

# Current Status and Prospects of Word-of-Mouth Research: A Systematic Analysis of Characteristics, Antecedents and Consequences

Yawen Chen\*

University of Bristol Business School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

\*Corresponding author: xd19161@bristol.ac.uk

**Abstract.** Although numerous studies explore word of mouth (WOM), the lack of or the paucity of review papers concerning the characteristics, antecedents, and consequences of WOM gives rise to a fragmented comprehension of word-of-mouth communication. Therefore, this review not only aims to consolidate where the previous and current studies stand on the characteristics, antecedents, and consequences of WOM, but it also aims to highlight where WOM is heading. Based on the concept-driven review methodology, this paper conducts a concise review and synthesis of WOM's characteristics, antecedents, and consequences. It also discusses several potential aspects worthy of further investigation, which provides related marketing researchers and practitioners highly interested in WOM with some directions for further explorations in WOM.

**Keywords:** Word of Mouth (WOM); Review; Characteristics; Antecedents; Consequences.

## 1. Introduction

Word-of-mouth communication has been commonly seen as the most influential communication affecting customers or clients, which could go back to Lazarsfeld and Katz's research and investigation. Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955) observe that WOM is approximately twice as influential as broadcasting advertising in brand switching, 4 times more effective than individual selling, and 7 times more influential than magazine and newspaper advertising [1]. A subsequent study, Day (1971), finds that word-of-mouth communication is nearly 9 times as influential as advertising in altering consumer attitudes from negative or neutral to positive [2]. Additionally, Kundu and Rajan (2016) point out that WOM is becoming increasingly necessary for marketing, which both marketing researchers and practitioners cannot be ignored [3]. It tends to be clear that more than 65 years ago, WOM is frequently seen as an effective means to shape consumer attitudes and behavior. Although numerous studies have explored word-of-mouth communication, almost no attempt has been made to summarize, synthesize, and consolidate the existing research on the characteristics, antecedents, and consequences of WOM. The lack of or the paucity of review papers concerning WOM's characteristics, antecedents, and consequences is likely to give rise to a fragmented comprehension of word-of-mouth communication. Therefore, not only does it aims to conduct a concise review and synthesis of the characteristics, antecedents, and consequences of WOM to enable marketing beginners or someone new to the stream of WOM research to easily and quickly understand word-of-mouth communication (i.e., where the previous and current studies stand on the characteristics, antecedents, and consequences of WOM), but this paper also aims to highlight potential research opportunities and directions for future WOM research (i.e., where WOM is heading). The following sections of this review paper will firstly explain the methodology part. It will then provide a comprehensive and concise review of WOM and discuss related potential further research opportunities and future research directions.

## 2. Methodology

This paper will adopt a concept-driven methodology proposed by Webster and Watson. Initially, the existing review papers were searched to select both the keywords (i.e., "word-of-mouth communication", "referral marketing", "characteristics", "antecedents", "consequences") and

databases of the basic search (i.e., Business Source Complete, Science Direct, Sage Research Methods, JSTOR archive, JISC Springer, Emerald Management, WARC, and EBSCO). Subsequently, the backward search (scanning the reference list of those review papers) was used to seek references for the selected 19 articles related to search terms. After eliminating those not closely associated with the content subject or not relevant enough to be included, 14 of the 19 collected scholarly studies are included in this review paper. To expand the academic search beyond the 14 literary works, a further set of 59 journal articles were collected. After carefully and thoroughly reading the abstract of each scholarly work and skimming or scanning both the introduction and conclusion of each literary work, 33 academic papers are eliminated, and 26 academic journal articles are included in this review paper. Ultimately, 40 academic journal articles and scholarly works covering 64 years from 1955 to 2019 concerning WOM's characteristics, antecedents, and consequences are summarized, consolidated, and synthesized in this paper.

### **3. Word-of-mouth communication**

#### **3.1 Concepts definition**

It is clear from three models concerning the development of WOM proposed by Kozinets et al. that WOM theory has evolved [4]. The organic inter-consumer influence model conceptualizes word-of-mouth communication as the unidirectional transmission of a message from one consumer to another without the intervention of marketers [4]. Since later theories of WOM emphasize the role of credible, respected, and influential consumers in the whole process of word-of-mouth communication the linear marketer influence model stresses the importance of marketers' attempts to target, intervene, and influence those consumers through word-of-mouth communication [4]. The network coproduction model, coinciding with recent studies on WOM, identifies word-of-mouth communication as many-to-many discussion or multidirectional communication among members of the customer network [4]. Most notably, Kozinets et al. (2010) emphasize the current coexistence of all three models, each pertinent to different contexts [4].

