Study on the Impact of various factors of eWOM and Visibility on Social Media for promoting Newly Released Movies

* Aravind. T. S
** Dr. Vinith Kumar Nair

Effulgence
Vol. 14 No. 2
July - December, 2016
Rukmini Devi Institute of Advanced Studies
E-mail : effulgence@rdias.ac.in, Website : www.rdias.ac.in
http://effulgence.rdias.ac.in/user/default.aspx
https://dx.doi.org/10.33601/effulgence.rdias/v14/i2/2016/87-96

Abstract

In highly technological world individuals devote the implausible part of one's time on various cyber events such as either connecting with one another or searching for various pieces of information. There are different types of The social media, such as social networking sites (e.g. Facebook), micro blogging sites (e.g. Twitter), photo sharing sites (e.g. Instagram), and video sharing sites (e.g. YouTube) played not only an extensive influence in every individuals life but also has become an inevitable part of the day to day activity .The prevalent consumption of social media has made an influence on the way marketers design their marketing activities, particularly in the pre and post release promotion of new movies. In this paper the authors explained the influence of Electronic Word of Mouth (E-WOM) on favorability and visibility of Promotional content of a newly released Movie. The purpose of the Research was to give a better understanding of how E-WOM and Visibility can create impact on the promotion elements such as shared contents, source credibility, perceived usefulness of newly released Movie. The data, obtained from the sample population of ninety college students, from various professional institutions in Kerala, was analyzed through Simple Regression tool and was found that E-WOM can generate visibility as well as favorability to the promotional content of a newly released Movie.

Key Words: *Electronic Word of Mouth (E-WOM), Favorability, Visibility, Social Sharing Network.*

INTRODUCTION

Social Media is an online platform, where people can do participative sharing (thoughts ideas, experience, information, critics) networking, discussing and bookmarking online. Majority of Social networking platforms are encouraging discussion, feedback, voting, comments, and sharing of information from all interested parties. Most of the Social Media and Social Networking Platforms are constructed in such a way that the users can interact spontaneously it is two way interaction channel compared with other traditional medias (Ron Jones 2009).

Interactive communication has received great attention in social psychology. This line of studies has reliably established how personal influence affects individuals to make choices. The influence of interpersonal effect through word-of-mouth communication has been well recognized in the consumer literature (Arndt, 1967; King and Summers 1970; Herr, Kardes, and Kim, 1991). The consumer influence through word-of-mouth communication is further accelerated with the advent of the Internet.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Electronic Word of Mouth is consider as any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, and former customers about a product or a company via the Internet (Hennig- Thurau et al., 2004). E-WOM communication can take place in various settings.

* Assistant Professor in Marketing, Sree Narayana Guru College of Legal Studies, Kollam
** Professor in Marketing, TKM Institute of Management, Karuvelil, Ezhukone, Kollam

Consumers can post their feelings, observations and reviews of products on weblogs (e.g. xanga.com), discussion forums (e.g. zapak.com), review websites (e.g. Epinions.com), e-bulletin board systems, newsgroup, social networking sites (e.g. facebook.com). The E-WOM communication has some attributes in common with traditional WOM communication, it is unlike from traditional WOM in several dimensions. These magnitudes attribute to the uniqueness of E-WOM communication. First, dissimilar to traditional WOM, E-WOM communications possess unprecedented scalability and speed of diffusion. As with WOM, sharing of information is between small groups of individuals in synchronous mode (Avery, Resnick, and Zeckhauser, 1999; Li & Hitt 2008, Dellarocas 2003; Steffes and Burgee, 2009). According to Hung and Li (2007) E-WOM communications involve multi-way exchanges of information in asynchronous mode.

