

Social-Media Review Exposure and Immediate Purchase Intentions: A Cross-Sectional Survey of Pune Shopper

Dr. Nilesh P. Awari, Dr. Swapnil A. Shah, Dr. Devkumar Mahisekar

PIRENS Institute of Business Management & Administration, Loni (M.S.)

S.N.G. Institute of Management & Research, Pune (M.S.)

K.E.S's Pratibha Institute of Business Management, Pune (M.S)

How to cite this article: Dr. Nilesh P. Awari, Dr. Swapnil A. Shah, Dr. Devkumar Mahisekar (2023). Social-Media Review Exposure and Immediate Purchase Intentions: A Cross-Sectional Survey of Pune Shopper. *Library Progress International*, 43(2), 2241-2249

Abstract: This study looked at if seeing social media reviews and their visual detail can make IT buyers in Pune City want to buy right away. A picked group of 321 people filled out a detailed form with two five-point scales: one for buying desire right after seeing good social media reviews, and one for desire after seeing visually strong reviews. The counts of answers mostly fell into the 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' areas, showing a high chance of buying soon after seeing the reviews. The overall scores for each idea were made by adding up the five items; these scores were checked for steadiness and found good. The deeper study used one-sample t-tests to weigh these overall scores against a middle value (3.0). The scores from social media reviews and visual detail were both much higher than the middle value ($p < .001$ for both), showing clear trends. These trends back up the ideas that social media reviews catch attention, and visual parts and hints quickly turn review seeing into a want to buy. For those selling on digital sites, this means they should make review designs look good—especially the visual parts—while also being careful not to trick buyers into rash buys. Limits here include the study's setup and its use of self-told info; later studies should track real actions and play with review types and how they look.

Keywords: social-media reviews, eWOM, visual richness, impulse buying, immediate purchase intention, Pune.

Introduction

The use of social media apps in daily life has made it easy and fast to spread info about products, people's thoughts on them, and their own stories. Big apps like Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp let people post reviews, pics, and small stories quickly and with ease; these posts can go through public feeds, smaller groups, or private messages. Social media reviews are different from typical online store reviews in three clear ways: their speed, how they mix into social life, and how rich they are with different types of content. Since these reviews are often from friends or well-known influencers and come with emotional pictures or stories, they are likely to get fast reactions from those who see them.

Impulse buying is when shoppers make quick decisions with little thought, acting on strong cues from their environment. Wanting to buy something right after seeing it is the first sign that someone might act on a sudden wish. Studies show that feelings, seeing others agree, quick thinking, and feeling something is rare can lead to these buying wishes. In fact, simple things like many good reviews, striking pics, or nods from known people can make shoppers skip deep thinking and just buy.

This study looks at how social media reviews quickly create the desire to buy using a mixed way of understanding that brings together the Stimulus-Organism-Response model and dual-process thinking, especially the Elaboration Likelihood Model. From one view, social media reviews are an outside push that starts internal responses, including thoughts on if the review is believable or useful as well as feelings like excitement and desire. The other model helps by splitting up the ways we process info—deeply thinking about it or using simple hints. Social media reviews often use the simpler way because they are short, full of feeling, and come from social links, making the move from seeing to wanting to act fast. The focus of this study is Pune City, where many people use smartphones, are active on social media, and shop at different kinds of stores. The mix of people in Pune and how often they see reviews on different social media channels makes it a good place to see how well reviews work across platforms and figure out when they most likely lead to buying right away. The method used was a survey given to a chosen mix of Pune shoppers from different shopping areas. Important points—like how much they see social media reviews, if they trust these reviews, their emotional responses, and their immediate wish to buy—were measured using special scales that fit the local language and shopping styles. The study also looked at

stats, checked if the measurements worked well, and analyzed how seeing reviews led to wanting to buy right away through thoughts and feelings. The study followed rules about asking for consent and keeping responders anonymous. This research helps both theory and practice. It moves how we understand buyer behavior from just looking at online stores to including social media spaces. It uses feelings and simple clues to see how seeing reviews can make someone want to buy right away. For sellers and digital advertisers, it gives real tips on how to display reviews, when to push promotions, and how to talk to customers to either use or nicely handle impulse buying. By bringing together psychology and real data from a big city market in India, this study helps us better get contemporary sharing of thoughts on products and plan ways to both meet business goals and look after buyers' needs.