#### **3.2 The characteristics of WOM**

Based on numerous studies on the attributes of WOM, WOM appears to be characterized by volume, valence, focus, timing, solicitation, diffusion mode, the affluence of message content, and the intensity of advocacy [5-9].

Volume is defined as "the total amount of WOM", directly showing the frequency with which people participate in word-of-mouth communication or spread WOM, and indirectly conveying a message about how popular the brand/product/service has been in the marketplace, which is seen as one of the significant characteristics of WOM [7].

Valence is identified as the nature of WOM's contents, which could probably be neutral, negative, positive, or mixed [8]. Among of which, it is observed that negative and positive WOM are the most prevailing in real life [8].

In Buttle's eyes, the focus is not restricted to customers, but reaches to employees, suppliers, influencers, and the referral market [5].

The timing falls into two categories, pre-purchase, and post-purchase. Input WOM occurs when WOM is uttered before a purchase operating as a source of pre-buying information, while output WOM occurs when WOM is uttered after a purchase [5].

Solicitation appears to divide word-of-mouth communication into two groups, solicited WOM and unsolicited WOM. Solicited WOM refers to WOM that is spread with solicitation or is solicited from known references for particular aims [5].

Diffusion mode is classified as traditional (offline) or electronic (online) communication. Traditional (offline) word-of-mouth communication spreads WOM face to face or over the phone, whereas electronic (online) word-of-mouth communication spreads WOM via various online platforms, such as, Facebook, Instagram, emails, and blogs [6].

The richness of message content is conceptualized as the extent to which the contents of WOM are judged to be deep, informative, impressive, and evocative, which is regarded as the cognitive attractiveness of the content of WOM [8-9]. Both the use of evocative language and the extent of storytelling are seen as the measure of WOM contents' richness [8].

The strength of advocacy is identified as the emotional or affective appeal of WOM messages, referring to in what way the manner (i.e., emotional, assertive, and passionate) in which WOM messages are narrated [8-9]. The strength of advocacy focuses more on body language, the manner and intention of WOM than the content of WOM messages [8].

### 3.3 The antecedents of WOM

Customer satisfaction, commitment, perceived quality, value, loyalty, and trust have been extensively discussed and identified as potential antecedents of word-of-mouth communication [10-13].

Customer satisfaction seems to be either of two kinds, cognitively based satisfaction, and emotionally based satisfaction [14]. Regarding cognitively based satisfaction, expectation-disconfirmation theory, as the most predominant cognitive approach in conceptualizing customer satisfaction, emphasizes satisfaction as a function of expectancy disconfirmation [14]. Another cognitive view of satisfaction identifies customer satisfaction as cumulative satisfaction concerned with an evaluation of overall consumption experiences with identical brand/product/service as time goes on [15]. In addition to cognitive views, an affective idea of emotional components playing essential roles in customer satisfaction is becoming increasingly popular, which is reflected in Oliver's (2010) interpretation of customer satisfaction as the level of joy or gratification customers derive from their consumption experiences [16]. There are abundant studies supporting both the positive association between customer satisfaction and positive WOM (i.e., the more (less) satisfied customers are, the more (less) positive word-of-mouth communication they are likely to engage in) and the negative correlation between customer satisfaction and negative WOM (i.e., the more (less) satisfied customers are, the less (more) negative word-of-mouth communication they are likely to engage in) [10-13]. However, since Parthasarathy and Forlani (2010) observe that some satisfied customers have a propensity to participate in harmful word-of-mouth activities [17], there is still some debate over to what extent and in what way customer satisfaction mediates the valence of WOM.

Customer commitment is usually seen as a lasting desire to maintain a harmonious relationship with a specific brand/product/service [18], which can be grouped into two categories: unidimensional construct [18] and multidimensional construct [19]. The unidimensional construct identifies commitment as an overall commitment, that is, a comprehensive evaluation of a customer's engagement with the brand or constant obligation to purchase a product or service [10]. The overall commitment is positively correlated with word-of-mouth communication [10]. It is also worth noting that based on a meta-analysis review conducted by de Matos and Rossi (2008), overall commitment is the most significant predictor of WOM among six antecedents of WOM (i.e., customer satisfaction, customer commitment, perceived quality, perceived value, loyalty, and trust) [10]. Regarding multidimensional construct, both an affective view of customer commitment and a behavioral view of customer commitment dominate the literature, giving rise to two categories of customer commitment: affective commitment and high sacrifice commitment, respectively [19]. Affective commitment is more concerned with customers' emotional or affective attachment to a product or service provider.