The use of various electronic technologies such as online discussion forum, electronic bulletin board, newsgroups, blogs, review sites and social networking sites facilitate the information exchange among communicators (Goldsmith, 2006). Second, opposite to traditional WOM, E-WOM communications are more persistence and accessible. Most of the text-based information presented on the Internet is archived and thus would be made available for an indefinite period of time (Herr, Kardes and Kim, 1991; Hennig-Thurau et. al., 2004; Sen, 2008; Park and Lee, 2009; Hung and Li; 2007; Lee, Park, and Hen, 2008). Third, E-WOM communications are more measurable than traditional WOM (Lee, Park and Hen, 2008; Park and Kim, 2008). The presentation format, quantity and persistence of E-WOM communications have made them more observable. Word-of-mouth information available online is far more voluminous in quantity compared to information obtained from traditional contacts in the offline world (Chatterjee, 2001). Lastly, traditional WOM emanates from a sender who is known to the receiver of the information, thereby the credibility of the communicator and the receiver knows the message. On the contrary, the electronic nature of E-WOM in most applications eliminates the receiver's ability to judge the credibility of the sender and his or her message.

Electronic Word of mouth, especially over Social Sharing Network of Newly release movie Promotional content (reviews, trailers, teasers, posters), has become a key information source that provides references to help moviegoers formulate their decisions (e.g., Duan, Gu, and Whinston 2008). Potential moviegoers appreciate E-WOM as trustworthy and prevalent (Holbrook 1999). In such case E-WOM helps in generating/show high favorability towards the Promotional content of Movie and Visibility factors also influenced by the E-WOM, it determines the success of entertainment goods, because such experiential goods are often consumed collectively and figure in daily conversations (Chevalier and Mayzlin, 2006; Eliashberg, Elberse, and Leenders 2006; Mayzlin 2006).

According to Rindova et al. (2007) term Favorability refers to the degree of goodness in the eyes of media, namely, “is it good or bad?”. Favorability echoes the social media's outlook towards the subject. When the like and comments are high the Consumers are more likely to make, as favorable comments provide an indicator of good product quality.

The researchers argue that Rindova et al. (2007) the level of awareness and exposure of the public towards the product is called Visibility, i.e. how many people know about the product. Visibility is the regularity that individuals confront information about or receive messages about the product. Knowledge of a product is one of the preconditions that must exist before people will buy the product.

Li and Zhan, (2011) claimed that these components had an influence on the credibility of the message. In specific source credibility is defined as “the perceived ability and motivation of the message source to produce accurate and truthful information”. Some other researchers quoted that credible information sources frequently produce successful influential messages and induce a favourable attitude towards the products/services related to the reviews (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Pornpitakan, 2004; Khong and Wu, 2013).

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The primary objectives are

1. To study the Impact of various factors on eWOM
2. To study the Impact of various factors on Visibility

The secondary objectives are

1. To study the impact of Shared Content on eWOM
2. To study the impact of Source Credibility on eWOM
3. To study the impact of Perceived Usefulness on eWOM
4. To study the impact of Shared Content on Visibility
5. To study the impact of Source Credibility on Visibility
6. To study the impact of Perceived Usefulness on Visibility

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no relationship between Shared Content and eWOM
2. There is no relationship between Source Credibility and eWOM
3. There is no relationship between Perceived Usage and eWOM
4. There is no relationship between Shared Content and Visibility
5. There is no relationship between Source Credibility and Visibility
6. There is no relationship between Perceived Usefulness and Visibility

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This descriptive study provides the detail explanation on the impact of various factors on eWOM. The researchers have identified Shared Content, Source Credibility and Perceived Usage as the independent variable, which influences the dependent variables eWOM. The study focuses on the students various professional college from south Kerala. The researchers have collected primary and secondary data for the study. To attain the objective, a thirty-eight items, seven point Likert scale is developed and the sample size of ninety is fixed. The date was analyzed through multiple regression using SPSS 21.

Research and Findings

The results of multiple regression are shown in the following table. As shown in Table1, respondents have given a higher scored for Share Content to the mean of 73.05 and standard deviation on 16.99 followed by Source Credibility with the mean of 66.10 and standard deviation of 16.15. Among the three variables perceived usage scored least with the mean of 42.57 and standard deviation of 10.21.