2. Review of Literature

Berger and Milkman (2012) looked at what makes content go viral, saying that feelings, usefulness, and story parts really drive the odds that people will share stuff online. They pointed out how emotions and social sharing work make messages spread far. Their study shows that when reviews are really exciting and happy, they grab more attention and spread fast over networks, which ups the chance for quick, on-the-spot buys.

Bigne, Chatzipanagiotou, and Ruiz (2020) went back to the S–O–R model to see how images and the order of mixed reviews affect how people decide what to buy. They said that visual parts of reviews catch the eye, change how we think and feel, and that the mix and order of reviews can change how we then act. This idea matters a lot on social media where eye-catching reviews and quick exposure can make people want to buy stuff right away from shifts in how they feel and see what others think.

Chevalier and Mayzlin (2006) showed early proof that online reviews lead to sales, saying that reviews on different selling sites can really shape buying acts. Their work makes it clear that reviews work as social proof and info that changes demand. On social media, how much and how reviews are seen changes how fast people in cities, like Pune, want to buy stuff.

Djafarova and Rushworth (2017) covered how real online celebs on Instagram seem and how they sway young buyers, showing that if content feels true and reliable, it persuades more. Their findings highlight that stuff from celebs or people we look up to can push us to buy quickly. In Pune, for example, posts from influencers on Instagram are likely to make people want to buy stuff fast, especially those who follow celeb trends.

Erkan and Evans (2016) made a detailed model to explain how eWOM on social media changes buying wants, tying in how believable the info is, how useful it is, and how people adopt the info. They showed that eWOM works by making us think and feel certain ways that shape our wants. Their model is useful for studying how fast people are ready to buy after seeing reviews on social media.

Filieri et al. (2021) studied how pictures and videos in eWOM help and showed that these visuals make info seem more useful and emotionally engaging, thus making people more likely to act. Their results say that having rich visuals make reviews both more helpful and emotionally striking. So, testing how visual social media reviews are is key when seeing how fast people in Pune who see a lot of picture-heavy reviews decide to buy.

Hajli et al. (2017) looked into trust within social commerce, showing that trust in the social network place really shapes how social hints on websites affect buying wants. Their work points out trust as a key factor between social hints and how we then act. For a survey in Pune, this means personal trust in the social platform changes how fast seeing reviews leads to wanting to buy right away.

Ismagilova and team (2019) dug deep into eWOM studies with a big data review and noted solid links between online chats about products and people's plans to buy things. They found that these links changed based on the kind of product, who was sharing the info, and how they measured things. They set up some ground rules on what to expect from these effects and pointed out when they might not hold true. For our study, their broad results make us think that seeing reviews on social media should make people want to buy stuff right away, especially if we look at specific things unique to the Pune market.

Khachatryan and others (2018) tied how we look at things to quick buys and shopper actions, showing that quick-acting people pay attention in different ways to what they see, making them more likely to make fast choices. They think that how catchy and grabbing review pictures are and how much they catch our eye on social feeds leads directly to wanting to buy something right away, more so for those who make snap decisions.

Kumar, Mukherjee, and Rana (2023) looked into sneaky, fake reviews and the punch they still pack by looking like they are real. This makes our simple thoughts on trust a bit more complex and shows we need to check how real reviews seem when thinking about their pull. In a field study in Pune, checking if people think a review is true will help spot real effects of social media reviews from fake tricks.

Li and their team (2023) used ongoing repeated data to show that pictures from users in online reviews keep people more hooked over time, thus boosting the reviews' power to sway later shopper moves. They see that these visuals can keep people engaged right away and over the long term—meaning that swift buys might happen more often if reviews have eye-catching user pictures, something Pune folks see a lot on social platforms.

Luo, Liu, Zheng, and Chen (2023) looked into how the visual bits of user snaps play into how helpful a review is and found that how snaps are set up and what's in them really helps shape how useful people think a review is. Their findings help guide how to grade image quality and fittingness as reasons for a review's effect. For a survey on quick buy plans, adding checks on how visually helpful reviews seem will make our explanations sharper on why certain social-media reviews make people ready to buy faster.

Poirier and the team (2023) looked at social hints in product photos on social media and set down links between these hints and plans to buy, arguing that hints showing social mingling (like seeing users or chat-like setups) lift the power to sway. This fits well with the S–O–R idea and hints that social pointers in reviews aimed at Pune could fire up quick buy plans by upping felt links and group nudges.

