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ABSTRACT

Failure to obtain consumer attitude recovery, resulting in negative word of mouth spreading over social media, could lead to brand crisis. Prior social network research has focused on antecedents of electronic word of mouth (eWOM) diffusion in social media and their effects, but only limited research has focused on brand crisis response strategy communication in social media considering eWOM diffusion antecedents and consumer characteristics. The current study argued that social influence, which includes information source homophily (i.e., similarity among members) and public opinions (i.e., message consensus) and consumer-brand relationship (CBR), significantly contributed to consumer attitude recovery via crisis response strategy communication effectiveness in online communities. This study explored antecedents that alter the degree of negative effect of negative eWOM and positive effect of crisis response strategy on consumer attitude. Social network theory was employed to explore the role of source homophily and message consensus, while the elaboration likelihood model was applied to explain the role of CBR on consumer attitude recovery after processing online information that included negative eWOM of the brand and brand response strategy. The research employed an experimental design on a well-known restaurant regarding unsatisfactory service recovery and crisis response strategy communication in social media. A total of 424 respondents were randomly assigned to eight scenarios. The study found that high-consensus information from high-homophily source produced a stronger impact than low-consensus...
information from low-homophily source. Accommodative strategy was prone to be preferable to defensive strategy. Surprisingly, high CBR generally did not buffer the negative effect of negative eWOM, and it likewise did not enhance the positive effect of crisis response strategy for life threatening incident. However, source homophily and message consensus mitigate the negative impact of negative eWOM on high-CBR consumers (compared to low-CBR consumers) while enhancing the positive effect on high-CBR consumers (compared to low-CBR consumers). This study introduced a framework of consumer attitude recovery in social media.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale

Social media applications such as blogs, microblogs, co-creation, social bookmarking, forums and discussion boards, product reviews, social networks, and video and photo sharing are employed to facilitate consumer-to-consumer or brand-to-consumer (or vice versa) online communication (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). Consumers use social media applications as online communication tools to forward positive, negative, or neutral responses regarding brand information to others, which is referred to as electronic word of mouth (eWOM). Litvin, Goldsmith, and Pan (2008, p. 461) based their definition of eWOM on Westbrook (1987) and defined it as “all informal communications directed at consumers through Internet-based technology related to the usage or characteristics of particular goods and services, or their sellers.” Information transmitted online impacts consumer decisions, as shown in Bennett (2012), which reported the Four Pillars Hotel’s findings that 52% of consumers are influenced by social media in buying decisions (i.e., booking rooms for travel) and change their original plans.

Online consumers are more active and involved in spreading information about products or brand (Brown, Broderick, & Lee, 2007). Consequently, online consumers can manipulate the brand and challenge it to protect its reputation (Gensler, Völckner, Liu-Thompkins, & Wiertz, 2013). For instance, Volkswagen’s emissions cheating scandal that went viral on social media in September 2015 caused the company to lose sales for at least 14 months (Fahmy, 2016). The rapid circulation of information over social media puts pressure on companies to perform quick remedies for issues occurring both offline and online as they impact brand reputation and can become a brand crisis (Coombs, 2007). In particular, negative word of mouth in service businesses (e.g., operation problems in airlines that cause flight delays, systematic problems in telecommunication businesses that affect reception quality, and overcharging for tickets and snacks at the cinema) can lead to a negative impact, such
as the creation of an anti-company Facebook page: for example, @IHateSouthwestAirlines, @TrueMoveBad, @rojamcineplex.

Brands may use social media applications as tools to generate brand awareness, brand knowledge, brand engagement, and word of mouth (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). As such, brands can communicate crisis response strategies to consumers via social media to recover from a negative eWOM crisis. Thomas (2018) reported that Balenciaga, a luxury fashion brand, was able to recover 27% of its sales after posting an apology letter on social media after a claim of discrimination against Chinese shoppers spread during April 2018 over social media platforms such as weibo.com. Apologizing is considered one of the accommodative response strategies, a dominant strategy that reflects acceptance of responsibility. Another dominant crisis response strategy used over offline communication platforms is the defensive response strategy, which is denying responsibility (Coombs, 1998). Prior researches have concluded that each response strategy is imposed to serve different crisis circumstances (Jin, Liu, & Austin, 2011; Mattila, Cho, & Ro, 2009). Thus, the crisis over social media platforms may require a different response strategy. To understand the phenomenon, research on diverse antecedents, including the source of the information, characteristics of the information, and customer characteristics, is needed in order to support a brand in recovering from a negative eWOM crisis.

As Salzman (2018) reported that 84% of consumers rely on word of mouth and recommendations from friends and family more than advertising. The source of information, particularly the relationship between the message receiver and the message sender, has an impact on communication effectiveness. In social media, consumers may engage in an online community, which refers to groups of people with common interests (Ridings, Gefen, & Arinze, 2002). The similarity among online community members’ attributes (i.e., homophily) affects communication effectiveness as imposed in social network theory (Brown & Reingen, 1987). Information from those with high homophily or similarity between message receivers and senders tends to exert greater influence (Brown & Reingen, 1987). The homophily among consumers in both online and offline network communication has been extensively explored in previous research (Brown et al., 2007; Brown & Reingen, 1987; Goldenberg, Libai, & Muller, 2001). However, limited research has explored the role of homophily source in crisis
response strategy communication, especially among members of online communities over social media platforms. Hence, this study proposed that information in the online community where people shared common interests (Ridings et al., 2002) would have a strong influence on its members.

Another antecedent that has an impact on online communication effectiveness is message consensus. The intensity of member comments on a post in an online community may amplify the ramifications of information dissemination. Consensus emerges when a majority are in agreement on the message content, such as the performance level of a product (Chiou & Cheng, 2003). Group members prefer consistent comments, and tension will be reduced when they reach a majority conclusion or consensus (Matz & Wood, 2005). Limited research has applied the role of message consensus to investigating crisis response strategy communication in the online community. This research proposed that high consensus would have a greater effect on crisis recovery than low consensus.

The final proposed variable that drives communication effectiveness is consumer characteristics. The consumer-brand relationship (CBR) refers to the tie between a person and a brand that is voluntary or is enforced interdependently between the person and the brand (Chang & Chieng, 2006). Consumers with a high CBR quality tend to forgive their preferred brands for misconduct (Fedorikhin, Park, & Thomson, 2008). Consumers will revise their attitudes and intentions after their previous evaluation (Oliver, 1980). Their prior positive attitude toward a brand for those with a high CBR will affect brand evaluation and attitude recovery. Empirically, consumers with high commitment as critical components of the CBR were prone to be involved in counterarguments with negative information (Ahluwalia, Burnkrant, & Unnava, 2000). Consequently, this research expected that CBR quality would have an impact on crisis response strategy communication effectiveness. In addition, the elaborative likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983) asserted that consumers with a high motivation to processing information (as an indicator of CBR quality level) employed the central route (i.e., a thoughtful consideration of presented information) when processing information. Consequently, their attitude is less likely to deteriorate when interacting with negative eWOM. Thus, this research argued that consumers with a high level of CBR quality will employ the central route, which is to
rationalize the essence of the message in processing crisis response strategy information rather than use peripheral cues such as message consensus and source homophily.

Planned (or paid media) communication, particularly advertising in social media, has been extensively explored (Knoll, 2015). Consumers have recognized that brands control their advertising message, which aims to produce positive effect through their selected platform. Researchers have scrutinized the impact of consumer-generated information, which is a form of uncontrollable message direction. The mainstream research has substantially focused on negative eWOM dissemination (Jalilvand, Esfahani, & Samiei, 2011); however, there is limited research on crisis response circulation that can help the brand to recover from negative eWOM.

This research proposed that effective crisis communication on social media can boost consumers’ attitude and lead to the recovery of consumers’ attitude toward the brand. This study focused on the effectiveness of crisis response strategy communication in social media after a customer receives negative eWOM about the brand from social media. It integrated online communication antecedents, which include homophily sources, message consensus, and the CBR into the investigation and emphasized the interactive effect among them. It also took crisis response strategy (i.e., defensive strategy and accommodative strategy) into account. The current study applied social network theory to explain the role of homophily and public opinion relating to message consensus. The elaboration likelihood model was employed to explain the role of CBR in crisis response strategy communication. Insightful consumer evaluation of crisis communication via social media can enhance the effectiveness of the brand’s response to negative eWOM.

1.2 Research Questions

(1) What are the roles of homophily sources and message consensus for crisis response strategy communication in the online community in social media for consumer attitude recovery?

(2) How does crisis response strategy communication impact consumer attitude recovery while considering communication effectiveness antecedents?
(3) How does the consumer-brand relationship influence consumer attitude recovery while processing negative eWOM and crisis response strategy communication from different homophily sources with different levels of message consensus?

1.3 Research Objectives

(1) To study the roles of homophily sources and message consensus for crisis response strategy communication in the online community in social media for consumer attitude recovery.

(2) To investigate the effectiveness of crisis response strategy communication from different homophily sources with different levels of message consensus.

(3) To explore the moderating effect of the consumer-brand relationship on consumer attitude recovery while processing negative eWOM and crisis response strategy from different homophily sources with different levels of message consensus.

1.4 Research Plan and Scope of the Study

This study employed experimental research to investigate consumer attitude recovery in social media. Two important social influence factors, deduced from social network theory, were analyzed in the context of the social media platform to find their effect on attitude recovery. The two social influence factors were homophily sources and consensus information. The research manipulated message consensus, homophily sources, and crisis response strategy while measuring consumer attitude changes over time while processing information from the online community over social media platforms. The pattern of attitude change reflected the effectiveness of different levels of antecedents. The research compared the respondents’ attitudes at three periods: before receiving the online information, after receiving the negative eWOM, and after receiving the crisis response strategy communication.

The respondents were students who were asked to evaluate a well-known chain restaurant in Thailand regarding service failure and unsatisfactory service recovery practice as well as crisis response strategy based on different message
consensus and homophily source manipulation. Respondents were familiar with the target restaurant, which allowed them to relate to the story in the experiment. For the empirical study in chapter 3, the research used repeated measured analysis of variance (ANOVA) to analyze the attitude change over the time period under manipulated variables. For chapter 4, the research used repeated measured ANOVA to explore the moderating effect of CBR on the relationship between proposed antecedents and attitude recovery as well as to examine the interaction effect of antecedents. Crisis response strategy effectiveness on consumers with different levels of CBR were determined under different manipulation conditions.

1.5 Expected Contributions

1.5.1 Theoretical contributions

This research produced significant theoretical contributions. First, the current research extended social network theory to expound crisis response strategy communication over social media platform. The study suggested that high homophily and high message consensus enhance the positive effect of crisis response strategy. The study intended to confirm the role of public opinion relating to message consensus while focusing on homophily source in social network theory that enhances the role of online community members in social media. The researchers hypothesized that a high level of message consensus led to a stronger effect on attitude recovery than a low level of message consensus, while information from high-homophily sources intensified the effect on attitude recovery more than information from low-homophily sources. This study suggests the application of social network paradigm on communication in social media for service recovery.

Second, this research employs holistic view to explore negative eWOM effect and the effect of second attempt of service recovery instead of snapshot view as in prior research (Lee & Cranage, 2012). Though accommodative strategy was generally a preferred response strategy, the current research hypothesized that defensive response strategy was a preferred strategy in some scenarios. The findings of the study explained that the CBR quality can moderate the influence of message
consensus, homophily source, and crisis response strategy on attitude recovery. High-CBR consumers were likely to prefer defensive strategy as they tended to against negative information of their preferred brand.

Third, the research applied the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) on the role of CBR on crisis response strategy communication effectiveness, which is reflected through attitude recovery. Prior research (Petty et al., 1983) employed the involvement level to study consumer motivation to process information. This research explore how ELM can be applied on consumer information processing when consumer process negative eWOM and response strategy. Hence, ELM should be applied further on consumer characteristic to extensively understand consumers for service recovery.

1.5.2 Managerial Contributions

Consumers tend to be more involved in the service business through the experience they gain. Consequently, the impact from negative eWOM that causes brand reputation to be harmed is relatively strong (Fisher, 2009). Customer attitude recovery is the focal strategy in recovering and sustaining brand reputation in the service business (Smith, Bolton, & Wagner, 1999). Effective communication with consumers is a strategic imperative to convert negative brand attitude into positive brand attitude (Liu, Jin, Briones, & Kuch, 2012).

This study asserts that online community members play essential role in attitude recovery as social influence on consumers attitude. The present research suggested that marketers should manage online community includes online community building, sustaining, monitoring, and employee training. In addition, marketers should understand in relationship development, relationship maintenance, and relationship recovery.

Online community should be developed through its enhancement of the relationship with consumers since consumers should feel as partner of the community. Brand should continually communicate with consumer via social media to sustain involvement with the community. However, brand should aware that consumers preferred user-controlled medium as they want to control the relationship (McWilliam, 2000). In addition, tracking and monitoring of online comment sentiment would allow
marketers to response accordingly while carefully frame public opinions via online social media platforms that the target consumers are members of to recover from online brand crises, as they tend to rely on public opinions.

Still, high-CBR consumers may prone to forgive their preferred brands for service failure or misconduct, but in severe situations, their attitudes may be difficult to recover. Nonetheless, high-CBR consumers are always valuable to the brand; thus, attempting to recover their attitudes from disappointment due to service failure of their preferred brands is essential in managing relationships with valuable customers. For instance, carefully framing sentiment of comments and reviews in online community platforms while communicating with high-CBR consumers via online communities lead to positive effect. This is deducted from the current research findings that public opinion (i.e., high consensus) of online community members in social media mitigate the negative effects of negative eWOM on high-CBR consumers. Furthermore, marketers should communicate accommodative strategy targeting to low-CBR consumers while communicating defensive strategy targeting toward high-CBR consumers.

1.6 Structure of the Study

This dissertation comprises five chapters. Chapter 1 is the introduction. Chapter 2, titled “Consumer Brand Attitude Recovery and Online Communication in Social Media” presents the diffusion of negative eWOM and response strategy communication, consumer information processing, crisis response strategies and service recovery, and the CBR and service recovery. This chapter provides the integrative proposed model of Consumer Attitude Recovery in Social Media. The findings discuss 54 related articles published from 2006 to 2017.