Impact of various factors on eWOM

Table 1 : Descriptive Statistics

Mean	Std. Deviation	N
69.1889	16.97711	90
73.0556	16.99264	90
66.1000	16.15727	90
42.5778	10.21783	90

Table 2 : Correlations

		eWOM	Shared Content_	Source Credibility	Perceived Usage
Pearson Correlation	eWOM	1.000	.757	.626	.433
	Shared Content	.757	1.000	.670	.485
	Source Credibilty	.626	.670	1.000	.499
	Perceived Usage	.433	.485	.499	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	eWOM	.	.000	.000	.000
	sharedcontent	.000	.	.000	.000
	Source Credibilty	.000	.000	.	.000
	Perceived usage	.000	.000	.000	.
N	ewom	90	90	90	90
	SharedContent	90	90	90	90
	Source Credibilty	90	90	90	90
	Perceived usage	90	90	90	90

The correlation between the independent variables and dependent variables are shown in Table 2 it was observed that the Independent variable Shared content has the highest correlation of .757 which is significant at .000 level ($P < .05$), followed by Source credibility with the correlation of .626 which is significant at .000 level (P,.05). The third variable Perceived Usage got a correlation of .433 which significant at .000 level ($P < .05$). Since the correlation of Shared Content and Source Credibility towards eWOM is more closer to 1, it can be concluded that both these Independent variables have got a Strong Positive correlation with Dependent eWOM.

Table 3 : Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.757	.573	.568	11.16065	.573	117.939	1	88	.000
2	.773	.598	.589	10.88428	.026	5.526	1	87	.021

It was found from Model 2 (Table3) the correlation coefficient of eWOM and the independent variable Share Content and Source credibility is .773. The explained variance R Square is .598. The F value is 54.765 it is significant at .000 levels (table 4). If the regression coefficient is 70% and above it shows a very good relationship, 50 to 69 good relationship 30-49 moderate relationship 10-29 poor relationship and 1-9 negligent relationship. In this research it was found that 59.8% of the variant of the dependent variable eWOM is explained by the independent variable Shared Content and Source Credibility.

Table 4 : ANOVA[c]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14690.499	1	14690.499	117.939	.000[a]
	Residual	10961.290	88	124.560		
	Total	25651.789	89			
2	Regression	15345.109	2	7672.555	64.765	.000[b]
	Residual	10306.680	87	118.468		
	Total	25651.789	89			

a. Predictors: (Constant), shared content

b. Predictors: (Constant), shared content Source Credibility

c. Dependent Variable: ewom_sum

Table 5 : Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	13.954	5.220		2.673	.009	3.579	24.328
	shared content	.756	.070	.757	10.860	.000	.618	.894
2	(Constant)	9.535	5.427		1.757	.082	-1.251	20.322
	shared content	.612	.092	.612	6.687	.000	.430	.794
	Source Credibility	.226	.096	.215	2.351	.021	.035	.417

As shown in the figure the beta value of shared content is .612 which is significant at .000 level (P< .05) and the beta value of source credibility is .215 which is significant at .021 levels (P<.05). The beta values show which variable has a strong influence on the dependent variable eWOM. It is very clear from the beta value that the independent variable Share content has more Positive influence on eWOM followed by Source Credibility. It was also found that the independent variable perceived Usage does not have any relationship with eWOM.

Relationship between Shared Content and eWOM

Coefficients show P is .000 (P<.05) and hence the analysis indicate that there is significant relationship between share content and eWOM hence the null hypothesis rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at the 5% significant level or at 95% confidence

Relationship between Source Credibility and eWOM

Here analysis shows that the P value is .021 which is less than .05 and hence it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between Source Credibility and eWOM. Hence the null hypothesis rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at the 5% significant level or at 95% confidence.

Relationship between Perceived Usage and eWOM

Analysis indicate that there is no significant relationship between perceived usage and eWOM hence the null hypothesis s accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected at the 5% significant level or at 95% confidence

Impact of various factors on Visibility

Table 6 : Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
visibility	26.8667	6.58258	90
sharedcontent	73.0556	16.99264	90
Source Credibility	66.1000	16.15727	90
Perceived Usage	42.5778	10.21783	90

With regard to the objective two, to find out the significant relationship between various factors on Visibility, the following results were observed.