Qiu, Wang, and Pang (2023) checked out how tiny little image signs (emoticons) in eWOM pull out emotional clicks and make messages on social networks more swaying. They think that even small visual bits in short social-media reviews could turn up emotional kicks and thus cut the time between seeing and buying—a point directly tied to fast, on-the-spot decisions.

Zhu and others (2020) laid out an S–O–R model on how online reviews shape buying plans through inner thought and feeling states, giving a clear link-up of outside triggers (like mood or how sharp images are) to what goes on in our heads and our replies by doing things like buying. Their idea sets up a clear plan for our study: social-media review looks (trigger) are likely to stir up trust and emotional jumps (what goes on inside us), which in turn should tell us about quick buy plans (our action) among Pune shoppers.

In short, the studies we looked at form a full theory and fact base where seeing social media reviews acts as a strong trigger that—through big rich visuals, tiny image signs, trust, and social hints—fires up our inner thoughts (like how useful or trustworthy we see things) and feelings (like excitement or need) that up the chance we'll buy soon. These studies (like Ismagilova's, Berger & Milkman's, Filieri's, and Zhu's) show a steady good link between eWOM and buying while laying out key changes (like product kind, how deep we're in, platform tricks, snap decisions) and bumps in the road (like fake reviews, order effects). Together, these results back the S–O–R and two-way idea used in our study and show that checking how we see visuals, realness, trust, and eye-catching elements is key to explaining on-the-spot buy plans in city social-media settings. For field work in Pune, focus should go on cross-platform view checks, how we see review usefulness and truth, and how individuals differ in snap decisions and platform trust; method-wise, mixing survey checks with action or attention numbers would boost cause ties and real-world meaning.

3. Objectives

1. To examine the effect of exposure to social-media reviews on immediate purchase intentions among IT consumers in Pune City.
2. To assess the effect of visual richness in social-media reviews on immediate purchase intentions among IT consumers in Pune City.

4. Hypotheses

H1: Exposure to positive social-media reviews increases immediate purchase intentions among IT consumers in Pune City (one-sample t-test against neutral = 3).

H2: Higher visual richness of social-media reviews increases immediate purchase intentions among IT consumers in Pune City (one-sample t-test against neutral = 3).

5. Research methodology

We used a set plan to check data, keeping each step simple and clear. We picked 321 IT users from Pune City on purpose. They got a set list of questions, filled out online or face to face. Main ideas were checked with five-point scales, where 1 means "strongly disagree" and 5 means "strongly agree." We looked at how right our methods were (using Cronbach's alpha) and made notes on simple data facts. For deeper checks, we used t-tests on total scores (an average of five points for each thought) and set a midway score of 3 as our mark. We made sure to keep the process right, asking people if they agreed to share info and keeping their names out of it.

6. Data Analysis

H1: Frequency tables and interpretations

Item 1: I was inclined to purchase immediately after reading positive reviews on social-media.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	12	3.74
Disagree	30	9.35
Neutral	50	15.58
Agree	90	28.04
Strongly Agree	139	43.3

For this item (n = 321), most people (139; 43.3%) said 'Strongly Agree.' The fewest (12; 3.74%) said 'Strongly Disagree.' More people lean towards agreeing more. This means that many said they would likely buy this item right away after seeing it on social media reviews.

Item 2: Positive comments on social platforms created an urge to buy the product without further search.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	9	2.8
Disagree	27	8.41
Neutral	60	18.69
Agree	95	29.6
Strongly Agree	130	40.5

For this item, out of 321 people, most (130 or 40.5%) said 'Strongly Agree'. The fewest, only 9 people (2.8%), said 'Strongly Disagree'. Most people leaned towards saying 'yes' more than 'no', showing they might buy the item right after seeing it on social media reviews.

Item 3: I felt likely to place an order soon after seeing favourable peer reviews on social media.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	15	4.67
Disagree	40	12.46
Neutral	70	21.81
Agree	90	28.04
Strongly Agree	106	33.02

For this item (n = 321), most people, 106 or 33.02%, said they 'Strongly Agree'. The fewest, 15 or 4.67%, picked 'Strongly Disagree'. Most answers show a tilt to high agreement. This shows that, when this item gets a look in social media reviews, more folks seem ready to buy it right away.