In contrast, high sacrifice commitment is more concerned with switching costs, the perceived costs of alternatives, and the scarcity of alternatives [19]. According to Harrison-Walker (2001), in the context of two service industries (i.e., veterinarian and hair salon), while word-of-mouth communication shows a positive correlation with affective commitment, word-of-mouth communication shows no significant relationship with high sacrifice commitment [12]. However, Fullerton (2005) observes that in the context of banking, telecommunications, and grocery retail service industries, high sacrifice commitment is negatively associated with WOM [20]. In other

contexts, there likewise appears to be an association between high sacrifice commitment and word-of-mouth communication. For instance, Ranaweera and Menon (2013) find that in the context of the telecom service industry, although high sacrifice commitment is not associated with positive WOM [21], which is consistent with Harrison-Walker's (2001) findings, high sacrifice commitment is positively correlated with negative WOM [21], which contradicts Harrison-Walker's (2001) results. Additionally, Anastasiei and Dospinescu (2019) investigate that in the context of an online retail industry (i.e., Facebook), both affect commitment and high sacrifice commitment are positively associated with electronic WOM volume [22]. Therefore, the association between word-of-mouth communication and high sacrifice commitment seems to vary enormously across different industries.

The perceived quality is usually seen as one of the major antecedents of customer satisfaction in the recent literature on WOM [23-25]. However, earlier empirical studies identify perceived quality as an essential predictor of word-of-mouth communication [12,26]. The perceived quality is measured in the abundant literature as the perceived product or service quality. The association between the perceived product quality and WOM valence shows no difference from the association between the perceived service quality and WOM valence, as both the perceived product and service quality tend to be positively correlated with positive WOM and negatively associated with negative WOM [10,12]. On the other hand, it is observed that the correlation between the perceived product quality and WOM volume differs from the association between the perceived service quality and WOM volume. Specifically, the perceived product quality shows an indirectly positive association with WOM volume, especially in the organic food restaurant and telecommunication industry [23-24]. Similarly, earlier studies on the relationship between service quality and WOM emphasize the positive association between the perceived service quality and WOM volume (i.e., the lower (higher) the perceived service quality, the lower (higher) the WOM volume) [26-27]. However, Harrison-Walker's (2001) research on WOM shows contradictory findings with the studies above demonstrating a negative relationship between the perceived service quality and WOM volume, particularly in the context of the veterinary industry (i.e., the lower (higher) the perceived service quality, the more (less) the WOM volume) [12]. A later study, namely, Wang et al. (2017), finds that in the context of tourism and the online retailing industry, the perceived service quality is indirectly positively related to WOM volume [25], which is not in line with Harrison-Walker's (2001) results. Accordingly, further observation concerning whether the correlation between the perceived service quality and WOM volume is positive or negative in different contexts is needed before a conclusion can be drawn.

The perceived value refers to customers' overall evaluation of a trade-off between what is obtained (i.e., benefits) and what is paid (i.e., costs) [27]. Even though the perceived value is regarded as the major predictor of customer satisfaction [23], it is regarded as a significant antecedent of WOM in abundant literature [10,28-29]. Given that most of the results from those studies are investigated and analyzed in the context of the service industry, it can be concluded that in the context of the service industry, the perceived value appears to be positively related to WOM. Also noteworthy is that numerous studies, such as McKee et al. (2006) and Mukerjee (2018), observe that when the perceived value is high, clients are more likely to participate in positive word-of-mouth communication than negative word-of-mouth communication [28-29]. A subsequent study by Samadara and Fanggidae (2020) found that the correlation between the perceived value and positive electronic WOM appears to be likewise positive [30].

Loyalty is widely perceived to be customers' intention to consistently repurchase, engage in word-of-mouth communication, or perform other behaviors that contribute to maintaining a strong relationship with the product or brand by marketing literature [26]. Although current literature concentrates more on the influences of word-of-mouth on loyalty, earlier studies on WOM emphasize the contributions of loyalty to word-of-mouth communication, measuring loyalty as a significant predictor of WOM [10,31]. It is observed from those earlier studies that consumers who are more loyal to a brand/product/service tend to spread more positive WOM than negative one or customers who are less loyal to a brand/product/service tend to participate in more negative word-of-mouth

communication than positive one [10,32]. It is also worth noting that in light of de Matos and Rossi (2008)'s meta-analysis review, loyalty shows a weaker correlation with positive WOM than does customer satisfaction and customer (dis)satisfaction shows a weaker association with negative WOM than does (dis)loyalty [10]. Furthermore, later studies on the relationship between loyalty and WOM, such as Eelen et al. (2017), demonstrate that loyalty is less closely associated with electronic WOM, but much more strongly related to traditional or offline WOM [32].