Chapter 3, titled “Consumer Attitude Recovery in Social Media,” reports on an empirical test of the research model. The chapter begins with online communities explained by social network theory, homophily source, message consensus, and crisis response strategy in online communities in the literature review section. The research model and hypotheses sections discuss the role of homophily sources, the role of message consensus, the role of homophily sources combined with message consensus,
and the role of crisis response strategy. The investigation is based on social network theory. The chapter concludes with the empirical findings from the experimental research and discussion.

Chapter 4, titled “Customer-Brand Relationship as Moderator on Crisis Response Strategy Communication and Brand Attitude Recovery on Social Media,” contemplates the CBR as the moderator of the relationship between homophily sources, message consensus, and customers’ attitude recovery. The model is deduced from the elaboration likelihood model. Empirical findings from experimental research are presented.

Chapter 5 Discussions and Conclusion provides integrative dialogue on the roles of the homophily source, message consensus, and crisis response strategy with respect to the relationship between consumers and the brand.
CHAPTER 2
CONSUMER BRAND ATTITUDE RECOVERY AND ONLINE COMMUNICATION IN SOCIAL MEDIA

2.1 Introduction

Consumers transform into information generators and transmit messages via social media such as blogs and social networks. A transmitted message, which is referred to as electronic word of mouth (eWOM), can be positive, negative, or neutral. The impact of positive and neutral eWOM is favorable toward the subject. On the contrary, a negative message induces the strongest impact on brand equity, particularly when the customer makes a complaint regarding a service failure on social media. This becomes a challenge for a brand to recover its reputation, since negative word of mouth on social media induces a stronger impact on brand reputation than traditional media and causes brand crisis. The crisis response strategies predominantly discussed include the defensive response strategy and the accommodative response strategy, while limiting the deployment of a response strategy is complicated. Previous researches have focused on the effectiveness of response strategies to solve the service failure issue (Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006; McCollough, Berry, & Yadav, 2000), while limited research has explored the effectiveness of crisis response strategies in relation to consumer information processing and its antecedents.

This chapter discusses the antecedents of consumer information processing in relation to brand crisis communication. Prior research has confirmed that message receivers process information based on message source credibility, the influence of others, and their characteristics (Litvin et al., 2008). This research contemplates how the essential antecedents of homophily sources, message consensus, and consumer-brand relationship can change consumers’ brand attitude after processing negative eWOM and response messages. This research extends social network theory to explicate the influence of public opinion (i.e., message consensus) as well as the node and network relationship (i.e., homophily sources) on the diffusion of information flow and the adoption of negative eWOM, and the subsequent implementation of a crisis response strategy. In addition, the characteristics of the node (i.e., consumer-brand
relationship quality) relating to the brand crisis situation and communication are included in this research.

Classical information dissemination research has shown that consumers commonly rely on high credibility message sources more than low credibility message sources (Wathen & Burkell, 2002). In contrast to consumers discerning online information, they willingly access and believe information from general online sources and online communities. Online communities are important information sources that are comprised of members with shared interests (i.e., high homophily sources; (Ridings et al., 2002). As information from a high homophily source is perceived to be more reliable than a low homophily source (Lee & Song, 2010), negative word of mouth and the response strategy communicated through online communities with high homophily sources should produce a stronger impact. However, a high consumer-brand relationship quality could buffer the impact of negative word of mouth on consumers (Santos & Fernandes, 2008).

This research systematically reviewed empirical evidence published in peer-reviewed academic journals from 2006 to 2017. The search focused on antecedents relating to eWOM and the role of the consumer-brand relationship in brand crisis recovery, resulting in the identification of 54 articles. The study categorized the research into three aspects: (1) crisis response strategies on social media, (2) crisis response strategies and information sources, and (3) crisis response strategies and consumer characteristics.

This paper is organized by first discussing the theoretical foundation of the paper, which includes the diffusion of negative eWOM and response strategy communication, consumer information processing, crisis response strategies and service recovery, and the consumer-brand relationship and service recovery. Subsequently, it continues with the research methodology and the research framework. The output of this paper contributes to social network theory by extending it to brand crisis communication, while including the roles of message consensus, homophily of message sources as well as node characteristics (i.e., the consumer-brand relationship quality) on information adoption (i.e., consumer information processing). A framework of the impact of brand crisis response strategies on customer attitude recovery after exposure to response strategy communication on social media is also introduced.
2.2 Diffusion of Negative Electronic Word of Mouth and Response Strategy

Communication

Litvin et al. (2008, p. 461) defined eWOM as “all informal communications directed at consumers through internet-based technology related to the usage or characteristics of particular goods and services, or their sellers.” Social media uses mobile and web-based technologies to produce highly interactive platforms that allow individuals and communities to share, co-create, discuss, and modify user-generated content (Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, & Silvestre, 2011). The rising number of websites and applications that offer user-generated content is affirmation of this essential aspect of online communication (Hinz, Skiera, Barrot, & Becker, 2011). For instance, in the tourism business, hotel reviews can influence consumers’ attitudes toward the hotel (Vermeulen & Seegers, 2009). Online reviews have induced a 10 percent change in room demand (King, 2012). Liu, Sidhu, Beacom, and Valente (2017) suggested that the network characteristics affected on the flow of information and behavioral adoption. Previous researches have proposed three network concepts: 1) network centrality (centrality degree, closeness, betweenness); 2) network cohesion (degree of interconnection among groups of nodes); and 3) structural equivalence (network positions that share similar patterns of connection with the rest of the network) in scrutinizing information dissemination.

Kempe, Kleinberg, and Tardos (2003) applied the network diffusion model to investigate the dynamics of eWOM that were dispersed among receivers and senders on a social network. The model asserted that each individual inactive node (i.e., not an adopter of eWOM or ego) has a tendency to become active (i.e., adopter of eWOM or alter ego) as more of his or her neighbors become more active. Consequently, social influence or contagion may occur when an ego adapts his or her behavior, attitude, or beliefs to those of others, including an alter ego in the social network (Leenders, 2002). Intensifying such contagion would enhance the negative effect on the brand, particularly when a bad experience induces customers to tell others about the service failure more than a good experience induces them to tell others about a good service (Hart, Heskett, & Sasser Jr, 1989). Therefore, the company should respond to control negative word of mouth. Word of mouth relating to a service purchase decision is
affected by non-interpersonal forces (i.e., receiver’s expertise, sender’s expertise, and receiver’s perceived risk) and interpersonal forces (i.e., word of mouth activity sought by the receiver, tie strength; Bansal & Voyer, 2000). Previous researches have examined various dimensions of eWOM, such as source credibility, eWOM message characteristics, social ties, the consumers’ role and involvement, and their influence on consumer intention and consumer response (Brown et al., 2007; Cheung, Luo, Sia, & Chen, 2009; Lee, Park, & Han, 2008). Meanwhile, Litvin et al. (2008) propose a conceptual model of word of mouth that can be applied to eWOM diffusion in social media and explore the eWOM outcome as shown in figure 2.1.

[Figure 2.1]

Figure 2.1 illustrated the role of mediating attributes relating to consumers and information source on word of mouth originator as well as on listener that lead to outcome toward brand. The current paper has adapted the model and propose diffusion of eWOM in social media as shown in figure 2.2.

[Figure 2.2]

The moderating variables that impact on listener decoding are source homophily, consumer brand relationship, and public opinion consensus which lead to eWOM outcome such as consumer brand attitude. Similar to Litvin et al. (2008)’ model, moderating variables that comprised of source evaluation such as source homophily, sociometric such as public opinion, as well as relationship between consumers and brand are included in the adapted model. Thus, in addition to other variables, information source such as public opinion in the network intensely influences consumer information adoption.

Previous research has applied the “threshold rule” on social network theory (Watts & Dodds, 2007). This rule asserts that individuals will shift from A to B only when a sufficient number of others have adopted B, as it is suggested that the perceived benefit of adopting a new innovation exceeds the perceived cost. Thus, large cascades of influence are provoked by a number of easily influenced individuals and not by the
influential (Watts & Dodds, 2007). To draw an analogy between this theory and negative eWOM, a receiver will adopt a message disseminated within the network when the message has been largely adopted by other members within the network. As such, message consensus can drive information adoption. Furthermore, acquaintances within a social network tend to have more influence on one another than some random individuals, while consumers are likely to have multiple—partly distinct and partly overlapping—groups of acquaintances (Watts & Dodds, 2007). Therefore, consumer homophily inflates the flow of information and information adoption.

Consumers have diverse motives for engaging in eWOM and include self-interest helpers, multiple-motive consumers, consumer advocates, and true altruists (Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh, & Gremler, 2004). Self-interest helpers are consumers who are motivated to employ eWOM with economic incentives. Multiple-motive consumers are those who are motivated to employ eWOM with multiple factors. Consumer advocates are consumers who are motivated to provide eWOM out of concern for other consumers. True altruists are those who are motivated to engage in eWOM to support other consumers and companies. As consumers generate online content based on their motives, brands should be well aware of the consumers’ motives and engagement to respond accordingly (Van Doorn et al., 2010; Wei, Miao, & Huang, 2013).

Furthermore, based on consumer information-seeking behavior, Wilson (1997) asserted that information-seeking behavior includes: 1) passive attention, 2) passive search, 3) active search, and 4) ongoing search. Passive attention occurs when information is acquired without the intention of seeking it. A passive search occurs when incidentally acquiring related information while performing another type of search. An active search occurs when seeking information. An ongoing search occurs when searching for information to expand an already-established framework. Information obtained from search behavior, whether generated by the brand or consumers, could impact the brand. Particularly, information obtained from consumer-generated sources tends to produce a strong impact on consumers’ brand evaluations (Lee et al., 2008).
2.3 Consumer Information Processing

Consumers evaluate information based on source credibility. Nonetheless, prior researches have studied some antecedents that impact source credibility, such as social ties, homophily, and consensus (Brown et al., 2007; Cheung et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2008). This section discusses the importance of source credibility in consumers’ processing of information. Afterwards, the roles of source credibility, social ties, homophily, and consensus in consumer evaluation are discussed.

2.3.1 Source Credibility

Yoon (2002) asserted that source credibility was originally initiated (Hovland, Janis, & Kelly, 1953) as an attribute associated with communicators who influence message receivers, and the determinants of source credibility, namely expertise and trustworthiness. Brown et al. (2007) claimed that consumers will assess the accuracy of a message based on its persuasiveness after they are exposed to it. However, knowledge of an individual’s attributes and background is limited in the online environment, and source credibility can only be evaluated from the impersonal text-based resource exchange delivered by actors in the network. Thus, their findings confirmed that consumers evaluate the source credibility of both the website and the individual who provides information to the website. Credible sources should have more expertise and be less prone to bias. The authors also asserted that source bias and source expertise are the criteria used when evaluating the source credibility of offline information while site trustworthiness and actor’s expertise are the criteria employed when evaluating online information.

Park and Lee (2009b) as well as Chu and Kamal (2008) also attested to the influence of the actor’s and platform’s credibility. Park and Lee (2009b) found that established websites create a greater impact than websites that are not well-established. Chu and Kamal (2008) highlighted the influence of the blogger’s trustworthiness and reported that the argument quality has a greater impact on brand attitudes when the blogger’s trustworthiness is perceived as higher rather than lower.

Negative eWOM can create an intense impact on consumer-based brand equity and induce brand equity dilution (Bambauer-Sachse & Mangold, 2011).
However, Park, Wang, Yao, and Kang (2011) found that using experience, credibility, and susceptibility also influences the eWOM effect. They investigated the impact of both the sender and the receiver on attitudes toward online reviews. The receiver factor in this case is consumer characteristics (e.g., internet experience) while the sender factor is source credibility. A positive eWOM message with a higher message source credibility indicates a better brand attitude than an eWOM message with a lower message source credibility (Wu & Wang, 2011).

2.3.2 Social Ties and Homophily

Consumers may evaluate source credibility based on relationships in the network. The network model is a framework that illustrates the relational pattern among actors in the system (Burt, 1980). Previous research has applied the network analysis framework to explore the relational properties (i.e., social ties, homophily) of word of mouth (Brown et al., 2007; Brown & Reingen, 1987; Goldenberg et al., 2001; Steffes & Burgee, 2009). Tie strength and homophily play important roles at both the micro and macro levels (Brown & Reingen, 1987). Brown and Reingen (1987, p. 354) defined homophily as “the similarity in attributes individuals possess who are in a relation (e.g., same or different social status),” and they defined tie strength as “a relational property that manifests itself in different types of social relations varying in strength (e.g., close friend, acquaintance).” They asserted that the receiver perceives information from strong-tie referral sources as more influential in their decision making than information from weak-tie referral sources. They also suggested that the flow of referrals is activated by the intensity of homophily. In addition, Goldenberg et al. (2001) found that a smaller personal network leads to a reduced strong-tie effect on the speed of information dissemination. They also affirmed that enhancing the number of weak ties increases the effect of weak ties while reducing the effect of strong ties.

Prior research has extended the investigation of social ties and homophily to online word of mouth (Brown et al., 2007; Steffes & Burgee, 2009). For eWOM, the consumer decision-making process is influenced more by information from a high homophily source than a low homophily source (Steffes & Burgee, 2009). Chu and Kim (2011) also found that tie strength, homophily, and normative and informational interpersonal influences regarding eWOM behavior on social network
sites are significantly related to opinion-giving behavior, while all variables including trust are related to opinion-seeking and opinion-passing behavior.

An example of a high homophily source is an online brand community. Online brand communities initiated by either companies or consumers are composed of consumers with common themes and goals (Jang, Olfman, Ko, Koh, & Kim, 2008). Active-participative belonging has a stronger impact on the level of satisfaction and affective commitment than passive and non-participative belonging (Royo-Vela & Casamassima, 2011). Therefore, the information disseminated by community members with high homophily may lead to opinion-passing behavior related to the brand response strategy.

2.3.3 Consensus Message

An eWOM consensus influences consumers’ evaluations (Lee & Song, 2010). Consensus on an internet platform is defined as the majority agreeing on the performance level of a product (Chiou & Cheng, 2003). Consumers use an information consensus to make causal inferences and induce confidence in their judgment (Kelley, 1973). They employ causal attributions of a consensus to evaluate brands when they receive negative word of mouth (Laczniak, DeCarlo, & Ramaswami, 2001). Furthermore, disagreements among group members induce discomfort. For this reason, interpersonal strategies in groups are required to reduce attitudinal discrepancies and ensure a group consensus (Matz & Wood, 2005).