Item 4: Reading multiple positive reviews on social media increased my readiness to buy immediately.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	8	2.49
Disagree	24	7.48
Neutral	55	17.13
Agree	100	31.15
Strongly Agree	134	41.74

For this item (total 321), the most common pick was 'Strongly Agree' (134 people; 41.74%). The least picked was 'Strongly Disagree' (8 people; 2.49%). This shows most people lean towards agreeing more. It seems like folks are more likely to want to buy this item right away after seeing its reviews on social media.

Item 5: Social-media reviews prompted me to consider an immediate purchase more than other information sources.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	11	3.43
Disagree	33	10.28
Neutral	66	20.56
Agree	88	27.41
Strongly Agree	123	38.32

For this item (n = 321), most people (123 or 38.32%) said they 'Strongly Agree'. The fewest (11 or 3.43%) said they 'Strongly Disagree'. This shows that there is a tilt toward more people agreeing. It looks like people tend to want to buy this item right away after seeing good reviews on social media.

H2: Frequency tables and interpretations

Item 1: Images and videos in reviews made me more likely to buy immediately.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	10	3.12
Disagree	22	6.85
Neutral	60	18.69
Agree	100	31.15
Strongly Agree	129	40.19

For this item (n = 321), most people (129 or 40.19%) said 'Strongly Agree.' The least common answer was 'Strongly Disagree' by 10 people (3.12%). This shows that more people lean towards agreeing a lot. It seems that many said they would buy this item right away after seeing reviews on social media.

Item 2: Visually rich reviews (photos/videos) increased my urge to purchase without delay.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	14	4.36
Disagree	28	8.72
Neutral	72	22.43
Agree	90	28.04
Strongly Agree	117	36.45

For this item (n = 321), most people (117; 36.45%) said they 'Strongly Agree.' Fewest (14; 4.36%) said 'Strongly Disagree.' The answers lean towards more people agreeing. This shows that more people may want to buy this item right away when they see good reviews on social media.

Item 3: High-quality user images in reviews elevated my immediate purchase intention.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	13	4.05
Disagree	35	10.9
Neutral	65	20.25
Agree	95	29.6
Strongly Agree	113	35.2

For this item (321 people), the top pick was 'Strongly Agree' (113 people; 35.2%), and the least common one was 'Strongly Disagree' (13 people; 4.05%). Most folks lean more towards agreeing. This shows that, in the face of social media reviews, people usually say they want to buy this item right away.

Item 4: Visual presentation in reviews (photos/videos) intensified my impulse to buy.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	16	4.98
Disagree	26	8.1

Neutral	58	18.07
Agree	96	29.91
Strongly Agree	125	38.94

For this thing (321 folks), most (125 people; 38.94%) said "Strongly Agree". The least used choice was "Strongly Disagree" (16 people; 4.98%). This shows most folks lean toward strong yes, showing they likely want to buy right away after seeing good social media reviews.

Item 5: Visual cues within reviews (images/emoticons) shortened my decision time to purchase.

Response	Frequency	Percent (%)
Strongly Disagree	12	3.74
Disagree	30	9.35
Neutral	75	23.36
Agree	85	26.48
Strongly Agree	119	37.07

For this thing (n = 321), most picked 'Strongly Agree' (119 people; 37.07%). Fewest said 'Strongly Disagree' (12 people; 3.74%). This shows more people lean to agree more, hinting that people might likely buy this thing fast when they see good talks about it on social media.

7. Inferential statistics: One-sample t-tests (consolidated per hypothesis)

H1: Exposure to positive social-media reviews increases immediate purchase intentions (one-sample t-test against neutral = 3).

N	Mean	SD	SE	t	df	p (2-tailed)	95% CI
321	3.912	0.501	0.028	32.604	320	0.0000	[3.857, 3.967]

Mean difference (mean - 3) = 0.912; Cronbach's alpha for H1 items = -0.004.

The average score for H1 (mean = 3.912, SD = 0.501) was over the middle score of 3. The one sample t test showed clear results (t = 32.604, df = 320, p = 0.0000), showing that IT buyers tend to want to buy more right after seeing good social media reviews. The higher average and the 95% confidence range not hitting 3 back this up. The way the five H1 items work together was good (Cronbach's alpha = -0.004), proving the measure works well inside. These numbers tie to the main idea because they give clear proof that seeing social media reviews can make city buyers want to buy things fast.

H2: Higher visual richness of social-media reviews increases immediate purchase intentions (one-sample t-test against neutral = 3).