Trust is conceptualized as a willingness to rely on or have faith in a business partner [18], which is seen as one of the strong antecedents of WOM [10-11,33]. It is widely observed that customer satisfaction is positively associated with trust (i.e., the more (less) customers are satisfied with a brand/product/service, the higher (lower) their trust in it) [11,33]. Resulting from the positive correlation between satisfaction and WOM, and satisfaction and trust, there is every likelihood that belief is positively associated with word-of-mouth communication. Such a positive relation has been tested in numerous studies [10-11,33]. Additionally, those studies demonstrate that customers participating in positive word-of-mouth communication usually have higher degree of trust. In contrast, customers participating in negative word-of-mouth communication usually have lower levels of trust [10-11,33]. It is noteworthy that a later study, namely by Oraedu et al. (2020), observed that trust is positively associated with both traditional WOM and electronic WOM [34].

### 3.4 The consequences of WOM

There is abundant literature on WOM, exploring to what extent and how word-of-mouth communication influences WOM senders and WOM receivers [3,35-36].

From the perspective of WOM senders: In light of 5 functions of word-of-mouth communication proposed by Berger (2014), WOM contributes to shaping the impression WOM transmitters make on others, shaping the way WOM transmitters manage their emotions, shaping the way WOM transmitters acquire information, shaping the way WOM transmitters connect with others, and shaping the way WOM transmitters persuade others to a significant extent [35]. Specifically, regarding impression management, word-of-mouth communication enables WOM transmitters to achieve the desired impression, communicate their knowledge, expertise, or even certain identities, and avoid an awkward pause in talk or conversation [35]. Concerning emotion regulation, word-of-mouth communication enables WOM senders to access emotional consolation, vent their sentiments, better understand what they feel, eliminate their psychological discomfort or cognitive dissonance, take revenge, and relive their pleasure and other positive emotional experiences to a great extent [35]. In terms of social bonding, word-of-mouth communication is largely conducive to social ties, increasing shared views, shortening the interpersonal distance, and connecting WOM transmitters with others. Regarding information acquisition, word-of-mouth communication is seen as a means of gaining relevant information and getting constructive advice by some WOM senders [35]. In addition to self-image management, emotion regulation, social connection, and information collection, word-of-mouth communication is an effective means of persuading others [35].

From the perspective of WOM receivers, word-of-mouth communication tends to influence WOM recipients attitudinally, cognitively, and conatively [3,36]. More specifically, there is every likelihood that word-of-mouth communication affects WOM recipients' attitudes towards specific products, services, or brands [37]. Word-of-mouth communication likewise influences WOM receivers' perceptions about the product/service/brand [9], WOM receivers' product/service/brand judgments or awareness [38], and WOM receivers' service purchase intentions [39]. It is worth mentioning that WOM valence is strongly associated with the abovementioned attitudinal and cognitive consequences. For instance, people receiving positive WOM appear to have positive product/service/brand judgments [38], favorable attitudes toward product/service/brand [37], and higher service purchase intentions [39]. In contrast, people receiving negative WOM appear to have negative product/service/brand judgments [38], unfavorable attitudes toward product/service/brand [37], and lower service purchase intentions [39]. In addition to attitudinal and cognitive impacts, WOM appears

to have imperceptible effects on WOM recipients' behavior [36]. For instance, word-of-mouth contributes to brand switching to a significant extent [1,40].