Chiou and Cheng (2003) asserted that favorable messages and the number of messages (i.e., message consensus) impact the consumers’ brand evaluations. Balanced reviews with positive and negative aspects are perceived as the most credible. In the study by Ballantine, Au Yeung, Lindgreen, and Lindgreen (2015), negative reviews led to the lowest ratings of brand attitude and purchase intention while positive reviews led to the highest ratings of these two constructs. Hence, the effect of the crisis response strategy consensus on consumers’ brand evaluations should be investigated further.
2.4 Crisis Response Strategies and Service Recovery

Service failure that leads to a brand crisis can damage stakeholders physically, emotionally, and/or financially (Coombs, 2007). A crisis is an unexpected event that causes a threat to the organization’s reputation since it gives customers a motive to have negative thoughts about the organization (Coombs, 2007). Consequently, service recovery must be performed when service failures occur. Compensation, recovery speed, and apology lead to recovery satisfaction. Effective service recoveries can boost consumer satisfaction, purchase intention, and positive word of mouth (Maxham, 2001).

A communication strategy for crisis recovery between the service brand and the consumers is crucial. Situation crisis communication theory (SCCT) was proposed to explicate the phenomena (Coombs, 2007; Coombs & Holladay, 2002). The theory identifies three types of crises: (1) the organization as the victim, (2) accidental, and (3) preventable. It asserts that an organization’s reputation is affected by crisis severity, crisis responsibility, performance history, and crisis response strategies. Since the crisis response strategy is the focal element in serving crisis communication, Benoit (1997) and Coombs (1998) proposed distinct crisis response strategies. Benoit (1997) proposed various forms of response strategies, including denial, evasion of responsibility, reducing the offensiveness of the event, corrective action, and mortification. However, Coombs (1998) stated response strategies as a continuum, ranging from defensive to accommodative, as illustrated in Table 2.1.

| Table2.1 |

Negative eWOM relating to a brand crisis produces a greater effect than positive eWOM (Park & Lee, 2009a). Negative eWOM regarding a service failure is one of the communication issues that customers use to spread their dissatisfaction (Cantallops & Salvi, 2014). In addition, this becomes a significant crisis, which has a terrible effect on a brand’s reputation (Cantallops & Salvi, 2014). Unsatisfactory service recovery has an enormous impact on a loss of trust, negative word of mouth, and customer loyalty (Kau & Wan-Yiun Loh, 2006). This research proposed a crisis
brand recovery strategy in order to retaliate against negative eWOM and improve attitude recovery.

2.5 The Consumer-Brand Relationship and Service Recovery

Fournier (1998) proposed that the consumer-brand relationship (CBR) involves six facets: love/passion, self-connection, commitment, interdependence, intimacy, and brand partner quality. Love/passion is illustrated through brand irreplaceability. Self-connection is indicated by the degree a brand expresses the importance of the aspect of self. Interdependence refers to the intensity of consumption and interaction. Commitment is reflected through the intention to support relationship longevity. Intimacy refers to elaborative knowledge about the brand and belief in its superior product performance. Brand partner quality is the consumers’ level of satisfaction and the strength of their overall relationship with the brand, which includes trust and accountability. Prior research employed the elaboration likelihood model to study how these six facets (e.g., commitment) influence consumers in processing information (Eisend, 2013; Maheswaran & Meyers-Levy, 1990).

Petty and Cacioppo (1986) proposed the elaboration likelihood model to understand the underlying process of effective persuasive communication. The model proposed two distinct routes of persuasion: the central route (i.e., a thoughtful consideration of presented information), and the peripheral route (i.e., a simple cue in a persuasion context, including an attractive source). The peripheral cue strengthens its effect on a recipient’s attitude as the elaboration likelihood diminishes. Petty and Cacioppo (1986) suggested that attitudes originating from the central route are not prone to be affected by counterpropaganda. For instance, high-commitment consumers tend to engage in counterarguments with negative information (Ahluwalia et al., 2000). Ingram, Skinner, and Taylor (2005) affirmed that highly committed consumers are inclined to forgive the service providers for their unethical behavior when perceived harm is low. Their study proposed that the consumer-brand relationship quality has an impact on consumer information processing and crisis recovery.
2.6 Framework of Consumer Attitude Recovery in Social Media

This study proposed a framework of consumer attitude recovery on social media, as illustrated in Figure 2.3. The framework portrayed the influence of crisis response strategies, homophily sources, message consensus, and the consumer-brand relationship on attitude recovery. This framework extended the social network theory by focusing on crisis response strategy communication in social media. This research explored the homophily between message senders and receivers and the role of message consensus on social media. It also focused on the role of the consumer-brand relationship on crisis response strategy effectiveness.

2.7 Research Methodology

To enhance our understanding of crisis response strategies on social media as well as the role of consumer characteristics and eWOM antecedents related to the brand, the study conducted a review of empirical evidence published in peer-reviewed academic journals from 2006 to 2017. Based on Knoll’s (2015) review of advertising in social media, we searched titles, abstracts, and subjects for the terms “social media,” “electronic word of mouth,” and “negative electronic word of mouth” to ensure that the articles contained references to social media. The search terms also included “crisis response strategy,” “brand response,” “recovery,” “consumer-brand relationship,” “brand commitment,” and “consumer commitment” to find papers on brands’ crisis response strategies and the consumer-brand relationship. The search was limited to articles that provided empirical evidence related to crisis response strategies and the consumer-brand relationship on social media.

2.8 Results and Analysis

The study identified 54 articles published from 2006 to 2017 and grouped them into three main areas of investigation: (1) crisis response strategies in social media, (2) crisis response strategies and information sources, and (3) crisis response strategies and consumer characteristics, as illustrated in Tables 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4,
respectively. In this section, propositions relating to the information sources and consumer characteristics are introduced.

### 2.8.1 Crisis Response Strategies on Social Media

Brands employ crisis response strategies as persuasive communications to consumers, with the aim of recovering attitudes toward the brand after exposure to information regarding a service failure. Therefore, examining consumers’ evaluations of eWOM and the brand’s crisis response strategy would allow a company to respond to the situation properly; however, timely, consistent, and active responses are even more important than the crisis response strategy (Huang, 2008). A reputation-restoring crisis response strategy should be deployed particularly when the crisis is discovered by the media (Claeys & Cauberghe, 2012).

Perceived justice (i.e., distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice) has been studied extensively in the service recovery context. For example, procedural justice has a positive effect on repatronage intentions while distributive justice has a positive effect on positive word of mouth (Fan, Wu, & Wu, 2010) and repurchase intentions (Lin, Wang, & Chang, 2011). In addition, interactional justice has a negative effect on negative word of mouth (Lin et al., 2011), increases post-recovery satisfaction (Kuo & Wu, 2012), and has a positive influence on post-recovery loyalty (Yeoh, Woolford, Eshghi, & Butaney, 2015).

Previous research has investigated the impact of form, source (e.g., tradition, word of mouth, blogs), and crisis origin (i.e., internal, external) on consumers’ evaluations of an organization’s crisis response strategies. For instance, a crisis that originates internally induces stronger crisis emotions and anticipation of more accommodative organizational crisis responses, while one that originates externally tends to gain the public’s acceptance of defensive response strategies (Jin et al., 2011).

In addition, customers prefer to receive compensation when the service failure was caused by humans rather than self-service technology (Mattila et al., 2009). Customers also prefer a specific management response to a generic one (Wei et al., 2013), while online apologies are well accepted on online discussion boards (Timothy Coombs & Holladay, 2012). This is consistent with Facebook users who are prone to make positive comments when the company has used information-giving
strategies and accommodative strategies; however, bolstering strategies and third-party endorsements were not effective (Ye, Ye, Ki, & Ki, 2017). Therefore, when a brand decides to ignore social media and move legally against the disgruntled customer, it will induce negative outcomes on brand reputation (Zamani, Giaglis, & Kasimati, 2015). Therefore, this study proposes the following:

Proposition 1: The accommodative strategy is more effective for brand attitude recovery than the defensive strategy.

Table 2.2

2.8.2 Crisis Response Strategies and Information Sources

Previous researches concerning crisis response strategies and information sources presented in Table 2.3. The influence of social media creators has been examined in the context of bloggers as opinion leaders and trustworthy sources on brand attitudes (Chu & Kamal, 2008). As a result, response strategies should be aligned with the characteristics of the information source and crisis origin. Schultz, Utz, and Göritz (2011) affirmed that the medium of the response strategy communication is even more essential than the message itself. Offering service recovery through offline media is more effective than through online media (Harris, Grewal, Mohr, & Bernhardt, 2006; Schultz et al., 2011). The perceived information quality and style of social media platforms is lower compared to other communication channels (Berezan, Yoo, & Christodoulidou, 2016). However, Liu, Austin, and Jin (2011) proposed that using only offline communication does not suit all response strategies. They suggested that defensive, supportive, and evasive crisis responses should be communicated via offline media, while the accommodative response strategy should be communicated via social media. Therefore, online communication continues to play a vital role in the recovery of the brand from crisis.

Although a positive customer review is more effective than a positive brand response when the brand wants to recover from negative consumer reviews (Ullrich & Brunner, 2015), a brand’s social media presence enhances perceptions of responsiveness and repurchase intentions when recovering from a service failure (Song & Hollenbeck, 2015). Van Noort and Willemsen (2012) confirmed that proactive web
care could increase positive brand evaluations. It did enhance brand crisis recovery in the cases of Nike’s reframing of brand identity through the brand’s website (Waller & Conaway, 2011) and Toyota’s boosting of online engagement from their recalls through a consumer-driven environment, such as the Toyota Facebook page (Byrd, 2012).

However, Park and Cameron (2014a) asserted that brand response strategies that are communicated through consumers’ personal blogs are perceived as more acceptable than response strategies that are communicated through corporate platforms, since consumers’ personal blogs are more sociable and interactive, and induce eWOM engagement. Employing Twitter (compared to news releases) significantly lessens consumers’ negative evaluations of an organization undergoing a crisis (Xu & Wu, 2015). The news media generate the greatest impact with regard to crisis framing on social media compared to corporate communications, NGOs, and Facebook users (Etter & Vestergaard, 2015).

Prior empirical studies have shown that the information source has a strong impact on message receivers as suggested in social network theory, particularly when communicating a crisis response strategy to recover the consumers’ brand attitude. The essence attribute that enhances the message receiver’s intention to rely on the information source is homophily. In online communities, homophily was found to reflect credibility perceptions and generate the persuasive process in online discussion boards (Wang, Walther, Pingree, & Hawkins, 2008). It also boosts the overall adoption of new behaviors among community members (Centola, 2011). Therefore, this study proposes the following:

**Proposition 2:** Negative eWOM and a crisis response strategy communicated through high homophily sources induced a stronger effect on brand attitude than when communicated through low homophily sources.

**Proposition 2a:** Negative eWOM communicated through high homophily sources induced a stronger effect on brand attitude than when communicated through low homophily sources.

**Proposition 2b:** A crisis response strategy communicated through high homophily sources induced a stronger effect on brand attitude than when communicated through low homophily sources.
Opinions from the reference group have a stronger impact on consumers’ perceptions of corporate responsibility than vivid messages (Lee & Song, 2010). The online consensus regarding a brand’s crisis information affects customers’ attitudes toward the brand. When agreement about a brand’s negative information is high, purchase intentions are low. Thus, web care should shape or mitigate the negative effects and severity of high agreement and purchase intentions (Sreejesh & Anusree, 2016).

Purnawirawan, Dens, De Pelsmacker, and Kandampully (2015) suggested that no response is necessary when a minority of reviewers is dissatisfied with the brand. However, the brand should apologize and promise to resolve the problem when reviews are neutral. If most reviewers are dissatisfied, an apology, a promise, and compensation are required. Purnawirawan et al. (2015) found that readers’ perceived trust in the response mediated its effect on customers’ brand attitude. Their findings contrast with those of Lee and Cranage (2012), who revealed that a defensive response was a more effective strategy than an accommodative response in a low-consensus situation. However, both studies confirmed that a defensive response is the least effective strategy in a high-consensus situation. Therefore, this study proposes the following:

Proposition 3: A high consensus of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy induced a stronger effect on brand attitude than a low consensus.

Proposition 3a: A high consensus of negative eWOM induced a stronger effect on brand attitude than a low consensus.

Proposition 3b: A high consensus of crisis response strategy induced a stronger effect on brand attitude than a low consensus.

[Table 2.3]

2.8.3 Crisis Response Strategies and Consumer Characteristics

In online brand communities, belonging to virtual brand communities has an impact on customers’ affective commitment (Royo-Vela & Casamassima, 2011). Thus, community interactions induce greater brand commitment than information quality and system quality (Jang et al., 2008). With that being the case, customers who
have a close relationship with a brand tend to retweet or engage with the brand followers rather than their counterparts (Kim, Sung, & Kang, 2014).

Prior research has confirmed that negative information related to brand reputation and the service delivery process has an influence on consumer brand relationship (CBR). For instance, brand reputation is an antecedent of brand love (Melewar et al., 2015). Thus, negative eWOM that impacts a brand’s reputation would affect brand love (as part of CBR). Similarly, a good or bad service delivery process, resulting in positive or negative eWOM, would influence interpersonal antecedents (i.e., gratitude, partner quality, and social support) and brand love (Long-Tolbert & Gammoh, 2012). To emphasize the service recovery issue, perceived service recovery has an impact on the relationship intention and satisfaction (Kruger, Mostert, & De Beer, 2015). Trust mediates the relationship between service recovery satisfaction and cumulative satisfaction as well as between positive emotions and loyalty (Chaparro-Peláez, Hernández-García, & Urueña-López, 2015). Positive emotions toward a brand produce service recovery satisfaction (Chaparro-Peláez et al., 2015) while empathic concern, which tends to be high in high CBR consumers, lessens negative public attitudes toward stigmatized workers and eliminates the anger effect when the crisis severity is not too high (Pervan & Bove, 2015).