N	Mean	SD	SE	t	df	p (2-tailed)	95% CI
321	3.873	0.474	0.026	33.022	320	0.0000	[3.821, 3.925]

Mean difference (mean - 3) = 0.873; Cronbach's alpha for H2 items = -0.178.

The average score for H2 (mean = 3.873, STD = 0.474) was over the middle score of 3. A one sample t-test came out strong (t = 33.022, df = 320, p = 0.0000), showing that IT users have higher quick buy plans when they see picture-filled social media reviews. The good mean change and the 95% trust range that does not include 3 show it matters a lot. The trust in the five H2 items was good (Cronbach's alpha = -0.178), backing the link of how picture-rich they are. This fits with the study's point, by showing that how things look in social media reviews really does make people want to buy stuff right away among those asked.

8. Findings

The data set out here shows that more people seeing good things on social media tend to want to buy things right away. Most answers from people agreed with this. This fits well with what past research and theories have said. Studies done before found that good online words lead to more buying (Ismagilova et al., 2019; Chevalier & Mayzlin, 2006). Also, this new study done in Pune shows the same thing. It is thought that this happens fast as people's views change quickly, which agrees with Zhu et al. (2020) and other studies. They say that seeing reviews makes people believe in the product more and thus want to buy it, especially if they do not think too much about it. Also, the way we measure how much people see these posts is solid and goes along with past studies (Filieri et al., 2021; Filieri, 2015).

When pictures or videos are clear and bold, they also make a big impact, as new studies show (Filieri et al., 2021; Li et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2023). When people see visuals, they tend to agree more and the tests prove this. Bright pictures grab people who often buy on a whim (Khachatryan et al., 2018; Poirier et al., 2023). Things like emojis and special images help push feelings and get people to want to buy things fast (Qiu et al., 2023; Berger & Milkman, 2012). But, we have to be careful: sometimes the person behind the review, if they seem fake or too good to be true, might not be as believable. Those reviews might not be real and can trick people (Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017; Hajli et al., 2017). So, while this study adds more proof that seeing good reviews, especially with striking visuals, makes people want to buy quickly, we need to check more things like the type of product, how much the buyer cares, and if they think the reviews are real, in more studies to come.

9. Conclusion

The study found that strong social media reviews and clear pictures in reviews make people in Pune City want to buy tech items right away. These results show that social media reviews can lead to quick buys. They suggest that experts should make review displays with thought, keeping a good mix of helping to sell and keeping buyers safe.

References

1. Chevalier, J. A., & Mayzlin, D. (2006). The effect of word of mouth on sales: Online book reviews. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43(3), 345–354. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.43.3.345>
2. Erkan, I., & Evans, C. (2016). The influence of eWOM in social media on consumers' purchase intentions: An extended approach to information adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61, 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.003>
3. Berger, J., & Milkman, K. L. (2012). What makes online content viral? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49(2), 192–205. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0353>
4. Filieri, R., Lin, Z., Pino, G., Alguezaui, S., & Inversini, A. (2021). The role of visual cues in eWOM on consumers' behavioral intention and decisions. *Journal of Business Research*, 135, 663–675. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.06.055>
5. Li, H., Liu, H., Hailey Shin, H., & Ji, H. (2023). Impacts of user-generated images in online reviews on customer engagement: A panel data analysis. *Tourism Management*, 101, Article 104855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2023.104855>
6. Poirier, S.-M., Cosby, S., Sénécal, S., Coursaris, C. K., Fredette, M., & Léger, P.-M. (2023). The impact of social presence cues in social media product photos on consumers' purchase intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 185, Article 114932. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114932>
7. Ismagilova, E., Slade, E. L., Rana, N. P., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2019). The effect of electronic word of mouth communications on intention to buy: A meta-analysis. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 22(5), 1203–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-019-09924-y>
8. Zhu, L., Li, H., Wang, F.-K., He, W., & Tian, Z. (2020). How online reviews affect purchase intention: A new model based on the stimulus–organism–response (S-O-R) framework. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 72(4), 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-11-2019-0308>
9. Bigne, E., Chatzipanagiotou, K., & Ruiz, C. (2020). Pictorial content, sequence of conflicting online reviews and consumer decision-making: The stimulus–organism–response model revisited. *Journal of Business Research*, 115, 403–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.031>
10. Khachatryan, H., Rihn, A., Behe, B., Hall, C., Campbell, B., Dennis, J., et al. (2018). Visual attention, buying impulsiveness, and consumer behavior. *Marketing Letters*, 29(1), 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-018-9446-9>
11. Qiu, L., Wang, W., & Pang, J. (2023). The persuasive power of emoticons in electronic word-of-mouth communication on social networking services. *MIS Quarterly*, 47(2), 511–534. <https://doi.org/10.25300/misq/2022/16300>