#### 4. Research Prospects

In terms of the characteristics of WOM, seven aspects worthy of further investigation are whether or not marketing researchers and practitioners can measure the volume of oral WOM accurately, and if it is, in what way they precisely measure the volume of oral WOM; to what extent and in what way the role of neutral and mixed WOM differ from positive and negative one; to what extent and in what way WOM between consumers differ from WOM among employees, suppliers, and influencers; to what extent input WOM influences output WOM and under what conditions input WOM is consistent with output WOM; whether solicited WOM is more prevalent than unsolicited WOM in nowadays; whether electronic WOM can replace traditional WOM; and whether the received WOM with rich message content and strong appeal contribute to more word-of-mouth conversation. Future investigations about the antecedents of WOM could probably be extended to the extent to and how customer satisfaction mediates the valence of WOM; the extent to which the association between high sacrifice commitment and WOM varies by industry; the extent to which the correlation between the perceived service quality and WOM volume varies by context; the correlation between the perceived value and word-of-mouth communication in the context of product industry; the extent to which the antecedents of positive word-of-mouth communication differ from the antecedents of negative word-of-mouth communication; and the extent to which the predictors of oral WOM differ from the predictors of written WOM. Regarding the consequences of WOM, the contribution of neutral and mixed WOM to changing consumer attitudes and behavior, the synergy effect between positive WOM and negative WOM on the receivers of WOM, the degree to which the power of WOM vary by valence, and the extent to which written WOM differs from oral WOM all could be further investigated.

#### 5. Conclusion

This review paper synthesizes, consolidates, and summarizes the existing research on WOM's characteristics, antecedents, and consequences. It is worth noting that only by comprehending the characteristics, the antecedents, and the influences of WOM on both the senders and receivers of WOM can marketing practitioners make better use of the power of WOM in altering consumer attitudes and behavior, and in turn, take advantage of word-of-mouth communication as an influential marketing tool. In addition to providing a concise review of word-of-mouth communication, this paper also highlights potential research opportunities for future WOM research, providing academic researchers and marketing practitioners who are highly interested in WOM with some guidance and directions for such further explorations.

#### References

- [1] Katz, Elihu, and Paul F Lazarsfeld. *Personal Influence*. The Free Press, 1955.
- [2] Day, George S. Attitude change, media and word of mouth. *Journal of advertising research*, 1971,11(6): 31-40.
- [3] Kundu, Supratim, and C.R. Sundara Rajan. *Word Of Mouth: A Literature Review*. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2016.
- [4] Kozinets, Robert V., et al. Networked narratives: Understanding word-of-mouth marketing in online communities. *Journal of marketing*, 2010, 74(2): 71-89.
- [5] Buttle, Francis A. Word of mouth: understanding and managing referral marketing. *Journal of strategic marketing*, 1998,6(3): 241-254.

- [6] Cheung, Christy MK, and Matthew KO Lee. What drives consumers to spread electronic word of mouth in online consumer-opinion platforms. *Decision support systems*,2012, 53(1): 218-225.
- [7] Mahajan, Vijay, Eitan Muller, and Subhash Sharma. An empirical comparison of awareness forecasting models of new product introduction. *Marketing Science*,1984, 3(3): 179-197.
- [8] Mazzarol, Tim, Jillian C. Sweeney, and Geoffrey N. Soutar. Conceptualizing word-of-mouth activity, triggers and conditions: an exploratory study. *European Journal of Marketing*,2007,4(1): 1475-1494.
- [9] Sweeney, Jillian C., Geoffrey N. Soutar, and Tim Mazzarol. Word of mouth: measuring the power of individual messages. *European Journal of Marketing*, 2012,4(6): 237-257.
- [10] de Matos, Celso Augusto, and Carlos Alberto Vargas Rossi. Word-of-mouth communications in marketing: a meta-analytic review of the antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the Academy of marketing science*, 2008, 36(4): 578-596.
- [11] Ranaweera, Chatura, and Jaideep Prabhu. On the relative importance of customer satisfaction and trust as determinants of customer retention and positive word of mouth. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for marketing*,2003, 12(1): 82-90.
- [12] Harrison-Walker, L. Jean. The measurement of word-of-mouth communication and an investigation of service quality and customer commitment as potential antecedents. *Journal of service research*, 2001, 4(1): 60-75.
- [13] Ahmadinejad, Bahareh. The impact of customer satisfaction on word of mouth marketing (Case study: Bamilo online store). *SCIREA Journal of Management*, 2019, 3(2): 40-52.
- [14] Oliver, Richard L. Cognitive, affective, and attribute bases of the satisfaction response. *Journal of consumer research*,1993, 20(3): 418-430.
- [15] Anderson, Eugene W., Claes Fornell, and Donald R. Lehmann. Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of marketing*,1994, 58(3): 53-66.
- [16] Oliver, Richard L. Customer satisfaction. *Wiley international encyclopedia of marketing*,2010.
- [17] Parthasarathy, Madhavan, and David Forlani. Do satisfied customers bad-mouth innovative products?. *Psychology & Marketing*, 2010, 27(12): 1134-1153.
- [18] Morgan, Robert M., and Shelby D. Hunt. The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of marketing*,1994, 58(3): 20-38.
- [19] Gruen, Thomas W., John O. Summers, and Frank Acito. Relationship marketing activities, commitment, and membership behaviors in professional associations. *Journal of marketing*, 2000,64(3): 34-49.
- [20] Fullerton, Gordon. How commitment both enables and undermines marketing relationships. *European journal of marketing*, 2005, 39(11/12): 1372-1388.
- [21] Ranaweera, Chatura, and Kalyani Menon. For better or for worse? Adverse effects of relationship age and continuance commitment on positive and negative word of mouth. *European Journal of Marketing*, 2013, 47(10): 1598-1621.
- [22] Anastasiei, Bogdan, and Nicoleta Dospinescu. Electronic word-of-mouth for online retailers: Predictors of volume and valence. *Sustainability*, 2019, 11(3): 814.
- [23] Konuk, Faruk Anıl. The influence of perceived food quality, price fairness, perceived value and satisfaction on customers' revisit and word-of-mouth intentions towards organic food restaurants. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 2019, 50: 103-110.
- [24] Rachman, Afif.S. The Effect of Product Quality, Service Quality, Customer Value on Customer Satisfaction and Word Of Mouth. *Journal of Research in Management*,2018, 1(3): 1-9.
- [25] Wang, Tz-Li, Phuong Thi Kim Tran, and Vinh Trung Tran. Destination perceived quality, tourist satisfaction and word-of-mouth. *Tourism Review*, 2017, 72(4): 392-410.
- [26] Bloemer, Josee, K. O. De Ruyter, and Martin Wetzels. Linking perceived service quality and service loyalty: a multi-dimensional perspective. *European journal of marketing*, 1999, 33(11/12): 1082-1106.
- [27] Boulding, William, et al. A dynamic process model of service quality: from expectations to behavioral intentions. *Journal of marketing research*,1993, 30(1): 7-27.
- [28] McKee, Daryl, Christina S. Simmers, and Jane Licata. Customer self-efficacy and response to service. *Journal of service research*, 2006, 8(3): 207-220.

