



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



Perception of Differences between Traditional and Electronic Word of Mouth: Case of Czechia

Ing. Dušan Mladenović
Faculty of Economics and Administration
Masaryk University
Lipova 41, 60200
Brno, Czechia

Ing. Anida Krajina Ph.D.
Central European Institute of Technology - CEITEC
Masaryk University,
Kamenice, 62500
Brno, Czechia

Abstract

*The purpose of the present study is to explore perceptions of differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth in the context of Czech Republic through the Hofstede's cultural dimensions. Research design incorporates questionnaire as data collection method. Questionnaire consists of 111 opinion-based items and is based on scales previously utilized by Chu and Choi (2011) and Lam et al., (2009). Generally, findings support the notion that only **individualism** and **long-term orientation** exhibit significant influence on awareness of the differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth. **Uncertainty avoidance**, **masculinity** and **power distance** are proven not to be statistically significant predictors. One of the major limitations is the questionnaire in the English language, implying that it was not translated into Czech. Secondly, the research did not investigate the effects of past behavior or personality characteristics – although these two concepts received significant coverage in other literature streams. Findings contribute to the literature on communication and Word of Mouth research and marketing by delving into the cultural influence on social relationships and the Word of Mouth. On industry note, this study should assist marketers and communication strategists to understand the ever-growing necessity to amend a strategic approach towards different cultural entities, in both offline and online business environments.*

Keywords: *traditional Word of Mouth, electronic Word of Mouth, WoM, eWoM, differences, Czechia, cultural dimensions*

Introduction

Scholars and practitioners claim that Word of Mouth communication is a key driving force behind the success of products, services, and consequently companies (Brown, Broderick & Lee, 2012; King et al. 2014). Word of Mouth has been recognized and underlined as one of the crucial gluing bonds in communication triangle between the company, potential customer and existing clients (Li & Du, 2011). Therefore, it has been classified as the most reliable way to reach and influence target audience – but at the same time, the most challenging one (Nyilasy, 2006).

However, Word of Mouth communication received greater academic attention only during the second half of 20th century (Dichter, 1966). Some authors believe that Word of Mouth communication has been neglected compared to other study areas of communication and marketing (Eisingerich et al.



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



2015; Money et al. 1998). Regardless of the considerable number of publications and the large span of issues that has been addressed so far, group of authors (King et al. 2014) suggests that this study area is still in its infancy and that many study gaps are recognized and not covered scientifically (e.g. cultural influences, demographic implications, technological implications, cross-cultural comparative studies, differences between traditional and online Word of Mouth, role of trust and tie's strength in Word of Mouth communication etc.).

In context of major differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth communication, literature reports several contributions on this topic (e.g. Meuter et al., 2013; King et al., 2014, Huete-Alcocer, 2017). It appears necessary that further studies are needed in order to properly explore the scope, severity and eventual managerial implications of these differences, in particular in different cultural contexts (Swanson et al., 2011). It is without doubt that marketers would gladly know if the target audience behaves the same way in the foreign environment (Dawar et al. 1996), if the tie's strength or trust reflects differently (King et al., 2014). Since Word of Mouth can have a significant influence on sales of new and/or established products (Lam et al., 2009), companies and marketers should closely observe Word of Mouth communication patterns that occurs in targeted customer segments. In addition, Holland and Gentry (1999) claim that business entities that carefully targeted “*Word of Mouth initiators*” to specific ethnic segments could greatly enhance their overall marketing and business efforts. As a matter of fact, both offline and online Word of Mouth have a significant impact on brand equity (Kotabe et al., 1998). While traditional channels have a stronger impact on brand awareness, online Word of Mouth communications strongly influence brand image. According to Coulter and colleagues (2012), company-crafted communication is shown to have an important impact on functional brand image, while user-generated communication exerts a major influence on hedonic brand image.

