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Abstract

Due to the increased popularity of social networking sites, a new platform called social commerce has emerged. Social commerce facilitates online interactions and user contributions to assist them in conducting commercial transactions. In this study, we rely on risk-return strategy in consumers’ decision making to study drivers and deterrents of social commerce use. We study both purchasing and participating behavior; according, we categorized risk and benefit related to each behavior. We also study trust from two insights: trust toward members and trust toward website. Using survey data from 196 users of etsy.com, we found that trust and benefit are important motivators of social commerce use, and perceived risk is a deterrent factor. Trust toward members reduces perceived risks related to both participating and purchasing behaviors. However, trust toward website does not have a significant effect on reducing risk perceptions. Implications for research and practice are discussed.
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Introduction

The growing popularity of social networking sites has resulted in transformation of e-commerce from a product-oriented environment to a social and collaborating-centered platform (Wigand et al. 2008). This new platform, called “social commerce”, uses social media to facilitate social interaction and members’ contributions. Social commerce users can share their shopping experiences with other members and seek their opinions and recommendations (e.g. Etsy, Pinterest, Facebook fan pages, etc.). Recently, there is a growth in the social commerce revenues due to the increasing use of social networking sites. The global revenue from social commerce is expected to increase to $80 billion by 2020 (HnyB Insights 2012). Given this growth, current social commerce studies focused mainly on understanding drivers of social commerce use (e.g. Chen and Shen 2015; Liang et al. 2011; Ng 2013). Nonetheless, there are negative facets which can demotivate the use of social commerce, and the role of these negative factors has been largely neglected in the current literature. This study fills this gap by examining the role of both drivers and deterrents of the social commerce acceptance. We study perceived benefit and trust (Farivar and Yuan 2014; Kim et al. 2008) as drivers of social commerce; at the same time, we study users’ perceived risk as the negative factor which may deter the social commerce use. Perceived risk is defined as the customer’s belief regarding potential negative outcomes of an online transaction or activity (Kim et al. 2008). Perceived risk has been studied as an important barrier of approach-oriented behaviors (Tversky and Kahneman 1992). In the social commerce, users can have two different behaviors: purchasing products/services or participating in the websites’ social activities. We study both behaviors in our research model. Accordingly, we consider risks and benefits related to each behavior. We study trust from two insights: trust toward members and trust toward website. We further examine the relationship between two types of risks and trusts in the social commerce context.
The rest of the paper is organized as following: first the theoretical background of our study is provided. Then, the research framework and hypotheses are presented. Next, our methodology and results are reported. Finally, we conclude by discussing the contributions and limitations.

**Theoretical Background**

In this study, we focus on both drivers and deterrents of social commerce acceptance. In our theoretical framework, we consider perceived risk as the negative factor which may deter the social commerce use, and perceived benefit and trust as motivators. This is consistent with risk-return strategy in consumers’ making decisions (Bilkey 1953, 1955; Peter and Tarpey 1975). According to the expectancy theory, consumers behave in a way that maximize their positive outcomes and minimize negative consequences (Vroom 1964). A trust-based consumer decision making model has been developed by Kim et al. (2008) to investigate the impact of trust, risk, and benefit in the setting of electronic commerce. We extend this theory to the social commerce context, and propose that users’ decision to purchase or participate in a social commerce website is based on trust, perceived risks and benefits from both social and commerce perspectives.

**Research Model and Hypotheses Development**

Figure 1 shows our proposed research framework as the extension of Kim et al. (2008)’s model in the setting of social commerce.

![Figure1. Research Model](image)

**Trust**

Trust in general refers to a reliance on someone or something to act in a specific manner, when there is some uncertainty regarding these actions (Gefen et al. 2003). Trust has been considered as an important factor in building and maintaining a successful relationship (Morgan and Hunt 1994). The effect of trust in predicting the use of online services such as online communities (e.g. Lin 2006; Posey et al. 2010) and e-commerce (Fang et al. 2014; Kim et al. 2008) has been intensively studied in IS literature. We will consider the effect of trust in the social commerce context from two perspectives: trust toward members and trust toward website (Turel and Gefen 2013). In this study, trust toward website is defined as an individual’s perception of the social commerce website as a reliable place to conduct purchasing and participating behaviors. The relationship between trust toward a website/vendor and customers’ behaviors/intentions to use the website has been strongly established in the literature (Shen 2012; Wu and Chang 2006). Hence, we contend that:

- **H1a**: Trust toward social commerce website would increase users’ intentions to purchase from the website.
- **H1b**: Trust toward social commerce website would increase users’ intentions to participate in the website’s activities.
Trust toward members refers to one’s positive feelings toward other members’ actions, words, and behaviors and the willingness to rely on them. According to the trust transfer theory (Stewart 2006; Turel et al. 2008) it is believed that trust toward website/server can be developed through interpersonal trust. The reason is that people tend to rely more on signals and are more likely to make inferences from one concept to another (Turel and Gefen 2013). Hence, the existence of trust among social commerce members would affect their perceptions of principles and regulatory of the website and make them believe that the website’s management is effective (Chen et al. 2014; Lu et al. 2010). Therefore, we hypothesize that:

H2: trust toward members would increase trust toward the website.