As shown in table.6 shared content has scored the highest mean of 73.05 and sample deviation of 16.99, followed by source credibility with the mean square of 66.10 and standard deviation of 16.15, and perceived usage with the mean square of 42.57 and standard deviation 10.21

Table 7 : Correlations

		visibility_sum	sharedcontent_sum	tt_sum	sc_sum
Pearson Correlation	visibility_sum	1.000	.682	.642	.575
	sharedcontent_sum	.682	1.000	.670	.485
	Source Credibility	.642	.670	1.000	.499
	Perceived Usage	.575	.485	.499	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	visibility_sum	.	.000	.000	.000
	sharedcontent_sum	.000	.	.000	.000
	Source Credibility	.000	.000	.	.000
	Perceived Usage	.000	.000	.000	.
N	visibility_sum	90	90	90	90
	sharedcontent_sum	90	90	90	90
	Source Credibility	90	90	90	90
	Perceived Usage	90	90	90	90

The Pearson Correlation value (r) for the share content and visibility is .682 which is significant at .000 level (P< .05), variable Source Credibility .642 which is significant at .000 level (P< .05) and for the variable perceived usage is .575 which is significant at .000 level (P< .05), since all the values are more or less closer to positive one, it can be concluded that all the three variable have a positive relationship with visibility. Among the three variables it was also observed that shared content has the strongest correlation with visibility.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.682	.465	.459	4.84253	.465	76.451	1	88	.000
2	.737	.543	.533	4.50056	.078	14.881	1	87	.000
3	.759	.576	.561	4.36125	.033	6.647	1	86	.012

Table 8 : Model Summary

To establish a relationship between visibility and various independent variables like shared content, Source credibility and perceived usage, a multiple regression analysis was conducted. It was found that R, the correlation coefficient is .759 and R Square, the explained variant is .576 (table 8). The F value 38.916 is significant at .000 level (table 9). The result indicate that 57.6% of the variants of the dependent variables. Visibility has been significantly explained by the independent variable Shared Content, Source Credibility and Perceived Usage. This shows that there is a good relationship between independent variable and dependent variable.

Table 9 : ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1792.790	1	1792.790	76.451	.000[a]
	Residual	2063.610	88	23.450		
	Total	3856.400	89			
2	Regression	2094.209	2	1047.104	51.696	.000[b]
	Residual	1762.191	87	20.255		
	Total	3856.400	89			
3	Regression	2220.634	3	740.211	38.916	.000[c]
	Residual	1635.766	86	19.021		
	Total	3856.400	89			

a. Predictors: (Constant), shared content

b. Predictors: (Constant), shared content

c. Predictors: (Constant), shared content

d. Dependent Variable: visibility

Table 10 : Coefficient

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	7.571	2.265		3.342	.001	3.069	12.072
	Shared Content	.264	.030	.682	8.744	.000	.204	.324
2	(Constant)	3.188	2.392		1.332	.186	-1.567	7.942
	Shared content	.204	.032	.527	6.360	.000	.140	.268
	Source Credibility	.206	.053	.320	3.858	.000	.100	.312
3	(Constant)	1.962	2.366		.829	.409	-2.742	6.666
	Shared Content	.149	.038	.385	3.955	.000	.074	.224
	Source Credibility	.169	.054	.262	3.144	.002	.062	.276
	Perceived Usage	.103	.040	.253	2.578	.012	.024	.183

If we take the beta value for the standardized coefficient it is found that the beta value of the shared content is .385, which is significant at .000 level ($P < .05$). For the independent variable the source credibility the beta value is .262 which is significant at .002 levels ($P < .05$). It was found that for the independent variable perceived usage the beta value is .253, which is significant .012 level. Among the three variables it was found that shared the independent variable shared content has strong positive relation with visibility.

Impact of Shared Content on Visibility

Coefficients show P is .000 ($P < .05$) and hence the analysis indicate that there is significant relationship between share content and Visibility hence the null hypothesis rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at the 5% significant level or at 95% confidence.

Impact of Source Credibility on Visibility

Here analysis shows that the P value is .002 which is less than .05 and hence it can be concluded that there is significant relationship between Source Credibility and Visibility. Hence the null hypothesis rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at the 5% significant level or at 95% confidence.