Methodology

As the main method in this research, self-administered questionnaire as a tool for data collection has been implemented. The questionnaire has been completely composed, administered and managed online (so-called internet-mediated questionnaires). This implies that data collection and extraction have been fully automatized. Thereafter, follow-up data processing has been performed using statistical software. The questionnaire has been developed using Google Forms service, available at no cost. The closed-ended question has been utilized in the form of rating questions. In marketing and communication studies rating questions has been often used to capture opinions and accompanying data (Hewege & Perera, 2013). The rating question mostly utilizes Likert scale in which respondent has been asked how strongly he/she agrees or disagrees with respective statements or claims. For this study 7-point Likert scale style questions have been used (with following wording: 1 Strongly agree, 2 Mostly Agree, 3 Slightly Agree, 4 Not sure, 5 Slightly Disagree, 6 Mostly Disagree, 7 Strongly Disagree). The questions and scales were partially adopted from Chu & Choi (2011) and Lam et al. (2009). For the purpose of this research purposive non-probability sampling has been used.

The questionnaire has been disseminated using one of the following channels: email, instant messaging, direct contact and posting on online platforms. The questionnaire has been sent out to the individuals from 01.06.2019 up until 30.06.2019. In this period the answers were accepted. The Uniform Resource Locator generator has been used (goo.gl) so to be able to trace Click-Through-Rate and further assess the response rate. The questionnaire is accessible via provided URL and not attached to the message, so to avoid any malware or virus dissemination. In total, six hundred-thirteen (613) individuals have been contacted. CTR stood at 31.6%, which could be considered as a high response rate (Hewege & Perera, 2013). Total of one hundred ninety-four (194) filled out questionnaires have been submitted and processed.



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



Theoretical Background

Stokes and Lomax (2001) defined Word of Mouth communication as so-called “face-to-face” interaction between two or more people including receiver and sender of information. In this case, the one marked as sender is perceived as a strictly non-commercial source of information regarding the product, service, brand or experience. Otherwise, it would be the case of spontaneous Word of Mouth communication. The sender must not exhibit monetary expressible interest in recommending and promoting respective product or service. Due to this, Word of Mouth ultimately experiences high degree of persuasion (e.g. Silverman 2011; Mazzarol et al., 2007). As already indicated, traditional Word of Mouth is also considered to have a stronger impact on receivers, than marketing communications because it is perceived as independent of the commercial motive driving the messenger of marketing communications (Wien & Olsen, 2014). Group of authors around Rahman (2012), reports that typical consumers face a great portion of information coming from commercial sources. Same authors claim that the most reliable and trusted are information that is acquired from so-called personal sources. Personal sources could be characterized as a relatively strong emotional relationship and includes family, neighbors, spouse or friends. The common ingredient for mentioned social groups is strong social ties and mutual trust. Extensive list of studies confirms that the greater the similarity (or homophile) between the persons who send and receive information, the greater influence and organic reach of Word of Mouth message is to be expected (e.g. Brown & Reingen 1987).

Recently, public and academia face certain shifts in the way how Word of Mouth communication functions (Litvin et al., 2008). Namely, because of individuals’ ever-growing dependence on the modern technological solutions and platforms, so-called electronic, digital or online Word of Mouth communication emerged. Zhou et al., (2013) define electronic Word of Mouth as information which is passed via electronic means of communication. Defined in such a fashion, it implies a great technological footprint onto area of Word of Mouth communication and all applicable consequences it implies. Kietzmann and Canhoto (2013) consider electronic Word of Mouth as any statement individuals share via internet. This is utterly broad interpretation of the virtual phenomenon which neither precisely defines similar or distinctive points with traditional Word of Mouth communication. Somewhat more specific were Jansen and colleagues (2009), who openly supported findings that electronic Word of Mouth primarily refers to any message consumers share via internet-based communication platforms (e.g. website, social networking sites, instant messaging, news feeds etc.) about experience, product, service, brand or company (Jansen et al., 2009). Observed from marketing perspective, Word of Mouth in its essence is the simple act of individuals conveying specific intelligence about goods, services, brands or companies. If such a message should be communicated via internet it most probably has a form of reviews, tweets, posts, “likes”, “pins”, images, testimonials etc. According to Babić and others (2016), it represents one of the most significant developments in contemporary consumer behavior which is originally based on verbal communication, and by this closely connected to the original concepts of oral storytelling.