Moreover, Previous studies have found the positive effect of trust toward members on online participation and shopping (Ridings et al. 2002; Shen et al. 2014; Wu and Chang 2006). If an individual has a feeling of trust toward other members of social commerce community, s/he will be more intended to use the website for purchasing and participating. Hence:

H3a: Trust toward members would increase users’ intentions to purchase from social commerce website.
H3b: Trust toward members would increase users’ intentions to participate in the social commerce website’s activities.

**Perceived Benefit**

Perceived benefit reflects “a consumer’s belief about the extent he or she will be better-off from the online transaction with a certain website” (Kim et al. 2008). In the social commerce setting, users’ perceived benefit include two categories: benefits related to commercial activities, and benefits related to their participating activities. Previous studies have found that individuals engage in social activities in order to receive companionship, approval, and respect from others (Eisenberger et al. 1990; Hemetsberger 2002). We define perceived commerce benefit as benefits social commerce users expect to receive by purchasing a product/service. Similarly, we consider the users’ believes regarding positive outcomes they would get from participation in a social commerce website as perceived participation benefit.

Online users have reported that they perceive to receive more benefits from online shopping comparing to the traditional way of shopping. These benefits include: increased convenience, cost savings, time savings, and increased variety of the products (Kim et al. 2008). Perceived benefit has been studied as a motivator for online purchasing (Kim et al. 2008); hence,

H4a: perceived commerce benefit would increase users’ intentions to purchase from social commerce website.

As previous studies show, users would participate in online communities in order to get companionship, social support, and social approval (Hemetsberger 2002). Thus, in the social commerce setting, these outcomes would be motivators for users to share their experience with others (write comments/reviews); therefore,

H4b: perceived participation benefit would increase users’ intentions to participate in the social commerce activities.

**Perceived Risk**

Perceived risk is defined as users’ uncertainty about negative outcomes of using a product or a service (Kim et al. 2008). Risk has been considered as multifaceted construct which can apply to users’ behaviors in different situations. For instance, there can be financial, performance, physical, psychological, social, time, and opportunity cost risk (Jacoby and Kaplan 1972) and each of these facets relates to negative consequences in different domains. Perceived risk has been studied as an important negative factor which deters physical and online transactions (Featherman and Pavlou 2003; Kim et al. 2008; Pavlou 2003). We define perceived commerce risk as negative outcomes of purchasing from social commerce website. The negative effect of commerce risk on purchasing intentions has been well stablished in previous literature; hence, we contend:

H5a: perceived commerce risk will reduce social commerce users’ intention to purchase from the website.

We also consider negative consequences of participating in the social commerce website as participation risk. Privacy risk and social risk has been studied as two main facets of risks in online community context (Featherman and Pavlou 2003). Privacy risk reflects the potential loss over personal information, and social risk relates to users’ potential loss of their social status in the group. In social commerce settings, the loss of privacy and social status may occur when users are engaged in the online activities.
instance, by writing comments and publishing posts about a product or a service, users’ profiles including their personal information would be disclosed; moreover, sharing the opinions may negatively affect the way others think about the user. Thus, we consider social risk and privacy risk as the components of participation risk. Participation in the online community may include different activities; such as writing comments, liking others’ posts, following other pages/users, and so on. We focus on writing comments/reviews as the social commerce users’ participation behavior; the reason is that this behavior (writing comments/reviews) is important for service providers and also it has a strong effect on other members’ behaviors (especially purchasing) (Charlton 2015). The users’ uncertainties about negative consequences of their participation in social commerce activities may deter their intentions to participate; hence, it is reasonable to postulate:

\[H5b: \text{perceived participation risk reduce social commerce users’ intentions to participate in its online activities.}\]