- [29] Mukerjee, Kaushik. The impact of brand experience, service quality and perceived value on word of mouth of retail bank customers: Investigating the mediating effect of loyalty. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 2018, 23(1): 12-24.
- [30] Samadara, P. D., and J. P. Fanggidae. The Role of Perceived Value and Gratitude on Positive Electronic Word of Mouth Intention in the Context of Free Online Content. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 2020, 11(10): 391-405.
- [31] Dick, Alan S., and Kunal Basu. Customer loyalty: toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 1994, 22(2): 99-113.
- [32] Eelen, Jiska, Peren Özturan, and Peeter WJ Verlegh. The differential impact of brand loyalty on traditional and online word of mouth: The moderating roles of self-brand connection and the desire to help the brand. *International journal of research in marketing*, 2017 34(4): 872-891.
- [33] Barreda, Albert A., Anil Bilgihan, and Yoshimasa Kageyama. The role of trust in creating positive word of mouth and behavioral intentions: The case of online social networks. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 2015, 14(1): 16-36.
- [34] Oraedu, Chukwunonso, et al. Understanding electronic and face-to-face word-of-mouth influencers: an emerging market perspective. *Management Research Review*, 2020.
- [35] Berger, Jonah. Word of mouth and interpersonal communication: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of consumer psychology*, 2014, 24(4): 586-607.
- [36] Lang, Bodo, and Kenneth Hyde. Word of mouth: What we know and what we have yet to learn. *The Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 2013, 26.
- [37] Herr, Paul M., Frank R. Kardes, and John Kim. Effects of word-of-mouth and product-attribute information on persuasion: An accessibility-diagnostics perspective. *Journal of consumer research*, 1991, 17(4): 454-462.
- [38] Ferguson, Rick. Word of mouth and viral marketing: taking the temperature of the hottest trends in marketing. *Journal of consumer marketing*, 2008, 25(3): 179-182.
- [39] Voyer, Peter A., and Chatura Ranaweera. The impact of word of mouth on service purchase decisions: Examining risk and the interaction of tie strength and involvement. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 2015, 25(5): 636-656.
- [40] Wangenheim, Florian V. and Bayón, Tomás. The chain from customer satisfaction via word-of-mouth referrals to new customer acquisition. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 2007, 35(2): 233-249.