In context of differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth, extensive browsing of literature provides four main contributions. The most appealing framework is developed by coming by King et al. (2014). They formulated six major crossroad points between traditional and online Word of Mouth: enhanced volume, dispersion, persistence and observability, anonymity, salience or valiance and community engagement. Eisingerich and others (2015) followed up on the King et al.’s (2014) framework but observed from the standpoint of social risk perspective and expected risk behavior. Yet another contribution is coming from Barreto (2015) whereby author in brief review



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



paper provided critique of most prominent differences, but strictly focusing on technical prospects. The most recent addition to the current body of knowledge is coming from Huete-Alcocer (2017) whereby author in systematic literature review retrieved accessibility, credibility, privacy and diffusion speed as a major distinguishing marks between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth. As a concluding remark, these segregating points have not been tested against various cultural dimensions (Chen et al., 2018).

For this research, the original framework of King and other (2014) has been incorporated in the survey (enhanced volume, dispersion, persistence and observability, anonymity, salience or valiance and community engagement). Furthermore, the category variable has been created *awareness of differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth (AwaT)* to simplify the calculations. This construct summarizes all the differences as per King and others (2014) and is being tested against applicable cultural dimensions accordingly.

Originally, Hofstede (1980) constructed five dimensions that are widely utilized in cross-cultural studies: (1) individualism - collectivism; (2) power distance; (3) uncertainty avoidance; (4) masculinity - femininity and (5) long - term orientation. Additionally, Hofstede (2010) defines cultural dimensions as *“an aspect of culture that can be measured relative to other cultures”*. Defined like this, these set of cultural dimensions presents a solid ground for comparative studies in various cultural contexts (Søndergaard, 1994), including this study design and settings.

Findings and Discussion

The questionnaire has been sent out to the individuals within period of one month. According to the online metrics, it took everyone on average approximately nineteen minutes to fill it out accordingly (19:05). From the total of 613 contacted individuals, 194 filled out questionnaires have been filed. This represents the response rate of 31.6%. When it comes to the demographic structure of the sample, it included gender, age groups, education and income levels (which will be presented in the following tables).

Looking at the gender distribution (Table 1), males filled in total one hundred-eleven (55.7%) and females eighty-three (44.3%) valid responses.

Table 1. Structure of Dataset – Gender Division

	Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Male	108	55.7
Female	86	100.0
Total	194	

Source: Authors

The age group demographics are shown in Table 2 In total, 107 respondents belong to 26-34 age group (55.2%). In principle, generation Y dominantly populates the dataset. As per Zhang and colleagues (2017) this generation proved to be less responsive to the conventional marketing instruments provided directly by organization. Moreover, they do tend to collect opinions from the individuals in the proximity and consequently make their choices based on the assessment of those opinions. This so-called “connectedness” is supported by strong participation in both virtual and physical social networking venues (Zhou et al., 2013) Therefore, it is to assume their high relevancy for the scope of this study. Both 19-25 and 35-44 age groups hit 17.5% in distribution, which is 34 respondents per group). Fifteen respondents were older than 44 (7.7%), and only four individuals



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



were up to eighteen years of age (2.1%). Hereby, the individuals between 26-34 years of age do dominate the dataset.

Table 2. Structure of Dataset - Age Groups Division

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Up to 18	4	2.1	2.1
19-25	34	17.5	19.6
26-34	107	55.2	74.7
35-44	34	17.5	92.3
44 and above	15	7.7	100.0
Total	194	100.0	

Source: Authors

When it comes to the education level (Table 3), in total six options were available in the questionnaire. The biggest portion of respondents is on master level – 89 or 45.9% of the total number of respondents. 45 respondents are holding bachelor’s degree (23.2%), followed by forty (20.6%) high school graduates. 20 individuals (10.3%) are holding Ph.D. or higher degree. No reported responds without schooling completed.

Table 3. Structure of Dataset - Education Levels Division

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
High School Graduate	40	20.6	20.6
Bachelor	45	23.2	43.8
Master	89	45.9	89.7
PhD or above	20	10.3	100.0
Total	194	100.0	

Source: Authors

In observation of annual income (Table 4), in total seven options were available in the questionnaire. Eighty-two respondents (42.3%) have net annual income higher than 10501 EUR. As an extreme, forty-six (23.7%) individuals reported net income of less than 3000 EUR. Twenty individuals are within 9001 and 10500 EUR of net annual income (10.3%).