Trust and Perceived Risk
In the literature, there has been some confusion regarding the relationship between trust and perceived risk and whether trust will predict perceived risk or vice-versa (Lim 2003; Pavlou and Gefen 2004). However, most evidence suggests that trust would influence perceived risk (Gefen et al. 2003). Trust has been found to influence perceived risk in different contexts such as online shopping (e.g. Jarvenpaa et al. 1999); or online auction domain (e.g. Pavlou and Gefen 2004; Pavlou 2003). Also, it has been shown that trust will increase risk-taking behavior in a relationship (Mayer et al. 1995). Hence, we contend that:

\[H6a: \text{trust toward website would reduce perceived commerce risk.}\]
\[H6b: \text{trust toward website would reduce perceived participation risk.}\]
\[H7a: \text{trust toward members would reduce perceived commerce risk.}\]
\[H7b: \text{trust toward members would reduce perceived participation risk.}\]

Methodology
To test the hypotheses we developed measurements for the constructs. Wherever possible, the measurement items were taken from the literature. We followed the three steps proposed by Moore and Benbasat (1991) for instrument development. We also conducted questionnaire pilot test through a panel of experts in IS (professors and IS professionals) who reviewed the questions and after that necessary changes and improvements were made.

Table 1 includes all the items; they were measured on a 7-point Likert scale. Perceived participation risk was measured as a second order formative construct, since its two dimensions do not have to covary and the total perceived participation risk is calculated by the weight sum of these two dimensions (Petter et al. 2007). However, we also tested the model with perceived participation risk being reflective; the results regarding the significance or the sign of path coefficients stayed the same. We also considered perceived commerce benefit and perceived participation benefit as formative construct; since they were formed with indicators reflecting different types of benefits (convenience, saving money, time, variety of products for commerce benefit; and monetary bonus, seeking friendship, and gaining popularity for participation benefit). This is consistent with operationalization in study by Kim et al. (2008).

We considered users’ age, gender, education and their personal innovativeness with IT (PIIT) as control variables in our model. PIIT refers to “the willingness of an individual to try out any new information technology” (Agarwal and Prasad 1998, p. 206).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Developed from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Privacy risk</td>
<td>By writing comments in this social commerce, my personal information from the online profile might be collected and used for other purposes. By giving my information to this social commerce website I increase my exposure to privacy violation risks. By posting my name on this social commerce I increase the chances of misuse of my private information.</td>
<td>(Featherman and Pavlou 2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Social risk  
Alpha=0.821  
CR=0.893  
What are the chances that writing comments in this social commerce website will negatively affect the way others think of you?  
Writing comments in this social commerce would lead to a social loss for me because other members would think less highly of me.  
Please rate the likelihood that writing comments in this social commerce website would affect unfavorable how others view you?  
(Featherman and Pavlou 2003)  
(Gupta et al. 2004)

Perceived Commerce risk  
Alpha=0.813  
CR=0.889  
Purchasing from this social commerce website would involve more product risk (e.g., not working, defective product) compared with other ways of shopping.  
By purchasing from this social commerce website, there is a chance I will lose my money.  
Purchasing from this social commerce website poses a risk that I will not be satisfied with product, service or delivery.  
(Jarvenpaa et al. 1999; Kim et al. 2008)

Perceived commerce benefit  
NA  
I think purchasing from this social commerce website is convenient.  
I can save money by purchasing from this social commerce website.  
I can save time by purchasing from this social commerce website.  
This social commerce website provides good products/services which I might not find by other ways of shopping.  
(Kim et al. 2008)

Perceived participation benefit  
NA  
I will receive bonus by sharing my experience in this social commerce website.  
I will find new friends by writing comments and sharing my experiences in this social commerce website.  
I will become more popular among my friends by sharing and writing comments in this social commerce website.  
(New items)

Trust toward members  
Alpha=0.840  
CR=0.904  
Members of this social commerce website are in general reliable.  
Members of this social commerce website are in general trustworthy.  
Members of this social commerce website are in general honest.  
(Pavlou and Gefen 2005)

Trust toward website  
Alpha=0.876  
CR=0.907  
I believe that this social commerce website is consistent in quality and service.  
I believe that this social commerce website is keen on fulfilling my needs and wants.  
I believe that this social commerce website is honest.  
I believe that this social commerce website has my best interests in mind.  
I believe that this social commerce website is trustworthy.  
I believe that this social commerce website has high integrity.  
(Fang et al. 2014)

Intention to purchase  
Alpha=0.869  
CR=0.920  
I intend to purchase from this social commerce website in the next three months.  
I plan to purchase from this social commerce website in the next three months.  
I predict I would purchase from this social commerce website in the next three months  
(Venkatesh et al. 2003)

Intention to participate  
Alpha=0.852  
CR=0.910  
I intend to participate (write comments) in activities on this social commerce website in the next three months.  
I predict I would participate (write comments) in activities on this social commerce website in the next three months.  
I plan to participate (write comments) in activities on this social commerce website in the next three months.  
(Venkatesh et al. 2003)