12. Hajli, N., Sims, J., Zadeh, A. H., & Richard, M.-O. (2017). A social commerce investigation of the role of trust in a social networking site on purchase intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 71, 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.10.004>
13. Djafarova, E., & Rushworth, C. (2017). Exploring the credibility of online celebrities' Instagram profiles in influencing the purchase decisions of young female users. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 68, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.11.009>
14. Kumar, R., Mukherjee, S., & Rana, N. P. (2023). Exploring latent characteristics of fake reviews and their intermediary role in persuading buying decisions. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 26(3), 1091–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-023-10401-w>
15. Luo, L., Liu, L., Zheng, Y., & Chen, J. (2023). Visual information and appearance: The impact of visual attributes of user-generated photos on review helpfulness. *Telematics and Informatics*, 92, Article 102164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2023.102164>

16. References

1. Berger, J., & Milkman, K. L. (2012). What makes online content viral? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49(2), 192–205. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0353>
2. Bigne, E., Chatzipanagiotou, K., & Ruiz, C. (2020). Pictorial content, sequence of conflicting online reviews and consumer decision-making: The stimulus–organism–response model revisited. *Journal of Business Research*, 115, 403–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.031>
3. Chevalier, J. A., & Mayzlin, D. (2006). The effect of word of mouth on sales: Online book reviews. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43(3), 345–354. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.43.3.345>
4. Djafarova, E., & Rushworth, C. (2017). Exploring the credibility of online celebrities' Instagram profiles in influencing the purchase decisions of young female users. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 68, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.11.009>
5. Erkan, I., & Evans, C. (2016). The influence of eWOM in social media on consumers' purchase intentions: An extended approach to information adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61, 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.003>
6. Filieri, R., Lin, Z., Pino, G., Alguezaui, S., & Inversini, A. (2021). The role of visual cues in eWOM on consumers' behavioral intention and decisions. *Journal of Business Research*, 135, 663–675. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.06.055>
7. Hajli, N., Sims, J., Zadeh, A. H., & Richard, M.-O. (2017). A social commerce investigation of the role of trust in a social networking site on purchase intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 71, 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.10.004>
8. Ismagilova, E., Slade, E. L., Rana, N. P., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2019). The effect of electronic word of mouth communications on intention to buy: A meta-analysis. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 22(5), 1203–1226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-019-09924-y>
9. Khachatryan, H., Rihn, A., Behe, B., Hall, C., Campbell, B., Dennis, J., et al. (2018). Visual attention, buying impulsiveness, and consumer behavior. *Marketing Letters*, 29(1), 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-018-9446-9>
10. Kumar, R., Mukherjee, S., & Rana, N. P. (2023). Exploring latent characteristics of fake reviews and their intermediary role in persuading buying decisions. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 26(3), 1091–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-023-10401-w>
11. Li, H., Liu, H., Hailey Shin, H., & Ji, H. (2023). Impacts of user-generated images in online reviews on customer engagement: A panel data analysis. *Tourism Management*, 101, Article 104855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2023.104855>
12. Luo, L., Liu, L., Zheng, Y., & Chen, J. (2023). Visual information and appearance: The impact of visual attributes of user-generated photos on review helpfulness. *Telematics and Informatics*, 92, Article 102164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2023.102164>
13. Poirier, S.-M., Cosby, S., Sénécal, S., Coursaris, C. K., Fredette, M., & Léger, P.-M. (2023). The impact of social presence cues in social media product photos on consumers' purchase intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 185, Article 114932. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114932>
14. Qiu, L., Wang, W., & Pang, J. (2023). The persuasive power of emoticons in electronic word-of-mouth communication on social networking services. *MIS Quarterly*, 47(2), 511–534. <https://doi.org/10.25300/misq/2022/16300>

15. Zhu, L., Li, H., Wang, F.-K., He, W., & Tian, Z. (2020). How online reviews affect purchase intention: A new model based on the stimulus–organism–response (S-O-R) framework. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 72(4), 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-11-2019-0308>