Table 4. Structure of Dataset – Income Levels Division

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
<3000	46	23.7	23.7
3001-4500	16	8.2	32.0
4501-6000	7	3.6	35.6
6001-7500	12	6.2	41.8
7501-9000	11	5.7	47.4
9001-10500	20	10.3	57.7



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



>10501	82	42.3	100.0
Total	194	100.0	

Source: Authors

To test the statistical relationships between predictor variables (cultural dimensions) and dependent or outcome variable (awareness of explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth) a multiple linear regression has been. Multiple linear regression is a technique that incorporates several explanatory (independent) variables to predict the outcome of a response (dependent) variable with the goal being to model the linear relationship between the variables (Saunders et al., 2009). Prior to the analyses, series of pretests have been performed to check for necessary assumption and if the dataset is suitable for this type of analysis at all (e.g. normality of data distribution for dependent variable has been performed, multicollinearity check, collinearity check, test for linear relation between dependent variable and independent variables). In order to check model’s fit, the following table (Table 5) reports one important coefficient – *Adjusted R Square*. Adjusted R Square indicates to which extent the model elaborates on the variance of the dependent variable (Field, 2013). This model, based on adjusted R square with five independent variables included, interprets and elaborates approximately 26.1% of the variance. The perfect case would be indicated if this coefficient is above .3 (30%) mark (Singh, 1982). Moreover, F statistics indicates that this is statistically significant finding in the respect of the model (*F value is 3.4919E-7* which is well below significance level of .05).

Table 5. Model Summary (IndT, MasT, PdT, LtT, UaT and AwaT)

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	.427 ^a	.182	.261	.629	.182	8.391	5	188	.000

Source: Authors

The following (Table 6) indicates the results of performed multi regression analysis on the set of independent variables and their influence and relation with dependent variable. The applicable model considered Czech national culture and respective scores on individual cultural dimensions.

Table 6. Multi Regression Analysis (IndT, MasT, PdT, LtT, UaT and AwaT) – Czechia

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations		
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
1 (Constant)	1.504	.225		4.230	.000			
Individualism	.219	.061	.087	0.064	.004	.205	.029	.050
Uncertainty Avoidance	.309	.081	.513	2.202	.191	.191	.330	.307
Masculinity	.110	.005	.074	.453	.405	-.102	.023	.024
Power Distance	.317	.055	.031	.268	.101	.016	.025	.023
Long term Orientation	.490	.031	.162	3.321	.001	.305	.201	.204

Source: Authors



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by

Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India

November 23rd and 24th, 2019



When it comes to the relation between perceived level of individualism in culture and dependent variable, the above model indicates that cultural dimension of Individualism has a positive relation with perceived difference ($\beta = .219$) with t statistics indicating that significant relation exists (p -value = .004). Therefore, model implies that higher (or increasing) levels of individualism will result in stronger awareness of explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth. As it was originally expected high (or higher) scores on individualism scale impose greater pressure on individuals to seek out for information (De Mooij and Hofstede, 2010). Therefore, as one gets in more engaged in Word of Mouth behavior, he or she should be more aware of explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth communication as they utilize more excessively both traditional and electronic Word of Mouth channels. Current results extend findings that individualism as a separate dimension does exercise overreaching influence on outcome variable - having in mind Czech national culture and its implications on this dimension.