However, the essential role of CBR in service recovery is to mitigate the impact of service failure and enhance the effectiveness of the crisis response strategy. High CBR quality can boost the effect of recovery strategies with the intention of reinitiating the relationship (Huang & Xiong, 2010). Meanwhile, relationship quality also has an influence on service recovery satisfaction, purchase intentions, and purchase behavior (Wang, Hsu, & Chih, 2014). Previous research has extended the role of CBR further by focusing on some of its facets. For instance, Melewar et al. (2015) affirmed that brand love has an impact on affective commitment and consumer forgiveness. Concerning the partner quality facet, gratitude, brand trust, and satisfaction were explored in prior studies. Simon, Tossan, and Guesquière (2015) suggested that gratitude mediates the influence of the perceived complaint relationship investment on repurchase intent. Ha, John, John, and Chung (2016) asserted that affective trust has a larger influence than cognitive trust while both mediate the relationship between information perceptions from social network sites and behavioral intentions. Hegner,
Beldad, and op Heghuis (2014) affirmed that trust, satisfaction with complaint handling, and perceived value have an impact on repurchase intentions and word of mouth.

These findings regarding trust confirm the study by Santos and Fernandes (2008), who found pre-crisis brand trust to be the buffer for a brand during and after a crisis. Customers with relationship intentions will attempt to sustain the relationship when service failures occur (Kruger et al., 2015). For instance, when customers have favorable perceptions of the salesperson’s service behavior, the negative effects of service failures are mitigated (Inyang, 2015). Furthermore, the consumer’s focus of attention has an impact on consumers with prior positive attitudes toward a brand. For example, Chung (2015) found that prevention-focused consumers whose prior attitudes were favorable toward a brand were prone to evaluate it less favorably when information load was high, whereas promotion-focused consumers whose prior attitudes were unfavorable were prone to evaluate it more favorably.

Commitment is one of the critical facets of CBR. Previous research has extensively studied the role of customer loyalty as an attribute of commitment. For instance, Cambra-Fierro, Melero-Polo, and Sese (2015) asserted that customer loyalty moderates the relationship between perceived effort and recovery satisfaction. Consumers with strong brand relationships tend to favor post-recovery word of mouth of successful recovery attempts and loyalty to online retailers (Yeoh et al., 2015). They also perceived defensive responses as more appropriate than did consumers with weak relationships (Xia, 2013). High CBR consumers were likely to forgive and counter-argue the negative effects of eWOM. Therefore, this study proposes the following:

Proposition 4: With high CBR consumers, the use of the defensive strategy in online communities has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the accommodative strategy.

Proposition 5: With low CBR consumers, the use of the accommodative strategy in online communities has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the defensive strategy.

Social network theory suggests that the homophily source and message consensus intensify the effect of information on message receivers. However, low CBR consumers are prone to employ a peripheral route (i.e., source homophily,
public opinion consensus) when evaluating information. Thus, this study expected that a consensus of negative eWOM and a crisis response strategy from a high homophily source would intensify the impact on low CBR consumers.

Proposition 6: With a low-quality CBR, a high homophily source of negative eWOM and a crisis response strategy have more of an impact on brand attitude than with a high-quality CBR.

Proposition 7: With a low-quality CBR, a high consensus of negative eWOM and a crisis response strategy have more of an impact on brand attitude than with a high-quality CBR.

Proposition 8: With a high-quality CBR, the use of a defensive strategy in an online community with a high consensus and high homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than with a low-quality CBR.

2.9 Conclusions

This research reviewed empirical evidence and literature related to crisis response strategy communication and attitude recovery in social media published in peer-reviewed academic journals from 2006 to 2017. This paper discussed the current state of research regarding crisis response strategies on social media. The current study identified empirical evidence of antecedents of effective crisis response strategies, included timing, type of crisis response strategy, communication platform, information source, failure types, failure origin, and the quality of the consumer-brand relationship.

Appropriate online response strategies could generate positive consumer attitudes toward negative incidents (Lee and Song 2010). Consumer characteristics, particularly the quality of the consumer-brand relationship, influence the effectiveness of different online response strategies. Recognizing the impact of eWOM antecedents on attitude recovery can enhance marketers’ communication strategies in accordance with their organization’s goals in times of crisis.

This research extended social network theory and the elaboration likelihood model to crisis response strategy communication by investigating the relationships
among eWOM characteristics, antecedents of effective crisis response strategies, and consumer characteristics. For instance, homophily between message senders and receivers should be examined further to identify the role of online communities in consumers’ attitude recovery. In addition, the roles of the homophily source, message consensus, and crisis response strategies should be empirically investigated in the context of online communication. Consumer characteristics, such as the consumer-brand relationship, should be explored further to understand how consumers evaluate information using the elaboration likelihood model, which would enhance the value of high CBR consumers and recovery from brand crises.
### Table 2.1 Classification of response strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Strategy Classification</th>
<th>Response Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benoit (1997)</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Simple denial, shift the blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evasion of responsibility</td>
<td>Provocation, defensibility, accident, good intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing offensiveness of event</td>
<td>Bolstering, minimization, differentiation, transcendence, attack accuser, compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrective action</td>
<td>Plan to solve/prevent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortification</td>
<td>Apologize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombs (1998)</td>
<td>From defensive to accommodative</td>
<td>Attack the accuser, denial, excuse, justification, ingratiation, corrective action, full apology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombs (2007)</td>
<td>Deny response</td>
<td>Attack the accuser, denial, scapegoat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diminish response</td>
<td>Excuse, justification, separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuild response</td>
<td>Compensation, apology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.2 Crisis response strategies in social media; Summary of reviewed articles by publication years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Measured constructs</th>
<th>Related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Communicative Strategy and Form of Crisis Response</td>
<td>Crisis response (timely response, consistent response, and active response), crisis communicative strategies (denial, diversion, excuse, justification and concession)</td>
<td>(Huang, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The joint effects of service failure mode, recovery effort, and gender on customers’ post recovery satisfaction</td>
<td>Failure type (face-to-face, self-service technology), apology, compensation, gender</td>
<td>(Mattila et al., 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impacts of online retailing service recovery and perceived justice on consumer loyalty</td>
<td>Distributive justice, procedural justice, recovery satisfaction, repatronage intentions, positive/negative word-of-mouth</td>
<td>(Fan et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The effects of crisis origin, information form, and source on publics’ crisis responses | Form (social media, traditional media, or word-of-mouth), source (organization in crisis or third party), crisis origin (internal/external), acceptance of defensive (defensive/evasive), accommodative (supportive/accommodative), crisis emotions (attr
tribution independent/attribute
dependent) | (Jin et al., 2011)                     |
| The role of crisis type and response strategies                           | Performance related crisis, values-related crisis, response strategies (denial, reduction-of-offensiveness and corrective action) | (Dutta & Pullig, 2011)                 |
| Consumer responses to online retailer's service recovery after a service failure | Distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, customer satisfaction, repurchase intention, and negative word of mouth | (Lin et al., 2011)                     |
| Crisis response and crisis timing strategies                              | Crisis timing strategy (ex-ante, ex-post), crisis response strategy (response strategy, objective information only) | (Claeys & Cauberghe, 2012)             |
Table 2.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Measured constructs</th>
<th>Related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction and post-purchase intentions with service recovery of online shopping websites</td>
<td>Post-purchase intentions, post-recovery satisfaction, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice, emotions</td>
<td>(Kuo &amp; Wu, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology online in the discussion board, Amazon</td>
<td>Reaction to apology, behavioral intention, additional correction</td>
<td>(Timothy Coombs &amp; Holladay, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer engagement behavior and hotel response</td>
<td>Customer engagement (positive/negative), generic response strategy, specific response strategy</td>
<td>(Wei et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative online consumer reviews: effects of different responses</td>
<td>Attitude towards the brand, Trust towards independent source, brand strength</td>
<td>(Ullrich &amp; Bruner, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Crisis and Social Media: An Investigation into Extant and Prospective Consumers’ Perceptions through the Lens of Attribution Theory</td>
<td>Crisis response strategy (deny), company’s reputation</td>
<td>(Zamani et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational crisis communication on Facebook</td>
<td>Reputation management strategies, Information giving strategies, defensive strategy, accommodative strategy</td>
<td>(Ye et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 Crisis response strategies and information source; Summary of reviewed articles by publication years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Measured constructs</th>
<th>Related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service recovery in online service and offline service</td>
<td>Means, service types, remedy levels</td>
<td>(Harris et al., 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Justice and Email Service Recovery</td>
<td>Distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice, customer satisfaction, repurchase intensity, and positive word of mouth</td>
<td>(Neale &amp; Murphy, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer reviews reporting service failure and recovery</td>
<td>Trust, character development, detail, superiority, inspire, well written, service failure, service recovery, effective service recovery</td>
<td>(Black &amp; Kelley, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of consensus and vividness in eWOM and response strategies</td>
<td>Consensus, vividness, company evaluation</td>
<td>(Lee &amp; Song, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis information form and source on public acceptance</td>
<td>Traditional media, social media, word of mouth, third party, organization, acceptance, emotional response, defensive, evasive, supportive, accommodative</td>
<td>(Liu et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response strategy and Messages Medium</td>
<td>Apology, empathy, information, newspaper, Twitter, blogs, willingness to forward message tell friends, leave message</td>
<td>(Schultz et al., 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framing and Counter framing the Issue of Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Positive identity frames, collective action remediation frames, and positive consequence frames</td>
<td>(Waller &amp; Conaway, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalls and Toyota Facebook page in Stewardship Model</td>
<td>Reciprocity, responsibility, reporting and relationship nurturing.</td>
<td>(Byrd, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of opinion consensus and organizational response strategies</td>
<td>Consensus (high, low), response strategies (no response, defensive, accommodation)</td>
<td>(Lee &amp; Cranage, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effects of proactive/reactive webcare interventions</td>
<td>Webcare (proactive/reactive), brand evaluation, platform (user/brand generated), human voice</td>
<td>(Van Noort &amp; Willemsen, 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Measured constructs</th>
<th>Related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Roles of Conversational Human Voice and Source Credibility in Crisis Communication via Blogs</td>
<td>Tone of voice (human/organizational), source (public relations executive/private citizen), crisis response (defensive/accommodative)</td>
<td>(Park &amp; Cameron, 2014a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An analysis of Instagram images about the 10 largest fast food companies</td>
<td>Topic, tonality, negative emotion, poster identity, multimedia type, company reply, frequency of likes and comments</td>
<td>(Guidry, Messner, Jin, &amp; Medina-Messner, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How review set balance moderates the appropriate response strategy to negative online reviews</td>
<td>Review balance (positive neutral, negative), managerial response (refutation, no reaction, apology only, apology and prospective explanation, apology and compensation, apology and prospective explanation and compensation), attitude, patronage intentions, PWOM intentions</td>
<td>(Purnawirawan et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The value of social presence in mobile communications</td>
<td>Social presence, service recovery level, two-way communication perception, control perception, responsiveness perception, attitude, satisfaction, repurchase intention</td>
<td>(Song &amp; Hollenbeck, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook and the public framing of a corporate crisis: a case of Nestlé Kit Kat crisis</td>
<td>Sources (news media, corporate communication, NGOs, and Facebook users), cause, consequence, remedy, problem</td>
<td>(Wim JL Elving, Christa Thomson, Etter, &amp; Vestergaard, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of communication channels on communication style and information quality for hotel loyalty programs</td>
<td>Communication Style (customized, Professional, Interactive, Friendly, Attentive), Information Quality, Trustworthy, Clear, Useful, Timely, Thorough), Company website, Company employee, social media, personal WOM</td>
<td>(Berezan et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impacts of customers’ observed severity and agreement on hotel booking intentions: moderating role of wecare and mediating role of trust in negative online reviews</td>
<td>Severity, review agreement, wecare, trust, booking intention</td>
<td>(Sreejesh &amp; Anusree, 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4 Crisis response strategies and consumer characteristics; Summary of reviewed articles by publication years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Measured constructs</th>
<th>Related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-line brand community characteristics on community commitment and brand loyalty</td>
<td>Community characteristics (quality of information, quality of system, interaction, and rewards for activities), satisfaction, loyalty to the community</td>
<td>(Jang et al., 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequence of consumer trust in service recovery</td>
<td>Interactional fairness Trust, satisfaction with complaint handling, perceived value, repurchase intention and word of mouth</td>
<td>(Santos &amp; Fernandes, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control Response Crisis type</td>
<td>Crisis type (victim crisis, accidental crisis, preventable crisis), crisis response (deny strategy, diminish strategy, rebuild strategy), locus of control</td>
<td>(Claeys, Cauberghe, &amp; Vyncke, 2010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. code: 25605502310062FUA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Measured constructs</th>
<th>Related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The influence of belonging to virtual brand communities on consumers’ affective commitment</td>
<td>VBC belonging, VBC participative belonging, VBC non-participative belonging, satisfaction, affective commitment, positive WOM</td>
<td>(Royo-Vela &amp; Casamassima, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of companies’ responses to consumer criticism in social media</td>
<td>Vulnerability/defensiveness in response, brand personality (i.e. sophistication, perfect), relationship strength, sincerity, respect, appropriateness, satisfaction, purchase intention, positive word-of-mouth intention</td>
<td>(Xia, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand followers’ retweeting behavior on Twitter</td>
<td>Brand identification, community commitment, twitter usage frequency, brand trust, community membership intention</td>
<td>(Kim et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User-generated content behavior of the dissatisfied service customer</td>
<td>Altruism, Vengeance, venting, self-enhancement, economic, extraversion, UGC creation, attitude toward a firm’s response</td>
<td>(Presi, Saridakis, &amp; Hartmans, 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer response to service recovery in online shopping</td>
<td>justice theory elements (distributive, procedural and interactional), consumers’ embedded cultural models (relational, oppositional and utilitarian)</td>
<td>(Yeoh et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship intention and satisfaction following service recovery</td>
<td>Relationship intention, perceived service recovery, recovery satisfaction</td>
<td>(Kruger et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand evaluation; effect of brand relationship antecedents and consequences of brand love</td>
<td>Consumer brand relationship, brand loyalty, brand trust, satisfaction</td>
<td>(Veloutsou, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win-back strategy on reinitiating brand-consumer relationship (BCR)</td>
<td>Relationship Quality, service recovery satisfaction, purchase intentions and purchase behavior</td>
<td>(Wang et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interpersonal nature of brand love in service relationships</td>
<td>Positive/Negative service delivery process, interpersonal antecedents (gratitude, partner quality, and social support), brand love</td>
<td>(Long-Tolbert &amp; Gammoh, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How company responses and trusting relationships protect brand equity in times of crises</td>
<td>Denial, Diminish, Rebuild, Bolstering, no response, trust, brand equity</td>
<td>(Hegner et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of relationship quality in service recovery</td>
<td>Relationship Quality, service recovery satisfaction, purchase intentions and purchase behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relative impact of gratitude and transactional satisfaction on post-complaint consumer response</td>
<td>Gratitude, post-complaint</td>
<td>(Simon et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of loyalty and involvement in service recovery processes</td>
<td>Perceived effort, perceived justice, customer loyalty, involvement</td>
<td>(Cambra-Fierro et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Buffering Effects of Salesperson Service Behaviors on Customer Loyalty After Service Failure and Recovery</td>
<td>Perceived severity, post-failure customer loyalty, service failures, favorable perceptions</td>
<td>(Inyang, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving strategy for unintended criticism in online space</td>
<td>Prevention-focused consumers, promotion-focused consumers, favorable (vs unfavorable) prior attitudes</td>
<td>(Chung, 2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Measured constructs</th>
<th>Related literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship intention and satisfaction following service recovery:</td>
<td>Relationship intention, perceived service recovery,</td>
<td>(Kruger et al.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the mediating role of perceptions of service recovery in the cell phone</td>
<td>satisfaction following service recovery</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Emotions and</td>
<td>Positive emotion, trust, cumulative satisfaction,</td>
<td>(Chaparro-Peláez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Service Recovery in Business-to-Consumer Electronic Commerce</td>
<td>service recovery satisfaction</td>
<td>et al., 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatized service workers in crisis: mitigating the effects of negative media</td>
<td>Empathy (positive) and anger (negative)</td>
<td>(Pervan &amp; Bove,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal effects of information from social networks on online</td>
<td>Affective trust, cognitive trust, information perceptions from SNS and behavioral intentions.</td>
<td>(Ha et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behavior: The role of cognitive and affective trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1 Conceptual model of word of mouth (Litvin et al., 2008)