Table1. Measurement items

Empirical data were collected to verify our model. First, we conducted a pilot study (separate from the one to check the content of questions) to check the initial reliability of the measurement items. We gathered 65 respondents from graduate students who had used social commerce before. Next to test our proposed research model, we focused on etsy.com, a popular social commerce website with 21.7 million users. We hired a research firm to distribute online surveys to Etsy’s active users. In our study users who have purchased from and participated (wrote comments) at the website in the past two months were considered as active users. We collected 196 respondents. The respondents included 137 females and 29 males; 46% of them were in the 30-39 age group, and 31% were in 21-29 age group. 74% of the respondents were members of the website for more than a year. 31% of our sample held bachelor’s degree, 27% had come college trainings, and 14% has master’s degree.
Results
We used SmartPLS 3 (Ringle et al., 2015), a Partial Least Square tool to analyze the data. First, we evaluated the measurement properties, which includes reliability and convergent/discriminant validity. For the convergent validity, we followed procedure suggested by (Fornell and Larcker 1981): we checked the Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliabilities, and the average variance extracted by constructs. As table 1 and 2 shows, all three criteria are met (Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliabilities are more than 0.7 and average variance extracted are more than 0.5). All the indicators were loaded on their corresponding construct and variance inflation factor (VIF) for participation benefit and commerce benefit items were below 3.3; hence no multi-collinearity was detected. To address common method variance, we followed Herman’s one-factor test (Podsakoff and Organ 1986). The results of unrotated exploratory factor analysis showed that five factors accounted for 62.3% of the variance and no single factor explains more than 29% of the variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>IPU</th>
<th>PPR</th>
<th>PSR</th>
<th>PCR</th>
<th>PCB</th>
<th>PPB</th>
<th>TrW</th>
<th>TrM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPU</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-0.415</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCB</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>-0.207</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPB</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrW</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrM</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-0.326</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table2. Descriptive statistics and discriminant validity (N=196)

Structural model
The proposed hypotheses were tested with a bootstrap procedure with 500 re-samples (Gil-Garcia 2008). Since we have a formative second order construct, we followed the procedure proposed by Lowry and Gaskin (2014) to check the structural model. As figure 2 shows, most hypotheses were supported. The model explained 44% of the variance in intention to participate, 52% in intention to purchase. Among the control variables, PIIT had a significant effect on the intention to participate; others had no significant effects. We also checked the mediation effect of trust toward the website, we conducted the Sobel mediation test (Soper 2016). The results showed that trust toward website fully mediates the relationship between trust toward members and intention to use social commerce (purchase and participate).

Discussion
This study aimed to examine the deterring effect of perceived risk along with motivating effects of trust and perceived benefits in social commerce use. We pinpointed relevant facets of risk in the social commerce context: perceived commerce risk and perceived participation risk. We analyzed the relationships between the risk (perceived commerce and participation risk) and intention to use social commerce (purchase and participate). The results confirmed the deterring effects of these risk factors for purchasing and participating intentions; hence, hypotheses 5a and 5b were supported. We also examined the relationship between trust (toward the website and toward the members) and intentions to purchase and participate. The results showed that trust toward members has positive effect on trust toward the website; which is consistent with trust transfer theory and our hypothesis 2 supported. Moreover, trust toward website motivates users to use social commerce for both purchasing and participating. Thus our hypotheses 1a and 1b supported. However, trust toward members does not have a significant effect on users’ intentions to purchase nor participate; thus, hypotheses 3a and 3b were not supported. Then we checked whether trust toward website mediates the relationships between trust toward members and intentions to use social commerce. For both behaviors (purchasing and participating), we found a full mediation effect. We also checked the relationship between both trust toward website/members and perceived commerce/participation risk. We found that trust toward website does not have a significant effect on reducing perceived commerce and participation risk (hypotheses 6a and 6b were not supported). Nonetheless, trust toward members reduces both participation and commerce risk (hypotheses 7a and 7b were supported). Previous studies in traditional online shopping, found a significant relationship between
trust toward website and perceived commerce risk. However, this association is weak for social commerce context because of the existence of strong social inference in social commerce community. Social commerce involves interactions and collaborations between members and this makes social commerce different from traditional electronic commerce. Hence, trust toward members plays a more important role in reducing user’ perceived commerce risk as well as participation risks.

As indicated in the model, R-squared value for participation risk is below 0.1. This shows that although trust toward members has a significant effect on reducing participation risk; it cannot explain the variance in participation risk very well. Participation risk includes privacy risk and social risk, and users’ privacy risk can be threatened by individuals outside the social commerce community (public) as well. Hence trust toward members only partially explains the participation risk.