In context to the impact of Masculinity dimension on dependent variable, the model indicates that statistically minor positive correlation exists ($\beta = .110$) whereby t statistics indicates no statistically significant relation (p -value = .405). Based on this outcome, model does not report masculinity as a statistically significant predictor variable. This further implies that higher valuing of masculine cultural dimension does not consequently leads to stronger awareness of differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth. Moreover, masculinity has been reported as one of the least contributing independent variables to changes in dependent variable (with *correlation coefficient* .023). The array of Hofstede's studies reported that Czech Republic scores higher on this cultural dimension (Hofstede, 1983; Hofstede, 2010). Based on these and background theory (Chen et al., 2018; Lam et al., 2009; Schumann et al., 2010; Eisingerich et al. 2015 etc.) the tested model indicates that although minor positive relation exists, accompanying statistics recognize this independent variable as a statistically insignificant predictor – which strongly collides with predicted outcome. Additionally, the model categorized this predictor as one of the weakest in terms of explanation power of changes of dependent's variable variance – practically implying that masculinity dimension is one of the weakest influencing factors on changes in awareness of explored differences between traditional Word of Mouth. Although it was originally assumed that the cultures that score high on this scale are to entertain greater need for information (King et al., 2014) because of proactive and competitive lifestyle that embraces social competitive behavior (Hofstede, 1983) - which consequently implies “proactive and aggressive” Word of Mouth behavior (Shoham & Ruvio 2008), In case of influence of Uncertainty Avoidance dimension on dependent variable, the model reports strong relation between the independent and dependent variable ($\beta = .309$) whereby t statistics indicates existence of non-statistically significant relation (p -value = .191). Implying that higher (or increasing) levels of uncertainty avoidance does not mean necessarily the greater awareness of explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth. When it comes to the predictive power of Power Distance cultural dimension in context of the dependent variable, the results indicate that a predictive capacity of this variable does not exist in this model, with reported $\beta = .317$ with p -value = .101. This implies that null hypothesis has been rejected, indicating statistically insignificant predictive capabilities. In context of the respective model, this implies that higher valuing of this cultural dimension does not lead to stronger awareness of explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth.

Lastly, the predictive capability of Long-term orientation as a cultural dimension has been considered in context of dependent variable. The model reports relatively strong relation and predictive capacity for Czechia, with $\beta = .490$ and with $p = .001$. These outputs imply statistically significant relation between the predictor and outcome variable. In context of the above tested model it implies that cultures scoring higher on long-term orientation as a cultural dimension should be more aware about the explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth. As a matter of fact, Czech Republic scores high on this scale and therefore it is expected that, according to Hofstede (2010), in its pragmatic context individuals tend to believe that truth depends on concrete situation, context and time (Holy & Holý, 1994). Originally, it was assumed that individuals originating from cultures with



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by

Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India

November 23rd and 24th, 2019



strong long-term orientation are inclined to think of the distant future (Jackson, 1995). To process many puzzling pieces of information, participants from high-scoring national cultures are expected to proactively inquire and challenge status quo. In context of Word of Mouth, aggressively and proactively engaging in opinion giving, opinion seeking and opinion passing – so to accommodate their ever-growing information needs (Lam et al. 2009). The present results of the multiple linear regression model report the strongest predicting power of this variable on the dependent one (AwaT).

Conclusion

The present research resulted in multiple outcomes that might be of increasing significance for the marketing and communications strategists in their cross-cultural marketing activities. Firstly, the focus of present study was to investigate explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth communication. As there is no such a study reported in current body of knowledge in context of Czech national culture, this research might be considered as a pioneering work that intends to extend the understanding of main differing points between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth and comprehensively emphasize the most appealing outcomes. These differences have been tested in context of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The results lead to mixed conclusions whereby **individualism** and **long-term orientation have been accepted as a powerful predictor of dependent variable** (AwaT – awareness of explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth). This implies, that cultures that score higher on these scales tend to experience statistically significant increase in awareness of explored differences between traditional and electronic Word of Mouth. While, on the other hand, **uncertainty avoidance, masculinity and power distance are statistically insignificant factors** to predict variance of outcome variable. Moreover, this outcome firmly confirms the reasoning that emerged from the respective theory.

A number of decisions and imperfections limit the work. Therefore, the results presented should be evaluated against the reported limitations hereby. Firstly, a single data-collection method has been utilized in form of self-administered questionnaire. Therefore, this could be considered as a mono-method based study which combines a questionnaire as a data collection tool and accompanying quantitative analysis that have been carried out. Secondly, the questionnaire is in English language, implying that it was not translated into Czech language, for data collection purposes. Thirdly, this research did not investigate the effects of past behavior per se or personality characteristics – although these two concepts received significant coverage in other literature streams. According to an extensive review of contemporary marketing literature, this is the first study to empirically compare traditional and electronic Word of Mouth, national culture and contexts of Czech Republic. The main outcomes should put pressure on study boundaries and consequently extend the respective study frontiers. Findings of this study specifically contribute to the literature on cross-cultural research and international marketing by delving into the cultural influence on social relationships and Word of Mouth. Secondly, in context of methodology, the research design and methodological approach could serve as a starting point in future studies focused on more profound investigations of implications of different set of independent variables on Word of Mouth communication (e.g. technology, religion, customs etc.).