Impact of Perceived Usage on Visibility

Analysis indicate P value is .012 ($P < .05$) which indicates that there is significant relationship between Perceived Usage and Visibility hence the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted at the 5% significant level or at 95% confidence

CONCLUSION

From this study, it is obvious that Social Networking is a developing social feeling that has marvelous effects on individuals by empirically testing the relationships of E-WOM and Visibility on Shared Content, Source

Credibility and Perceived Usefulness. Influence of social media on youth is increasing day by day. More over the youth population is swayed by the cohorts. And social media provides a perfect Launchpad for the peer interaction. This proliferated the influence of eWOM. Previous researches have shown that the impact of eWOM is more for experience goods like movies. This the study depict that the eWOM has a significant relationship with shared content and source credibility but does not have significant impact on perceived usages. The results also find out that the beta value of shared content and source credibility is 0.612 and 0.215 respectively. Hence it can be concluded that the variable share content has more impact on eWOM compared to source credibility. The study also finds out that all the three variables Shared Content, Source credibility and Perceived usefulness has a significant relationship with visibility. The results also find out that the beta value of shared content, source credibility and Perceived usefulness is 0.385, 0.262, and 0.253 respectively. Hence it can be concluded that the variable share content has more impact on visibility compared to source credibility and perceived usefulness.

REFERENCE

1) Arndt, J. (1967). Role of productRelated conversations in the diffusion of a new product. Journal of Marketing Research, 4, pp. 291-295.
2) Avery, C., Resnick, P., & Zeckhauser, R. (1999). The Market for Evaluations. American Economic Review, 89(3), pp. 564-584.
3) Kumar, S. R. (n.d.). Online Reviews: Do Consumers Trust Them. SSRN Electronic Journal SSRN Journal Volume 28, pp. 129-133.
4) Duan, W., Gu, B. & Whinston, A. (2008). Do online reviews matter? - An empirical investigation of panel data. Decision Support Systems Vol. 45, No. 4, pp. 1007-1016.
5) Goldsmith, R. E. (n.d.). Electronic Word-of-Mouth [Abstract]. Encyclopedia of E-Commerce, E-Government, and Mobile Commerce, Volume 3, 2011, pp. 4246
6) Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet? Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18(1), pp. 38-52.
7) Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet? Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18(1), pp 38-52.
8) Hung, K. H., & Li, S. Y. (2007). The Influence of eWOM on Virtual Consumer Communities: Social Capital, Consumer Learning, and Behavioral Outcomes. Journal of Advertising Research JAR, 47(4), pp. 485-495.
9) Herr, P. M., Kardes, F. R., & Kim, J. (1991). Effects of Word-of-Mouth and Product-Attribute Information on Persuasion: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Perspective. J CONSUM RES Journal of Consumer Research, 17(4), pp. 454.
10) Herr, P. M., Kardes, F. R., & Kim, J. (1991). Effects of Word-of-Mouth and Product-Attribute Information on Persuasion: An Accessibility-Diagnosticity Perspective. J CONSUM RES Journal of Consumer Research, 17(4), pp.454.
11) Hung, K. H., & Li, S. Y. (2007). The Influence of eWOM on Virtual Consumer Communities: Social Capital, Consumer Learning, and Behavioral Outcomes. Journal of Advertising Research JAR, 47(4), pp. 485-495.
12) Kirmani, A., & Zhu, R. (. (2007). Vigilant Against Manipulation: The Effect of Regulatory Focus on the Use of Persuasion Knowledge. Journal of Marketing Research, 44(4), pp. 688-701.
13) King, C. W., & Summers, J. O. (1970). Overlap of Opinion Leadership across Consumer Product Categories. Journal of Marketing Research, 7(1), pp. 43.
14) Park, C., & Lee, T. M. (2009). Information direction, website reputation and eWOM effect: A moderating role of product type. Journal of Business Research, 62(1), pp. 61-67.
15) Park, D., & Kim, S. (2008). The effects of consumer knowledge on message processing of electronic word-of-mouth via online consumer reviews. Electronic Commerce Research and Applications, 7(4), pp. 399-410.

16) Rindova, V. P., Petkova, A. P., & Kotha, S. (2007). Standing out: How new firms in emerging markets build reputation. Strategic Organization, 5(1), pp. 31-70.
17) Social Media Marketing 101, Part 1. (n.d.). Retrieved May 10, 2016, from Https://searchenginewatch.com /Sew/opinion/2064413/social-media-marketing-101-part
18) Sen, S. (2008). Determinants of consumer trust of virtual word-of-mouth: An observation study from a retail website. The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge, 14(1), p.p 30-35.