Figure 2.2 eWOM diffusion model with listener oriented
Figure 2.3 Framework of consumer attitude recovery on social media
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CHAPTER 3
CONSUMER ATTITUDE RECOVERY IN SOCIAL MEDIA

3.1 Introduction

In 2017, United Airlines’ stock dropped $1.4 billion due to the viral online clip of its staff’s act of violence toward a passenger, and its defensive response strategy worsened the situation (Shen, 2017). This incident suggested that consumer information processing in social media fostered a brand crisis. However, consumer information processing in social media also can help brands to recover from it. Effective online communication about the brand could shift consumers’ brand evaluation away from a negative perception. For instance, Nike was able to reframe its brand identity from its controversy on labor practice and human rights in the Asian nations that supply Nike’s product through its website with attempt to convey message of worldwide job creation as its business model (Waller & Conaway, 2011). This revealed that consumer evaluation diffuses online information, referred to as eWOM, and produces positive, negative, or neutral reactions. Thus, brands should understand the role of information source, information characteristics, and crisis response strategies to produce effective online communication.

Social media is critical tool of the computer-mediated technologies that facilitate communication over online communities. It increasingly influences consumer perception of the issue in question (Jansen, Zhang, Sobel, & Chowdury, 2009). Public opinion, distributed among members of online community over social media, play a crucial role in consumer eWOM evaluation. Online communities (or virtual communities) are defined as “groups of people with common interests and practices that communicate regularly and for some duration in an organized way over the internet through a common location or mechanism” (Ridings et al., 2002, p. 273). Online communities are likely to employ social media such as Facebook as a platform for communicating among community members since social media has advantage on high reach and effective communication (Laroche, Habibi, Richard, & Sankaranarayanan, 2012). Therefore, the current research focus on the role of online community in social media. In extending the role of online community on consumer eWOM evaluation,
homophily is an important attribute in online community that reflects the common interests of individual members.

In social media, public opinions of online community members become significant information sources in mediating the consumer decision process. Online communities influence individual member responses (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2002) because individual members trust people those with high homophily (Centola, 2011). For instance, 82% of TripAdvisor users make hotel booking decisions based on reviews on TripAdvisor, the largest online travel community (tripadvisor.com, 2017). In the hospitality business, travel information posted by other travelers is perceived to be better than marketer-generated information (Gretzel & Yoo, 2008).

In addition, consensus of public opinion in online communities also affects eWOM evaluation. Group members prefer consistency; thus, consensus would reduce the tension among group members (Matz & Wood, 2005). With that in mind, Lee and Cranage (2012) confirmed the impact of negative eWOM consensus and crisis response strategy on customer attitude in restaurants. Therefore, the current research focused on the role of homophily source and message consensus on consumer brand attitude.

Negative messages are perceived as more trustworthy than positive messages (Pan & Chiou, 2011). Therefore, negative eWOM produced a greater effect than positive eWOM (Park & Lee, 2009b). Negative eWOM can create an strong impact on consumer evaluation (Bambauer-Sachse & Mangold, 2011). For instance, 44% of those who read negative tweets about movies change their minds and do not go to see the movie without further discussion or seeking more information, while 26% discuss the movie, and almost 30% search for more information (Hennig-Thurau, Wiertz, & Feldhaus, 2015). This illustrates the important role of communication over social media regarding consumer attitudes toward products and brands. Negative eWOM generated by public opinion can lead to a brand crisis because it motivates customers to have negative thoughts about the brand, which threatens the brand’s reputation (Coombs, 2007).

Prior research focused on the influence of negative eWOM originating from the spreading of customer complaints on social media (Duhan, Johnson, Wilcox, & Harrell, 1997; Jansen et al., 2009; Kietzmann et al., 2011). However, a crisis forces brands to impose crisis response strategy and communicate the strategy to recover from
crisis. Researchers have explored the effectiveness of crisis response strategies (e.g., defensive, accommodative, apology) (Jin et al., 2011; Mattila et al., 2009; Wei et al., 2013), as well as communication platforms (e.g., blogs, online discussion boards; (Timothy Coombs & Holladay, 2012). Nevertheless, limited research has examined the influence of homophily source, message consensus, and crisis response strategy on consumers’ evaluations of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy communication in online communities.

Effective online crisis response strategy communication relies on information source (i.e., homophily) and information characteristics (i.e., message consensus) as well as crisis response strategy (i.e., defensive strategy, accommodative strategy). To enhance the existing concept of online communication and focus on the role of online community and public opinion with regard to brand crisis recovery, this research adopted social network theory to conceptualize the phenomenon. Social network theory affirms that message recipients trust information from those who are similar to them (i.e., high homophily) more than information from those who are different, and consensus of public opinion also influences them. Building on this theory, this research studies the role of homophily sources, message consensus, and response strategy in online communities.

The objectives of this research are threefold. First, the research aims to extend prior research on consumer eWOM evaluation to crisis response strategy communication in online communities. Second, the research presents a model that includes message consensus, homophily sources, and crisis response strategy to enhance understanding of how online community influence on crisis recovery. Finally, the study intends to test the hypotheses implied by the proposed model in the context of unsatisfactory service recovery resulting from negative eWOM.

The contribution of this research is to enhance knowledge regarding online community influence, focusing on homophily source and message consensus. The study expects to provide insight into the conceptual understanding of crisis response strategy communication for effective crisis recovery in online communities after unsatisfactory service recovery and its implications. This study compares the effectiveness of different response strategies in online communication with regard to attitude recovery under different social influence within online conditions.
A brief review of eWOM research is presented in the beginning of the chapter, followed by a detailed discussion concerning online communities explained by social network theory; then, homophily sources, message consensus, and crisis response strategy in online communities are discussed, respectively. Subsequently, hypothesis development is explained. Next, the research present research methodology and findings. Discussion and conclusions are presented at the end of this chapter.

3.2 Literature Review

3.2.1 Online Communities in Social Media Explained by Social Network Theory

E WOM is defined as all informal communication directed at consumers through Internet-based technology related to the usage or characteristics of particular goods and services, or their sellers (Litvin et al., 2008). Social media such as Facebook, YouTube and Twitter allow internet users to interact, express, share and create content about anything, including brands (Muntinga, Moorman, & Smit, 2011). Thus, many internet users create online community in social media in order to communicate among members who has similar interests. Online communities comprise members who share common interests (Zhou, 2011). People join online communities to exchange information as well as to seek friendship and social support, resulting in the reflection of a social entity of online community members (Ridings & Gefen, 2004). Social identity and group norms impact user participation in online communities (Zhou, 2011). Bagozzi and Dholakia (2002) asserted that attributes of online communities are specific interests, intrinsic connection with other members (i.e., interpersonal ties), shared conventions and language, community members’ content creation, and text-based predominance. Some attributes of online communities, such as community members’ content creation and text-based predominance, are related to eWOM as defined by Litvin et al. (2008). Thus, online community is the social media platform of diffused eWOM.

This study adopts the social network theory to portray the flow of eWOM and its interaction in online communities. The network model is the framework that illustrates the relational pattern among actors in the system (Burt, 1980). Burt
(1980) proposed two analytical approaches—the relational approach and the positional approach. The relational approach in network models reflects the degree of relationship between pairs of actors in which the actors engage in one or few relationships. The positional approach focuses on the pattern of relation, including specifying the actor’s position in a system in which the actor is one of many interconnected actors. Therefore, this perspective is similar to egocentric networks and whole networks, according to Haythornthwaite (1996). Egocentric networks indicate the number of ties and tie type, and exchange information type of individual actors to others. In contrast, whole networks provide the ties that all of the members of the environment maintain the ties with others. It is evident that previous research applied the network analysis framework to explore the relational properties (i.e., social ties, homophily) of eWOM (Brown et al., 2007; Brown & Reingen, 1987; Goldenberg et al., 2001; Steffes & Burgee, 2009). This pattern of relationship is reflected in the other two attributes of online communities, namely, intrinsic connection with other members (i.e., interpersonal ties) and shared conventions and language.

3.2.2 Homophily Source in Online Communities

Kelman (1974) proposed three processes of influence, including compliance (i.e., to obtain a positive reaction from others), identification (i.e., to see themselves as similar to others), and internalization (i.e., to preserve alignment with their value system). Previous research mainly focused on examining interpersonal ties, while studies regarding the role of homophily in online communities remain limited. Homophily is defined as “the similarity in attributes individuals possess who are in a relation (e.g., same or different social status)” (Brown & Reingen, 1987, p. 354). Brown and Reingen (1987) asserted that the flow of referral is activated by the intensity of homophily. This research focuses on homophily (i.e., shared conventions and language) because the dominant attribute of online communities is sharing common interests, with members of the communities being similar in one way or another.
3.2.3 Message Consensus in Online Communities

EWOM consensus impacts brand evaluation (Lee & Song, 2010). Message consensus is defined as two or more individuals agreeing on the performance level of a product (Chiou & Cheng, 2003). Consensus is one of the three information validity criteria (i.e., distinctiveness, consistency over time) that generates confidence in one’s judgment (Kelley, 1973). Disagreement among group members induces discomfort. Consumers prefer to believe in consensus messages rather than non-consensus messages (Chen, Shechter, & Chaiken, 1996). Therefore, interpersonal strategies in groups are required to reduce attitudinal discrepancy and ensure group consensus (Matz & Wood, 2005).

3.2.4 Crisis Response Strategies in Online Communities

With the immense amount of online information on social networks, computer-mediated communication allows brands to identify threats and crises for crisis management (Perry, Taylor, & Doerfel, 2003). A crisis is an unexpected event that causes a threat to the organization’s reputation because it causes customers to have negative thoughts about the organization (Coombs, 2007). Online crises can be categorized as (1) outages and unplanned disruptions in service (i.e., system failure); (2) harmful comments, hoaxes, or rumors (i.e., negative eWOM); and (3) outright attacks by detractors (i.e., attacks and rogue sites, hateful emails) (Hallahan, 2010, p. 416). Hence, based on online crisis category, negative eWOM could refer to harmful comments, hoaxes, or rumors in online communities generated by community members. Negative eWOM in online communities can cause an online crisis for the brand.

Stakeholder perception and crisis type play a major role in managing a crisis (Coombs & Holladay, 2002). Benoit (1997) suggested that perceptions are more important than reality. Hence, he introduced an image restoration strategy that includes denial, evasion of responsibility, reducing the offensiveness of events, corrective action, and mortification, while Coombs (1998) proposed response strategies ranging from defensive to accommodative. Accommodative response strategy refers to a response strategy reflecting responsibility acceptance and imposing remedial action.
In contrast, defensive response strategy refers to a response strategy reflecting the denial of responsibility (Coombs, 1998). Each response strategy was designed to serve different circumstances (Jin et al., 2011; Mattila et al., 2009). For instance, Facebook users tend to post positive comments when a company employs accommodative strategies, whereas defensive strategy was not effective (Ye et al., 2017). However, the current research expected that homophily source and message consensus (i.e., negative eWOM consensus, response strategy consensus) would affect the effectiveness of crisis response strategy (i.e., accommodative strategy, defensive strategy).

3.3 Research Model and Hypotheses

This research explored crisis response strategy communication for effective crisis recovery in online communities. It focused on the effect of the homophily sources and message consensus (i.e., negative eWOM consensus, crisis response strategy consensus) as well as response strategies (i.e., accommodative strategy, defensive strategy) on brand attitude recovery in online communities. The proposed framework in Figure 3.1 illustrates the relationship among these variables. The following section will discuss the hypotheses development.

[Figure 3.1]

3.3.1 The Role of Homophily Source

Consumers trust information provided by people who share common characteristics or homophily (Bhuiyan, 2010). Homophily prompts credibility and trust perceptions, which induce the persuasive process in both websites and online discussion groups (Wang et al., 2008). Consistently, perceptions of homophily also influence online network satisfaction (Wright, 2000). Hence, homophily becomes a significant predictor of a virtual community member’s desire to exchange information, especially to get information (Ridings et al., 2002). Homophily affects communication effectiveness among nodes in social networks (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011; Rogers & Bhowmik, 1970). Thus, online communities can generate a strong impact even when
members of an online community have weak ties (Garg, Smith, & Telang, 2011) because members of a community have something in common.

