, J., Yao, Z., & Yan, H. (2019). Exploring eWOM in online customer reviews: Sentiment  
24 analysis at a fine-grained level. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 81, 68–78.  
25 doi:10.1016/j.engappai.2019.02.004
- 26 Thakur, R. (2018). Customer engagement and online reviews. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer*  
27 *Services*, 41, 48–59. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.11.002
- 28 Valant, J., 2015, *Online consumer reviews: The case of misleading or fake reviews*, European  
29 Parliamentary Research Service
- 30 Weisstein, F. L., Song, L., Andersen, P., & Zhu, Y. (2017). Examining impacts of negative reviews and  
31 purchase goals on consumer purchase decision. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 39,  
32 201–207. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.08.015
- 33 Weitzl, W., Hutzingger, C., & Einwiller, S. (2018). An empirical study on how webcare mitigates  
34 complainants' failure attributions and negative word-of-mouth. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 89,  
35 316–327. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2018.07.012
- 36 Wern, L. J., Sarafudin, N. K. N., Norhisham, N. S., & Zulkifli, N. E. F. (2016). *The effectiveness of Electronic*  
37 *Word-of-Mouth (eWOM) on consumer purchase intention among Generation-Y* (Doctoral dissertation, Faculty  
38 of Entrepreneurship and Business).
- 39 Yan, Q., Wu, S., Zhou, Y., & Zhang, L. (2018). How differences in eWOM platforms impact  
40 consumers' perceptions and decision-making. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic*  
41 *Commerce*, 28(4), 315-333.
- 42 Yang, J., & Yecies, B. (2019). The paradox of opinion leadership and recommendation culture in  
43 Chinese online movie. *Big Data Recommender Systems: Application Paradigms*, 2, 293.
- 44 Zhao, J. D., Huang, J. S., & Su, S. (2019). The effects of trust on consumers' continuous purchase  
45 intentions in C2C social commerce: A trust transfer perspective. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer*  
46 *Services*, 50, 42-49.