In relation to the future research and study prospects, there are several promising venues to engage. Firstly, there is a solid chance that minor or radical changes in the sample (or the ways sample is perceived) could bring new insights. For instance, if the sample size would be amended so to include higher number of individual cases, it is to assume that results might experience deviations to certain extent. Future research may develop this concept further and apply the same research design on the larger sample to improve the generalizability of the present results. Additionally, some scholars suggest incorporating different national cultures in this context. Basically, the list of cultures explored in this context is rather short and considering the outstanding number of cultures around the Globe – there is a great room for investigations. Lastly, to investigate causalities between independent and dependent variable maybe new forms of structural equation modelling might be employed. This way,



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



even with the present data, new insights could be retrieved and consequently new (or amended) conclusions could be formed as a result.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Masaryk University under grant MUNI/A/1155/2018.

References

- Babić Rosario, A., Sotgiu, F., De Valck, K., & Bijmolt, T. H. (2016). The effect of electronic word of mouth on sales: A meta-analytic review of platform, product, and metric factors. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 53(3), 297-318.
- Barreto, A. M. (2014). The word-of-mouth phenomenon in the social media era. *International Journal of Market Research*, 56(5), 631-654.
- Brown, J. J., & Reingen, P. H. (1987). Social ties and word-of-mouth referral behavior. *Journal of Consumer research*, 14(3), 350-362.
- Brown, J., Broderick, A. J., & Lee, N. (2012). Word of mouth communication within online communities: Conceptualizing the online social network. *Journal of interactive marketing*, 21(3), 2-20.
- Coulter, K. S., Bruhn, M., Schoenmueller, V., & Schäfer, D. B. (2012). Are social media replacing traditional media in terms of brand equity creation?. *Management Research Review*.
- Chu, S. C., & Choi, S. M. (2011). Electronic word-of-mouth in social networking sites: A cross-cultural study of the United States and China. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 24(3), 263-281.
- Chen, M., Zhang, P., & Chen, X. (2018). Influence of Electronic and Traditional Word-Of-Mouth on Patients' Health-Care-Seeking Behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 46(5), 759-768.
- Dawar, N., Parker, P. M., & Price, L. J. (1996). A cross-cultural study of interpersonal information exchange. *Journal of international business studies*, 27(3), 497-516.
- Dichter, E. (1966). How word-of-mouth advertising works. *Harvard business review*, 44(6), 147-160.
- De Mooij, M., & Hofstede, G. (2010). The Hofstede model: Applications to global branding and advertising strategy and research. *International Journal of advertising*, 29(1), 85-110.
- Eisingerich, A. B., Chun, H. H., Liu, Y., Jia, H., & Bell, S. J. (2015). Why recommend a brand face-to-face but not on Facebook? How word-of-mouth on online social sites differs from traditional word-of-mouth. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25(1), 120-128.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage.
- Huete-Alcocer, N. (2017). A literature review of word of mouth and electronic word of mouth: Implications for consumer behavior. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8(2), 1256-1271.
- Holland, J., & Gentry, J. W. (1999). Ethnic consumer reaction to targeted marketing: A theory of intercultural accommodation. *Journal of Advertising*, 28(1), 65-77.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15-41.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 13(1-2), 46-74.
- Hofstede, G., & Minkov, M. (2010). Long-versus short-term orientation: new perspectives. *Asia Pacific business review*, 16(4), 493-504.
- Holy, L., & Holý, L. (1996). *The little Czech and the great Czech nation: National identity and the post-communist social transformation (Vol. 103)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hewege, C. R., & Perera, L. C. R. (2013). In search of alternative research methods in marketing: Insights from Layder's adaptive theory methodology. *Contemporary management research*, 9(3).
- Jansen, B. J., Zhang, M., Sobel, K., & Chowdury, A. (2009). Twitter power: Tweets as electronic word of mouth. *Journal of the American society for information science and technology*, 60(11), 2169-2188.
- Jackson, T. (1995). *Cross-cultural Management*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.