Moreover, as expected, our results show that perceived commerce benefit has a significant positive effect on intention to purchase; and similarly, perceived participation benefit increases user’ intention to participate; therefore, hypotheses 4a and 4b were supported.

**Contributions to Theory and Implications for Practice**

Our study contributes to the IS literature by extending the current understanding of social commerce use. Current social commerce literature has focused mainly on examining drivers of social commerce use (e.g. Liang et al. 2011; Zheng et al. 2013; Zhou et al. 2013). However, our model integrates drivers and deterrents of social commerce acceptance. Negative factors can play a significant role in deterring online users’ behaviors (Featherman and Pavlou 2003); hence their effects should not be neglected. Future research should study a broader set of demotivating factors in the social commerce context.

We considered both possible behaviors of social commerce users: purchasing and participating. Accordingly, we defined two categories for perceived risk: perceived participation risk and perceived commerce risk. Commerce risk mainly includes uncertainty regarding financial issues (Kim et al. 2008). As facets of participation risk, we considered social risk and privacy risk. Comparing the standardized path coefficients and explained variances in our model with previous studies (e.g. Featherman and Pavlou 2003; Weeger and Gewald 2014) showed that we were able to point relevant risk factors in the social commerce context. Future studies in social commerce can use these risk facets; however, we also encourage them to examine additional risk facets and study their possible effects.

Moreover, our results show that trust toward website/vendor does not have significant effect on reducing perceived commerce and participation risks. Previous studies in e-commerce found that trust toward website/vendor would reduce risk perceptions (e.g. Kim et al. 2008; Pavlou 2003). Instead, we found that in the social commerce context, trust toward members is the important factor in reducing perceived commerce and participation risk. This result highlights the prime difference between social commerce and other forms of e-commerce; which is social commerce involves a broader social context. Future research in social commerce should consider this difference in their model.

We have included PIIT as one of our control variables. Prior studies found a positive relationship between personal innovativeness and online shopping intentions (e.g. Limayem et al. 2000; Liu et al. 2010). In our
model, the effect of PIIT on participating behavior is significant; however, its effect is not significant for purchasing. A possible explanation is that online shopping was considered innovative few years ago, but overtime this has changed and online shopping is no longer considered as innovative; however, participation and writing comments are considered to be more innovative. Future research should further study this explanation.

Our results also have practical implications. We have pointed important negative factors which deter social commerce use. Social commerce developers should understand these potential risks and focus on reducing their likelihoods. For instance, to mitigate commerce risk, managers can consider having some strategies such as money back and consumer satisfaction guarantees which can help in reducing risks (Featherman and Pavlou 2003). They can also have strategies for mitigating privacy and social risk. For instance, having clear website privacy policy (Featherman and Pavlou 2003), respond to users’ unfavorable comments, and including online chat (Turel et al. 2011) can be useful. Furthermore, the results showed that trust toward members would reduce user’ risk perceptions. Hence, social commerce developers should try to provide a trustworthy and comfortable environment to encourage the members to participate in the activities and purchase from the website.

Limitations and Future Research
In this study, there are some limitations which can spawn future studies. First, we conducted a cross-sectional study, and we analyzed drivers and deterents of social commerce use at a single point in time. Future studies can examine the longitudinal behaviors and analyze whether these deterrent and drivers may change over time. Second, in IS context, intentions have been studied as an appropriate proxy to analyze the actual behaviors (Davis 1989); therefore, we also measured intentions in our study instead of users’ actual behaviors. Future studies should examine whether there is any gap between intentions and behaviors of social commerce users. Third, in our model the R-squared for participation and commerce risk is relatively low; future studies should consider other factors which better explain these risk variables. Finally, we focused on writing comments as users’ participation activity. Nevertheless, there are varieties of activities which social commerce users may be engaged in (e.g. liking other posts, following others, sending messages, etc.). Future research can examine other possible activities.

Conclusion
The current study examined the drivers and deterrents of social commerce use. We considered two possible behaviors: purchasing products/services from the website and participating in online activates. The deterring role of negative factors has been largely neglected in the past social commerce studies. Our results showed that perceived risks regarding commerce and participation play important roles in demotivating users from purchasing and participating behaviors respectively. We found trust toward website positively affect the intention of purchasing and participating but trust toward members does not have direct impact but only indirect impact (through the mediation of trust on website) on the intention of purchasing and participating. We also found an important role of trust toward members in reducing both users' perceived commerce risk and participation risk. Since social commerce is different from other forms of e-commerce, the social context and interactions among members play significant roles as we have discovered.
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