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INTRODUCTION

- eWOM have become an essential source of product-related information
- The massive quantity, diversity, and accessibility of online reviews has contributed to their attractiveness and growing popularity
- Difficult to judge the credibility of reviews in the online environment while they are submitted by strangers worldwide
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- What are the predominant central and/or peripheral variables used for credibility judgment of online consumer review?
- How do these variables function for readers at different levels of motivation and ability?
LITERATURE REVIEW

• Online consumer reviews
  • “peer-generated product evaluations posted on company or third-party web sites” (Mudambi & Schuff, 2010)
  • Text-based product appraisals on the Internet (Stauss, 1997)
  • One form of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) through which Internet users informally and non-commercially interact and exchange positive and negative consumer experiences (Boush & Kahle, 2001; Hu, Liu & Zhang, 2008)
  • Affect readers’ consumer behavior (Hennig-Thurau & Walsh 2003)
LITERATURE REVIEW

• Credibility is defined as believability or the characteristic that makes people believe and trust someone or something (Wathen & Burkell, 2002)

• A review that is viewed as credible is believed and accepted by the receiver and affects their subsequent behavior (Chow, Lim & Lwim 1995; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Smith & Vogt, 1995)

• Argument quality and source credibility are primary factors that affect the degree of information influence (Sussman & Siegal, 2003)
THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

- Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986)
  - Central Route – Involves high level of elaboration, message recipients will carefully consider the issues presented in the message
  - Peripheral Route – Entails low level of elaboration, use simple heuristic cues or informational factors to assess the believability of a message
  - The degree of elaboration through either the central or peripheral route depends on the recipient’s ability and motivation
HYPOTHESES

- H1: Argument quality has a positive effect on review credibility
- H2: Source credibility has a positive effect on review credibility
- H3: Review consistency has a positive effect on review credibility
- H4: Two-sided reviews are perceived to be more credible than one-sided reviews
- H5: The effect of argument quality on review credibility is stronger when both the recipient’s expertise (H5a) and involvement (H5b) are higher
- H6: Source credibility’s effect on review credibility is stronger for recipients with lower levels of expertise (H6a) and involvement (H6b)
- H7: Review consistency’s effect on review credibility is stronger for recipients with lower level of expertise (H7a) and involvement (H7b)
- H8: Review sidedness’s effect on review credibility is stronger for recipients with lower levels of expertise (H8a) and involvement (H8b)
METHODOLOGY

- Online Survey
- Randomly selected 792 Epinions.com users
- Respondents were asked to recall the most recent review they had read in Epinions.com
- Response rate of 12.5%
**HYPOTHESES TESTING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>: Argument quality has a positive effect on review credibility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>: Source credibility has a positive effect on review credibility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong>: Review consistency has a positive effect on review credibility</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4</strong>: Two-sided reviews are perceived to be more credible than one-sided reviews</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5</strong>: The effect of argument quality on review credibility is stronger when both the recipient’s expertise (H5a) and involvement (H5b) are higher</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6</strong>: Source credibility’s effect on review credibility is stronger for recipients with lower levels of expertise (H6a) and involvement (H6b)</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7</strong>: Review consistency’s effect on review credibility is stronger for recipients with lower level of expertise (H7a) and involvement (H7b)</td>
<td>Reversely Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8</strong>: Review sidedness’s effect on review credibility is stronger for recipients with lower levels of expertise (H8a) and involvement (H8b)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

• Argument quality to be the most influential factor in the evaluation of online consumer reviews, and the influence did not significantly vary across different levels of expertise and involvement

• People also rely on other review cues, such as source credibility, review consistency, and review sidedness to evaluate online consumer reviews

• Greater impact of review sidedness not just at a low involvement level but also a high expertise level
IMPLICATIONS

- Identified 5 specific information cues that consumers use when evaluating the credibility of online consumer reviews
- Unveiled the complex roles of different review cues at different levels of the recipient’s expertise and involvement
- Provided general design principles to online review providers for better design and manage of an online review system
- Assist marketers to identifies online comments likely to have a nigger impact on user decisions