OUR HERITAGE

ISSN: 0474-903- Vol-67, Special Issue-9

“GRCF Dubai International Conference On Sustainability And Innovation In Higher Education, Engineering Technology, Science, Management And Humanities” Organised by
Global Research Conference Forum, Pune, India
November 23rd and 24th, 2019



- King, R. A., Racherla, P., & Bush, V. D. (2014). What we know and don't know about online word-of-mouth: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of interactive marketing*, 28(3), 167-183.
- Kotabe, M., Helsen, K., & Kotabe, M. (1998). *Global marketing management*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kietzmann, J., & Canhoto, A. (2013). Bittersweet! Understanding and managing electronic word of mouth. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 13(2), 146-159.
- Lam, D., Lee, A., & Mizerski, R. (2009). The Effects of Cultural Values in World-of-Mouth Communication. Source: *Journal of International Marketing* (Vol. 17).
- Litvin, S. W., Goldsmith, R. E., & Pan, B. (2008). Electronic word-of-mouth in hospitality and tourism management. *Tourism management*, 29(3), 458-468.
- Li, F., & Du, T. C. (2011). Who is talking? An ontology-based opinion leader identification framework for word-of-mouth marketing in online social blogs. *Decision support systems*, 51(1), 190-197.
- Mazzarol, T., Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. N. (2007). Conceptualizing word-of-mouth activity, triggers and conditions: an exploratory study. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(11/12), 1475-1494.
- Money, R. B., Gilly, M. C., & Graham, J. L. (1998). Explorations of national culture and word-of-mouth referral behavior in the purchase of industrial services in the United States and Japan. *Journal of marketing*, 62(4), 76-87.
- Meuter, M. L., McCabe, D. B., & Curran, J. M. (2013). Electronic word-of-mouth versus interpersonal word-of-mouth: are all forms of word-of-mouth equally influential?. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 34(3), 240-256.
- Nyilasy, G. (2006). Word of mouth: what we really know—and what we don't. V *Connected marketing: the viral buzz and word of mouth revolution*, ur. Justin Kirby in Paul Marsden, 161–184.
- Rahman, M. S., Khan, A. H., & Haque, M. M. (2012). A conceptual study on the relationship between service quality towards customer satisfaction: Servqual and Gronroos's service quality model perspective. *Asian Social Science*, 8(13), 201.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., Thornhill, A., & Wilson, J. (2009). *Business research methods*. Financial Times, Prentice Hall: London.
- Schumann, J. H., Wangenheim, F. V., Stringfellow, A., Yang, Z., Blazevic, V., Praxmarer, S., ... & Jiménez, F. R. (2010). Cross-cultural differences in the effect of received word-of-mouth referral in relational service exchange. *Journal of International Marketing*, 18(3), 62-80.
- Silverman, G. (2011). *Secrets of word-of-mouth marketing: how to trigger exponential sales through runaway word of mouth*. Amacom books.
- Singh, S. (1982). Field statistics in some generalized Jaynes-Cummings models. *Physical Review A*, 25(6), 3206.
- Søndergaard M. (1994) “Research Note: Hofstede’s Consequences: A Study of Reviews, Citations and Replications”, *Organization Studies*, 15(3), pp. 447-456
- Soares, A. M., Shoham, A., Farhangmehr, M., & Rubio, A. (2008). Exploratory behavior: a Portuguese and British study. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Stokes, D., & Lomax, W. (2001). Taking control of word-of-mouth marketing: The case of an Entrepreneurial Hotelier. Kingston Business School, Kingston University
- Swanson, S. R., Frankel, R., Sagan, M., & Johansen, D. L. (2011). Private and public voice: exploring cultural influence. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 21(3), 216-239.
- Wien, A. H., & Olsen, S. O. (2014). Understanding the relationship between individualism and word of mouth: A self-enhancement explanation. *Psychology & Marketing*, 31(6), 416-425.
- Zhou, L., Zhang, P., & Zimmermann, H. D. (2013). Social commerce research: An integrated view. *Electronic commerce research and applications*, 12(2), 61-68.
- Zhang, T., Abound Omran, B., & Cobanoglu, C. (2017). Generation Y’s positive and negative eWOM: use of social media and mobile technology. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 732-761.