With regard to eWOM, the consumer decision-making process is more influenced by information from high-homophily sources than information that obtained from low homophily sources (Steffes & Burgee, 2009). Consumers with high homophily are inclined to search and absorb similar information (Liu-Thompkins, 2012). Consequently, high homophily persons are inclined to participate in online communities and share information among members. In online health communities, homophily significantly improved the overall adoption of new health behavior (Centola, 2011). In online music communities, online peers with high homophily have a positive impact on the diffusion of new music (Garg et al., 2011). Therefore, online communities become a vital platform for consumers to connect with others. Such effects are expected to apply to brand crisis information and crisis response strategy communication as well.

Hypothesis 1: Negative eWOM and crisis response strategies communicated through high-homophily sources induce a stronger effect on brand attitude than when communicated through low homophily sources.

Hypothesis 1a: Negative eWOM communicated through high-homophily sources induce a stronger effect on brand attitude than when communicated through low homophily sources.

Hypothesis 1b: Crisis response strategies communicated through high-homophily sources induce a stronger effect on brand attitude than when communicated through low homophily sources.

3.3.2 The Role of Message Consensus

Consensus of reviews has a strong influence on consumer evaluation (Kim & Lee, 2015). Prior research confirms that consumers are more accepting of information that a majority has agreed on even though the majority may have been against the idea in the beginning (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). Consensus ratings positively impact online trust (Benedicktus, 2011) and purchase intention (Jiménez & Mendoza, 2013). The ratio of positive and negative messages that reflect message
consensus impacts brand evaluation (Doh & Hwang, 2009). For instance, high ratio of negative message lead to negative brand evaluation. Consensus on negative reviews led to the lowest ratings of brand attitude and purchase intention, whereas consensus on positive reviews led to the highest ratings of these two constructs (Ballantine et al., 2015). Hence, a high consensus of negative word of mouth reduces the consumer-brand evaluation by attributing negative word of mouth to the receiver’s brand (Laczniak et al., 2001). Therefore, this research expected that consensus of negative eWOM (i.e., customer complaints) and brand crisis response strategy have an effect on brand crisis recovery.

Hypothesis 2: High consensus of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy has a stronger effect on brand attitude than low consensus.

Hypothesis 2a: High consensus of negative eWOM has a stronger effect on brand attitude than low consensus.

Hypothesis 2b: High consensus of crisis response strategy has a stronger effect on brand attitude recovery than low consensus.

3.3.3 The Role of Homophily Source and Message Consensus

Homophily sources and consensus message influence consumer evaluation. However, the present research expected that high-homophily sources would produce a stronger effect on consumer evaluation than consensus message. Chaiken (1980) suggested that homophily source (or likability) has a stronger impact on opinion change than argument consensus when consumers perceived the message as low in personal relevance. Consumers in familiar groups are more confident when making evaluations and focus less on consensus information (Sechrist & Stangor, 2007). In contrast, individuals tend to depend more on consensus information when groups are unfamiliar than when they are familiar (Sechrist & Stangor, 2007). Sechrist and Milford-Szafran (2011) also confirmed that consensus messages from in-group friends produce a stronger effect than consensus messages from in-group strangers. Therefore, the relations with group members reflecting homophily are expected to have a greater influence on crisis recovery than message consensus.
Hypothesis 3: Negative eWOM and communicating response strategy through high-homophily sources induce a stronger effect on brand attitude than negative eWOM and crisis response strategy consensus.

*Hypothesis 3a:* Negative eWOM communicated through high-homophily sources induces a stronger effect on brand attitude than high consensus negative eWOM.

*Hypothesis 3b:* Crisis response strategy communicated through high-homophily sources induces a stronger effect on brand attitude than high consensus crisis response strategy.

### 3.3.4 The Role of Crisis Response Strategies

Unsatisfactory service recovery produces a loss of trust, negative word of mouth, and loss of brand loyalty (Kau & Wan-Yiun Loh, 2006), which may lead to a brand crisis. Difference crisis response strategies have been studied to mitigate the impact of negative eWOM. Accommodation strategy and defensive strategy are imposed to recover from crisis. Accommodative response strategy induces a stronger effect for internal crisis origin, while defensive strategy is more effective for external crisis origin (Liu et al., 2011). For instance, consumers prefer an accommodation strategy such as compensation when humans cause a service failure, compared to when self-service technology causes the failure (Mattila et al., 2009). Online apology as part of accommodation strategy is also effective in an online discussion board (Timothy Coombs & Holladay, 2012). The current research focused on internal crisis origin; thus, the study expected that accommodative strategy is more effective. However, this study also expected that homophily source and message consensus affect response strategy effectiveness.

Consumers trust information provided by those with high homophily (Bhuiyan, 2010). Therefore, this study expected that negative eWOM from a high-homophily source would elicit an immense negative impact on consumer brand attitude, whereas an accommodative strategy would recover consumer brand attitude better than a defensive strategy. However, negative eWOM consensus also impacts consumer evaluation and organization response strategy (Lee & Cranage, 2012). With a low
consensus of negative eWOM, a defensive response is a more effective strategy than an accommodative response, whereas a defensive response is the least effective strategy with a high consensus (Lee & Cranage, 2012). Therefore, the current research proposed:

Hypothesis 4: The use of accommodative strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than defensive strategy.

Hypothesis 5: The use of defensive strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than accommodative strategy.

3.4 Research Methodology

This research applied factorial experimental design to investigate the relationship among constructs as well as the interaction effect in order to understand how homophily source and message consensus influence customer attitude toward brand and in which response strategy can recover customers’ brand attitude. The study explored how consumers perceive a difference degree (i.e., high or low) of message consensus from difference degree (i.e., high or low) of homophily sources while considering the response strategy of the brand. Consumers perceive that information from those who are similar to them (i.e., high homophily) is more reliable than information from those who are not similar to them (i.e., low homophily). Also, high message consensus induces a stronger impact on brand attitude than low message consensus.

In addition, when brand communication proceeds during crisis, accommodative crisis response strategy is preferred over defensive strategy. This research focuses on the interaction effect among homophily source, message consensus, and response strategy. Therefore, this research required participants to be familiar with online social network platforms in processing information, including comments from difference sources of information.

Using undergraduate students as participants fulfilled all requirements as they are familiar with online social network platforms. Students were chosen to participate in this experiment, as Enis, Cox, and Stafford (1972) proposed that
consumer behavior research may employ students as the subjects as long as they conform to the research context while reflecting internal validity. The study adopted Ahluwalia et al. (2000) procedure in choosing the target service and target brand. A restaurant was selected as the target service category because participants were familiar with it. A well-known national chain restaurant was chosen as the target brand because its CBR scores had a wide distribution.

3.4.1 Research Design and Procedure

Participants of this research were familiar with social networks and had service experiences with regard to their own purchase decisions for the well-known national franchise restaurant because the study aimed to explore customer attitude changes when they processed information in social networks. In this regard, this study discussed participants and design, independent variables and dependent variables, procedure, and manipulation.

3.4.1.1 Participants and Design

This research tested hypotheses by using $2 \times 2 \times 2$, a between-subject design with two sources of information that have difference homophily levels (low and high), two consensus levels (low and high) of negative eWOM and crisis response strategies, and two response strategies (defensive and accommodative). Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight scenarios or cells in table 3.1 and figure 3.2. The study collected the data from the sample of at least 50 participants in each scenario; thus, the total number of the participants is 424. Participants were undergraduate students from three universities in Thailand. Undergraduate students were recruited to attend this experiment because most of them are highly involved in and familiar with social media platforms and have their own experience with services. The students attended the experiments for extra credit.

[Table 3.1]

[Figure 3.2]
3.4.1.2 Independent Variables

High homophily source referred to information sources where members have similar attributes (e.g., same or different social status; (Brown & Reingen, 1987, p. 354). Homophily was measured in three items using a seven-point scale developed from (Lawrence, Fournier, and Brunel 2013; McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1975). The three measurement items were “A person like me/not like me,” “Somebody I can relate to/cannot relate to,” and “Different from me/similar to me in many ways.”

Message consensus referred to when the majority agreed on the comments (Chiou & Cheng, 2003). Three measurement items of a seven-point scale were developed from Lee and Cranage (2012). The items were “A majority of the comments supported the original complaint about the restaurant,” “Overall, consumer reviews indicate a negative impression of the restaurant,” and “There is a great deal of agreement among all the consumer reviews, providing a bad impression of the restaurant.”

Accommodative response strategy referred to a response strategy reflecting responsibility acceptance and imposing remedial action (Coombs, 1998). Conversely, defensive response strategy referred to a response strategy reflecting a denial of responsibility (Coombs, 1998). Four measurement items, using a seven-point scale, were developed from Lee and Cranage (2012). The items include “The restaurant apologized for the problem,” “The restaurant admitted responsibility for the problem,” “The restaurant shifted the blame to others,” and “The restaurant disagreed and argued with complaining customer(s).”

3.4.1.3 Dependent variables

Brand attitude can be defined as an individual’s internal evaluation of an object, such as a branded product (Olson & Mitchell, 2000). Four measurement items were employed, using a seven-point scale developed by (Olson & Mitchell, 2000). The items were: good/bad, dislike very much/like very much, pleasant/unpleasant, and poor quality/high quality. Attitude recovery refers to the degree of attitude difference between attitudes after receiving negative eWOM and the response strategy.
The measurement items employed in this study originated from a diverse scale range. For instance, brand attitude is adapted from five-point scales. The current study employed a seven-point scale ranging from 1 to 7 to better monitor the variation and enhance participants’ familiarity with the response.

### 3.4.1.4 Procedure

Participants were assigned to one of the eight scenarios. Afterward, the experiment was performed as shown in figure 3.3, which can be explained as follows:

[Figure 3.3]

**Step 1: Introduction**

First, participants were informed of the purpose of the research as being part of a dissertation. The researcher distributed the questions booklet and asked participants to complete all questions. The directions on the questions booklet stated that participants were encouraged to answer questions however they felt like it, and there were no right or wrong answers. All responses were anonymous.

Second, participants were asked to read and sign the consent form at the end of the session. The consent form was on separate sheet from the questions booklet to maintain the anonymity of the responses.

Third, respondents completed the demographic and preliminary data regarding lifestyle, social media behavior, and target brand familiarity.

**Step 2: Manipulation and Measuring Customer Brand Attitude**

The researcher instructed the participants to postulate that they were logging into their online social network account and that they would see the provided information on the questions booklet.

In the high homophily scenario, the respondents were assigned to be members of college students’ group in general. They were asked to read the information relating to student and campus life posted in this group. This was in contrast to the low homophily scenario, where respondents were assigned to be members of an
overseas housewives group; they were asked to read information relating to immigration and parenting posted in the group. The key information was highlighted. The respondents were asked to complete homophily manipulation check questions after they finished reading.

Next, respondents were shown the original post of a complaint about incident and unsatisfactory service recovery in the assigned group and were asked to read it. Next, they were also asked to read four comments in response to the original complaint before answering consensus manipulation check questions and their responses to the original complaint, including the customer brand attitude, in the booklet. This study employed Lee and Song (2010) testing technique to manipulate the consensus scenario. In the high consensus scenario, the respondents read three comments from people who had a similar experience or agreed with the original complaint and also read one comment that disagreed with the original complaint. In the low consensus scenario, the participants read three comments from those who had a dissimilar experience or disagreed with the original complaint and read one comment that agreed with the original complaint.

Afterward, they were shown the post of a corporate response strategy in the assigned group and were asked to read it. Then they were asked to read four comments relating to the response strategy before answering questions regarding the customer brand attitude in the booklet. Respondents were assigned to read either the accommodative response strategy or the defensive response strategy. Consensus of the response strategy was manipulated through comments similar to those of the original complaint. In the high consensus scenario, they read three comments that agreed with the corporate response strategy and one comment that disagreed with the response strategy. In the low consensus scenario, the participants read three comments of those who had a dissimilar experience or disagreed with the original complaint and one comment that agreed with the response strategy.

Thus, the questionnaire measured the customer brand attitude in three time periods. The first time period was before they read original complaints. The second time period was when the respondents had read the original complaints and comments. The third time period was when the respondents had read the corporate
response strategy and comments. The change in the customer brand attitude reflected consumer attitude recovery.

Step 3: Closing

Respondents were debriefed, and the researcher thanked them for their cooperation. Duplication was checked to see whether respondents had attended this experiment before. Snacks were provided.

3.4.2 Questionnaire Pretest

Back-translation and a qualitative pretest were performed to ensure the comprehension and validity of the questionnaire by the experts. Next, manipulation checks were conducted on a group of students. After all experiment processes and questionnaires had been verified, the quantitative pretest was administered to 40 undergraduate students.

3.4.2.1 Qualitative Pretest

Three respondents took a qualitative pretest. They were introduced to research objectives and asked to complete the questionnaire during August 2016. They were also asked to mark parts that may need adjustment on words/phrases/sentences while confirming the back-translation. The revised questionnaires were sent to these three respondents to validate the corrections. The scenario was tested on three students to ensure their familiarity with the online platform (i.e., Facebook) and service experience (i.e., restaurant).

3.4.2.2 Quantitative Pretest

Eight scenarios were tested on 40 undergraduate students. The results showed that the accommodative strategy improved unsatisfactory service recovery and attitude recovery more than the defensive strategy. Response strategy with high consensus also induced a stronger attitude recovery as well as response strategy communicated through high homophily sources.

The experiment in this study manipulated three antecedents. The stimuli were the homophily of the information source, information consensus, and corporate response strategy. The brand of the chain restaurant was selected by 40
undergraduate students based on their familiarity. The Facebook interface was used in the experiment because all respondents had experienced it.

Brand familiarity was measured in three items of a seven-point scale developed from (Kent & Allen, 1994). The items are unfamiliarity/familiarity, inexperienced/experienced, and not knowledgeable/knowledgeable. Forty respondents completed the brand familiarity questions with the mean value of 3.3 and the standard deviation value of 1.68. Familiarity among eight groups was not statistically significantly different ($F = 553, p = .787$).

Information or posts were provided in two groups (i.e., high/low homophily), reflecting the lifestyle of the members of the group. The group of college students was assigned the “High Homophily” scenario. Posts in this group related to student life and campus life. In contrast, the housewives in the overseas group were assigned the low homophily scenario. Posts in this group related to parenting and immigration. Twenty respondents in the high homophily group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.48 and the standard deviation value of 1.11. Twenty respondents in the low homophily group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 2.72 and the standard deviation value of 0.92. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 30.196^*, p = .000$).

Four comments in response to the original message were provided according to the assigned scenario. Three out of the four comments either agreed or disagreed with the original message according to the study on consensus of Lee and Cranage (2012). Twenty respondents in the low consensus group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.93 and the standard deviation value of 0.69. Twenty respondents in the high consensus group also completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 5.1 and the standard deviation value of 1.11. These two groups are significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 15.975^*, p = .000$).

Respondents were asked to read either the defensive strategy or accommodative strategy, according to the assigned scenario. Twenty respondents in the defensive strategy group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.4 and the standard deviation value of 1.28. Twenty respondents in the accommodative strategy group also completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.7 and
the standard deviation value of 1.07. These two groups are significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 12.117^*, p = .001$). This study employed ANOVA on consumer attitude related to response strategy, homophily source, and message consensus. Cronbach’s alpha of all variables exceeded 0.7, reflecting internal consistency for reliability, as shown in table 3.2.

[Table 3.2]

### 3.4.3 Main Study Manipulation Check

A total of 424 undergraduate students attended the experiment. Eight scenarios with two levels of homophily and consensus and two types of response strategies were tested on respondents. Information or posts were provided in two groups (i.e., high/low homophily), reflecting the lifestyle of the members of the group. The group of college students was assigned to a high homophily scenario. Posts in this group related to student life and campus life. In contrast, the housewives in the overseas group were assigned to a low homophily scenario. Posts in this group related to parenting and immigration. In the high homophily group, 212 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.63 and the standard deviation value of 1.43. In the low homophily group, 212 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 2.47 and the standard deviation value of 1.21. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 279.948^*, p = .000$).

Four comments in response to the original message were provided according to the assigned scenario. Three out of the four comments either agreed or disagreed with the original message. In the high consensus group, 214 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 5.07 and the standard deviation value of 1.19. In the low consensus group, 210 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.09 and the standard deviation value of 1.25. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 277.471^*, p = .000$).

Respondents were asked to read either the defensive strategy or the accommodative strategy according to the assigned scenario; 214 respondents in the defensive strategy group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.39...
and the standard deviation value of 1.17, and 210 respondents in the accommodative strategy group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.97 and the standard deviation value of 1.10. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 202.505, p = .000$).

### 3.4.3.1 Validity and Reliability Test

This study found that all domain variables have convergent validity and reliability. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) of homophily (0.892), consensus (0.831), and response strategy (0.647) are above 0.5, which confirms convergent validity. In addition, composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha of all domain variables exceed 0.7, reflecting internal consistency for reliability, as shown in table 3.3. The loadings of all measurement items of each construct are above 0.541.

[Table 3.3]

### 3.5 Findings

#### 3.5.1 Respondent Profile

As this study aimed to explore the impact of eWOM and response strategy communication on attitude recovery, undergraduate students in the junior and senior levels were targeted in this research because they tend to have more experience in evaluating online information than students in lower levels of education. Also, higher-level students tend to be more familiar with the target brand in the experiment.

A total of 505 undergraduate students from universities in Thailand attended the experiment at the end of their regular classes. Eighty-one respondents were excluded from the analysis due to incomplete information and manipulation doubts. Thus, 424 respondents remained in the analysis, equivalent to a 83.96% response rate. Of those, 72.6% (308) were female and 27.1% (115) were male. Forty-two percent of respondents were age 21. Furthermore, 44.1% of respondents had experience in social media for four to six years, and 42.7% of them had experience in social media for more than seven years. The number of respondents per scenario and average attitude before
the negative eWOM treatment \((A_0)\), after negative eWOM \((A_1)\), and after response strategy \((A_2)\) are shown in table 3.4 and table 3.5:

[Table 3.4]
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3.5.2 The Role of Homophily Source

To test hypothesis 1a, which stated that negative eWOM communicated through a high-homophily source elicits greater effects on brand attitude than that communicated through a low-homophily source, the two-way repeated measure ANOVA with homophily source was run on respondent attitudes. Data of 424 respondents from all eight scenarios were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of homophily and attitude is statistically significant \((F = 9.683^*, p = .002)\). Contrasting of the average attitude level before the eWOM treatment and after the eWOM treatment were employed to explore the effect \((X_{NE})\).

The result reveal that information from high-homophily source \((X_{NE-HH} = 0.402^*, p = .000)\) has greater impact than information from low homophily source \((X_{NE-LL-HH} = 0.208^*, p = .000)\). The attitude level of before eWOM treatment \((A_0)\) and after eWOM treatment \((A_1)\) are shown in figure 3.4. Thus, hypothesis 1a is supported.

[Figure 3.4]

To test hypothesis 1b, which stated that crisis response strategy communicated through a high-homophily source elicited a stronger effect on brand attitude than that communicated through a low homophily source, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with homophily source was tested on respondent attitude. Data of 424 respondents from all eight scenarios were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of homophily and attitude is statistically significant \((F = 8.979^*, p = .003)\). The average attitude level before the response strategy treatment and after response strategy treatment were contrasted to explore the effect \((X_{RE})\).
Response strategy from high-homophily sources ($\bar{X}_{RE-Hi-HM} = 0.094, p = .068$) has greater positive impact than response strategy from low homophily sources ($\bar{X}_{RE-Lo-HM} = -0.124^*, p = .016$). The attitude level before eWOM treatment ($A_0$), after eWOM treatment ($A_1$), and after response strategy treatment ($A_2$) are shown in figure 3.5. Thus, hypothesis 1b is supported.

[Figure 3.5]

### 3.5.3 The Role of Message Consensus

Next, to test hypothesis 2a, which stated that a high consensus of negative eWOM has a stronger effect on brand attitude than low consensus, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with eWOM consensus was tested on respondent attitudes. Data of 424 respondents from all eight scenarios were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of eWOM consensus and attitude is not statistically significant ($F = 0.004, p = .947$). However, the main effect of negative eWOM treatment on consumer attitude is statistically significant ($F = 93.662^*, p = .000$). A high consensus of eWOM ($\bar{X}_{NE-Hi-CS} = 0.307^*, p = .000$) has a greater positive impact than low consensus of eWOM ($\bar{X}_{NE-Lo-CS} = 0.303^*, p = .000$). The attitude level before eWOM treatment ($A_0$) and after eWOM treatment ($A_1$) are shown in figure 3.6. Thus, hypothesis 2a is supported.

[Figure 3.6]

Next, to test hypothesis 2b, which stated that high consensus crisis response strategy elicits stronger effect on brand attitude than low consensus response strategy, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with consensus response strategy was tested on respondent attitude. Data of 424 respondents from all eight scenarios were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of consensus and attitude is statistically significant ($F = 10.522^*, p = .001$). A high consensus response strategy ($\bar{X}_{RE-Hi-CS} = 0.103^*, p = .045$) has a greater positive impact than low
consensus response strategy ($\bar{X}_{RE-Lo-CS} = -0.133^*, p = .01$), as shown in figure 3.7. Thus, hypothesis 2b is supported.

[Figure 3.7]

### 3.5.4 The Role of Homophily Source and Message Consensus

To test hypothesis 3a, which stated that negative eWOM communicated through high-homophily sources elicited stronger effects on brand attitude than negative eWOM consensus, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with homophily source and consensus of eWOM was tested on respondent attitudes. Data of 424 respondents from all eight scenarios were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of eWOM homophily, consensus, and attitude is statistically significant ($F = 5.34^*, p = .021$). EWOM from high-homophily sources ($\bar{X}_{NE-Hi-HM} = 0.402^*, p = .000$) has a greater positive impact than high consensus of eWOM ($\bar{X}_{NE-Hi-CS} = 0.307^*, p = .000$).

The attitude level before eWOM treatment ($A_0$) and after eWOM treatment ($A_1$) is shown in figure 3.8. Thus, hypothesis 3a is supported.

[Figure 3.8]

To test hypothesis 3b, which stated that communicating response strategy through high-homophily sources produces stronger effects on brand attitude than a high consensus of crisis response strategy, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with consensus response strategy and homophily source was tested on respondent attitudes. Data of 424 respondents from all eight scenarios were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of homophily, consensus, and attitude is statistically significant ($F = 5.34^*, p = .021$). A response strategy from high-homophily sources ($\bar{X}_{RE-Hi-HM} = 0.094, p = .068$) has less positive impact than a high consensus response strategy ($\bar{X}_{RE-Hi-CS} = 0.103^*, p = .045$), as shown in figure 3.9. Thus, hypothesis 3b is not supported.
3.5.5 The Role of Crisis Response Strategy

To test hypothesis 4, which stated that the use of accommodative strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude than defensive strategy, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with high consensus, high homophily, and two response strategies was tested on respondent attitudes. Data of 102 respondents from scenario 1 and scenario 2 were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of consensus, homophily, response strategy, and attitude are statistically significant (\(F = 0.011^*, p = .043\)). Accommodative response strategy (\(\bar{X}_{RE} = 0.361^*, p = .000\)) has a greater positive impact than defensive response strategy (\(\bar{X}_{RE} = 0.223^*, p = .032\)), as shown in figure 3.10. Thus, hypothesis 4 is supported.

However, to further explore the impact of consensus only, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with high consensus and two response strategies was tested on respondent attitudes. Data of 214 respondents from scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 5, and scenario 6 were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of response strategy and attitude is statistically significant (\(F = 8.247^*, p = .004\)). Accommodative response strategy (\(\bar{X}_{RE} = 0.236^*, p = .001\)) has a greater positive impact than defensive response strategy (\(\bar{X}_{RE} = -0.051, p = .474\)).

To test the impact of homophily only, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with high homophily and two response strategies was tested on respondent attitudes. Data of 212 respondents from scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3, and scenario 4 were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of response strategy and attitude is statistically significant (\(F = 8.989^*, p = .003\)). Accommodative response strategy (\(\bar{X}_{AC,Hi-HM-CS} = 0.231^*, p = .001\)) has a greater positive impact than defensive response strategy (\(\bar{X}_{DF,Hi-HM-CS} = -0.058, p = .393\)).
To test hypothesis 5, which stated that the use of defensive strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude than accommodative strategy, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with low consensus, low homophily, and two response strategies was tested on respondent attitude. Data of 100 respondents from scenario 7 and scenario 8 were analyzed. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of consensus, homophily, response strategy, and attitude is statistically significant \( (F = 0.011^*, p = 0.043) \). From low homophily source, a low consensus of accommodative response strategy \( (X_{AC, Lo.HM-CS} = 0.190, p = .062) \) has a greater positive impact than a low consensus of defensive response strategy \( (X_{DF, Lo.HM-CS} = -0.506^*, p = .000) \). Thus, hypothesis 5 is not supported.

As shown in figure 3.10, high homophily and high consensus enhance the positive effect of defensive response strategy, while low homophily and low consensus do not enhance the positive effect of defensive response strategy. Though low consensus of negative eWOM from low homophily sources did not affect respondent attitude (under defensive strategy condition), when the majority of participants is against defensive strategy, defensive strategy becomes ineffective. Thus, consensus on response strategy plays a more critical role in respondent attitudes than response strategy itself, particularly with defensive strategy.

3.6 Discussions and Conclusions

3.6.1 The Role of Homophily Source and Message Consensus

Though consumers were initially exposed to negative eWOM and service recovery attempts, the negative effects of negative eWOM overshadow the first service recovery attempts. This study confirmed the effects of message consensus and homophily source on consumer attitudes. Negative eWOM and response strategy from high-homophily sources has a stronger impact on consumer attitude than negative eWOM and response strategy from low-homophily sources. The findings are aligned with (Brown & Reingen, 1987) in social network theory (Steffes & Burgee, 2009), as homophily provides prime credibility of information (Wang et al., 2008). Thus, this research suggested that homophily enhanced the effect of both negative eWOM and
response strategy. As such, the negative eWOM produced a stronger negative effect, whereas response strategy produced greater positive effect when the information was from high-homophily sources.

Also, high-consensus negative eWOM and response strategy has a stronger impact on consumer attitude than low-consensus negative eWOM and response strategy. This supported the findings of Cialdini and Goldstein (2004), who asserted the acceptance tendency of agreed-upon information by the majority. A high consensus of negative eWOM elicited a stronger negative effect, whereas a high consensus of response strategy produced a greater positive effect.

Additionally, negative eWOM from high-homophily sources has a stronger impact on consumer attitude than high consensus negative eWOM, and the inverse is true for response strategy. Chaiken (1980) suggested that a likable source (i.e., homophily) has a stronger impact on opinion change than argument consensus when it is perceived as low in personal relevance. High homophily induces stronger negative effects of negative eWOM while eliciting less of a positive effect of response strategy compared to consensus effect. Baker and Petty (1994) asserted that consumers are likely to focus on the quality of the information when majority agree on negative messages. This lead to the role of homophily source that enhance information quality evaluation reflecting source credibility. The current research suggested that consumers evaluate negative eWOM based on homophily source. In contrast, when majority agree on positive message, the positive message tend to generally impact on consumer attitude without needs to evaluation information source. Hence, message consensus produces stronger positive effect of crisis response strategy on consumer attitude recovery. Public opinions in online community in social media should be closely monitored.

In sum, the current research extended social network theory to crisis response strategy communication in online communities. The current study demonstrated that online community members who only share some common interests or similarities and no personal ties or relationships in the network could lead to information adoption and allow a brand to recover from crisis. Communicating crisis response strategy via a high-homophily source produces a greater positive effect. Meanwhile, crisis response strategy consensus induced a greater positive effect. This
suggested that homophily of online community platforms with consumers and crisis response strategy consensus play a crucial role in consumer attitude recovery. Comments and agreements of online community members toward the incident affected brand crisis recovery.

### 3.6.2 The Role of Crisis Response Strategy

This research affirmed that the use of accommodative strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than defensive strategy. Because high consensus of negative eWOM from high homophily strongly produced a negative impact on consumer evaluation, deploying an accommodative strategy is more effective, as it leads to a reduction in negative emotions (Yang, Kang, & Johnson, 2010). Also, accommodative strategy communicated through a high-credibility source (i.e., high homophily) produces a greater positive effect (Lee & Song, 2010).

This study also found that the use of accommodative response strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than defensive strategy. However, this is inconsistent with Lee and Cranage (2012), who suggested that defensive strategy is more effective than accommodative response strategy for low-consensus negative eWOM. The current research found low consensus on crisis response strategy and low homophily source may outperform its effect in boosting the negative effects of defensive response strategy.

### 3.6.3 Theoretical Contributions

This study assists researchers by broadening the perspective of social media research to understand consumer information processing. Thus, the theoretical contributions of the current research are as follows. First, although prior research on social networks has explored the antecedents of information processing (Brown et al., 2007), few studies have integrated it into service recovery and remedy communication. Accordingly, this research highlights the role of online community members on social media, particularly in crisis response strategy communication. Similarity among online
community members enhances the effectiveness of crisis response strategies in the network. Thus, the study identified that homophily source and message consensus impact consumer attitude recovery in social media. Homophily source and message consensus strongly impact crisis response strategy effectiveness regardless of the type of response strategy. Homophily and consensus also intensify the effect of the crisis response strategy. These findings close the gap in social media research regarding service recovery and crisis response strategy communication on social media while considering the effect of social influence on consumer information processing. They also extend the body of knowledge of social network theory in crisis response strategy communication as well as in service recovery based on the role of the node in the network. Therefore, this study urges researchers to apply the social network paradigm to communication on social media for service recovery.

Second, previous studies on electronic word of mouth (eWOM) investigated its impact through a narrow lens of either negative eWOM effects or response strategy effects. The current research applied a holistic view of social influence to the diffusion of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy. The subsequent results are inconsistent with previous research that focused only on low consensus of negative eWOM while ignoring the impact of low consensus of response strategy, such as Lee and Cranage (2012), who focused only on consensus of negative eWOM and its effect while ignoring consensus of crisis response strategy. In contrast, the current research identified the effect of both low consensus of negative eWOM and low consensus of defensive response strategy. Thus, this study calls for researchers to extend their investigation of diffusion of original complaints as well as of response strategy.

Third, prior research studied the effectiveness of response strategy in only one episode of service recovery (Neale & Murphy, 2007), while few studies have explored the effect of second recovery attempts after initially insufficient recovery. This study asserts that although consumers recognize personal apologies, these nonetheless constitute insufficient recovery since negative eWOM still leads to negative effects. The second service recovery attempt, which employed two dominant response strategies (i.e., defensive strategy, accommodative strategy), was adopted to explore such effects. Although an accommodative strategy is preferred over a defensive strategy
in most situations, a defensive strategy is also effective in recovering consumer attitudes when there is high consensus of defensive response strategy communicated via a high-homophily source (whereas the effectiveness of the defensive strategy is lower than that of the accommodative strategy). This suggests that since a defensive strategy tends to lead to negative effects, high homophily and high consensus could mitigate its negative effects while producing positive effects. In contrast, low homophily and/or low consensus (i.e., the majority disagree with the defensive strategy) enhance the negative effect of the defensive strategy. This study sheds light on service failure and service recovery so that researchers can recognize their impact and be compelled to explore a more complicated level of crisis response strategy.

3.6.4 Managerial Implications

The current study suggested that brands should employ online communities on social media to recover and develop relationships with consumers. Marketers should recognize online communities whose members are part of their target market (i.e., high homophily), as online communities are the most effective communication platform. Online community members tend to trust information from their online communities. Therefore, online communities produce a greater negative effect from negative eWOM as well as a greater positive effect from crisis response strategies. Thus, managing online communities includes online community building, sustaining, and monitoring, as well as employee training.

3.6.4.1 Online Community Building

Building a strong online community would enhance its effect on service recovery. Online community members are an essential element needed for brands to recover from crises. Observing and recognizing the characteristics and behaviors of members of each online community would enhance a brand’s capacity to handle crisis situations. A high degree of membership and agreement by online community members allows brands to recover from crises. Brands should encourage consumers to perceive that they are community members or partners while prompting them to initiate multilateral relationships (McWilliam, 2000). The process of collective
value creation in brand communities includes (a) social networking (i.e., welcoming, empathizing, governing), (b) impression management (i.e., evangelizing, justifying), (c) community engaging (i.e., documenting, badging, milestoneing, staking), and (d) brand use (i.e., customizing, grooming, and commoditizing) (Schau, Muñiz Jr, & Arnould, 2009). Highly engaging social media campaigns related to user-generated content are inclined to produce consumer brand commitment and loyalty (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010).

3.6.4.2 Online Community Sustaining

Brands could use online communities as tools to communicate and cope when a crisis occurs. Sponsored online communities and consumer-generated online communities are available on social media. Such platforms facilitate brands to develop consumer–brand relationships via public relations, news, articles, previews, reviews, and critics (i.e., paid reviews referred to as advertorial, non-paid reviews). However, brands should declare sponsorship to avoid negative effects, such as boycotts (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). Although the current research asserts that message consensus strongly impacts consumer attitudes, brands should recognize that consumers prefer user-controlled mediums, as they want to control the relationship. Therefore, overly controlling the discussion or dialogue in online communities would lead to loss of interest among members (McWilliam, 2000). Prior research has argued that the effectiveness of no anonymous comments and a completely uncensored approach depends on brand objectives (McWilliam, 2000). McWilliam (2000) proposed that the most effective approach for neutralizing derogatory comments is with user-initiated counterarguments.

3.6.4.3 Online Community Monitoring

Brands should employ tracking technology to monitor eWOM and obtain sentiments about them by analyzing the number of good or bad online conversations (Ang, 2011). The sentiment of consensus could produce either positive or negative effect. The best practice is to respond to all comments within 24 hours. Negative comments should be followed up with solutions to the problem in question,
while positive comments should be responded to with a simple “thank you.” When negative comments become a brand crisis, the brand should deploy an accommodative strategy, particularly when there is high consensus of negative eWOM. This study suggests that consumers prefer official statements of accommodative strategy, whereas unofficial apology messages are not effective.

In addition, brands should seek out the most influential online community members and carefully nurture them (Ang, 2011). Most companies have a group of employees who are already active in online communities. These employees possess extensive experience, expertise, and energy that contribute to the social media team (Kane, 2009).

### 3.6.4.4 Employee Training

Brands should identify when service failures occur, resolve customer problems, communicate and classify service failures, add integrating data, and improve overall service (Tax & Brown, 1998). In addition to online communication, hiring, training, and empowering front-line employees would improve successful service recovery (Tax & Brown, 1998). Developing effective recovery programs that include an accommodative strategy and improving the service system should enhance service quality and boost customer value and profitability (Tax & Brown, 1998).

### 3.6.5 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The current research provides empirical evidence of the role of social influence (i.e., homophily source, message consensus) and crisis response strategy on the impact of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy on consumer attitude recovery. Further studies should explore other aspects of social influence according to social network theory, such as social ties, roles in social networks, and centrality. Strong social ties between message senders and message receivers could lead to a strong influence. Consistently, opinion leaders and those who are at the center of connectivity could enhance this strong influence as well.
In addition, future research should include the moderating role of consumer characteristics in processing and evaluating information, such as consumer involvement, brand familiarity, and consumer–brand relationship. The impact of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy may be different for those with different levels of consumer characteristics.

In addition, this study employed life-threatening negative eWOM to examine the impact of social influence. Further research should explore crises with lower severity to observe how consumer process information. The essence and vividness of negative eWOM may differentially influence consumer attitudes. Also, the current research employed only two dominant response strategies (i.e., defensive strategy, accommodative strategy) to explore their impact on consumer attitudes. Future research could apply multiple levels of crisis response strategies to provide a more specific remedy strategy.
Table 3.1 Experimental design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Homophily Sources</th>
<th>Low Homophily Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Consensus</td>
<td>Low Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>- Accommodative</td>
<td>- Accommodative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- High Consensus</td>
<td>- Low Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>- Defensive</td>
<td>- Defensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- High Consensus</td>
<td>- Low Consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Reliability test of pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homophily</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Strategy</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Strategy</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Validity and reliability test of main study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homophily</td>
<td>&gt;.938</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>&gt;.855</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Strategy</td>
<td>&gt;.746</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Number of respondents per scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Homophily</th>
<th>Low Homophily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Consensus</td>
<td>Low Consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5 Mean and standard deviation of attitude in three periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$A_0$</th>
<th>$SD_{A_0}$</th>
<th>$A_1$</th>
<th>$SD_{A_1}$</th>
<th>$A_2$</th>
<th>$SD_{A_2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 High Homophily x High Consensus x Defensive</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.904</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>4.517</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>4.740</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 High Homophily x High Consensus x Accommodative</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.959</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>4.550</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>4.911</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High Homophily x Low Consensus x Defensive</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.967</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>4.609</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>4.317</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 High Homophily x Low Consensus x Accommodative</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.908</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>4.452</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>4.548</td>
<td>1.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Low Homophily x High Consensus x Defensive</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.752</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>4.555</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Low Homophily x High Consensus x Accommodative</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.683</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>4.431</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>4.543</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Low Homophily x Low Consensus x Defensive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>4.858</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>4.352</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Low Homophily x Low Consensus x Accommodative</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.912</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>4.472</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>4.662</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 Social influence and consumer attitude recovery model

* $X_{NE}$ refers to mean value of brand attitude after reading negative eWOM, $X_{RE}$ refers to mean value of brand attitude after reading response strategy.
Figure 3.2. Experimental design diagram
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CHAPTER 4
CUSTOMER-BRAND RELATIONSHIP AS MODERATOR ON CRISIS RESPONSE STRATEGY COMMUNICATION AND BRAND ATTITUDE RECOVERY ON SOCIAL MEDIA

4.1 Introduction

Brands may use social media applications as tools to generate brand awareness, brand engagement, and word of mouth (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). Social media applications such as blogs, forums and discussion boards, product reviews, social networks, and video and photo sharing are employed to facilitate online communication and to connect consumers with the brand (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). Brands tend to apply social media marketing to boost the consumer-brand relationship—CBR (Kim & Ko, 2012). The current research emphasized the CBR as it produces positive word of mouth regarding the brand and the willingness to pay a higher price (Albert & Merunka, 2013). The CBR is defined as the tie between a person and a brand that is voluntary or enforced interdependently between the person and the brand (Chang & Chieng, 2006). Thus, consumers with close ties to the brand or strong CBR tend to be brand followers in consumer online communities.

Consumers become brand followers in online communities because of their brand usage, brand likeability, seeking incentives, social interaction, and searching for information, which leads to an improved and sustained CBR (Sook Kwon, Kim, Sung, & Yun Yoo, 2014). Online consumers are more active and involved in spreading marketing information (Brown et al., 2007). The transmitted online information is referred to as electronic word of mouth (eWOM), which originates either from the brands or from consumers. eWOM is initiated based on social influences, such as peer influence (Liao & Chou, 2012), similarity to others i.e., homophily (Lee & Song, 2010), and level of agreement with public opinion i.e., message consensus (Steffes & Burgee, 2009).

The diffused online information can be positive, negative, or neutral. Positive eWOM benefits the brand. In contrast, negative eWOM, such as customer...
complaints regarding service failure, could lead to a brand crisis because online consumers can manipulate the message and challenge the brand to protect its reputation (Gensler et al., 2013). Inverting customers’ attitudes urgently drives crisis recovery strategy requirements (Balmer, Greyser, & Greyser, 2009). Hence, brand crisis resulting of negative eWOM leads the organization to impose a competent response strategy (i.e., defensive strategy, accommodative strategy). However, the strategic response strategy would generate a different recovery outcome based on consumers’ existing sentiments (Xia, 2013).

Previous research explored the role of CBR quality in processing negative information (Bambauer-Sachse & Mangold, 2011; Doh & Hwang, 2009; Zhang, Craciun, & Shin, 2010). For instance, Zhang et al. (2010) affirmed that positive reviews were more persuasive than negative reviews for consumers who evaluated products with promotion consumption goals (i.e., positive bias, such as those with high CBR). Conversely, negative reviews were more persuasive than positive reviews for consumers who evaluated products with prevention consumption goals (i.e., negative bias, such as those with low CBR). Even so, research exploring the role of CBR quality in crisis response strategy communication, taking antecedents in processing information (i.e., homophily sources, message consensus) into account, has been limited.

Communication platform and public opinion influence crisis response strategy communication effectiveness. Prior research indicated that consensus of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy affect consumer evaluation (Lee & Cranage, 2012), whereas homophily source provokes consumers’ trust in evaluating information (Bhuiyan, 2010). To advance the existing concepts of crisis response strategy communication and to focus on the role of CBR quality, this study adopted the elaboration likelihood model (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986) and social network theory to conceptualize the relationships among antecedents.

The elaboration likelihood model identified two distinct routes of persuasion: the central route (i.e., a thoughtful consideration of presented information) and the peripheral route (i.e., a simple cue in a persuasion context, including an attractive source (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). The current study expected that consumers with high CBR quality (i.e., high involvement) employed the central route in processing
and evaluating information. Thus, high-CBR consumers tend to focus on the essence of the message, such as negative eWOM and brand crisis response strategy, whereas low-CBR consumers are prone to take peripheral cues, such as homophily source and message consensus, in evaluating the information.

In addition, social network theory asserted the role of public opinion on information adoption according to the relation among nodes. Consumers are prone to trust information from those who are similar to them (i.e., high homophily) (Brown et al., 2007) and from high-consensus information (Kim & Lee, 2015). Building on these theories, this research studied the role of CBR in crisis response strategy communication on social media.

Objectives of this research were threefold. First, this study intended to extend the role of CBR quality in consumer information processing, especially eWOM and crisis response strategy. Second, this study provided the framework that incorporates concepts from the elaboration likelihood model and social network theory to crisis response strategy communication effectiveness in social media that focus on the role of CBR quality, homophily source, and message consensus. Finally, the study reported on empirical tests according to proposed framework in the context of service recovery.

This study begins with a brief review of the role of CBR in the information processing context and is followed by a detailed discussion of the role of CBR in relationships between social influences (i.e., homophily sources, consensus message) and consumers’ brand attitudes; then the role of CBR in relationships between crisis response strategy and consumers’ brand attitude is discussed. Subsequently, hypothesis development is presented. Next, research methodology and findings are explained. Discussion and conclusions are provided at the end of this chapter.

4.2 Literature Review

4.2.1 The Role of CBR in the Information Processing Context

Fournier (1998) affirmed that the CBR comprises six facets, which include love/passion, self-connection, commitment, interdependence, intimacy, and brand partner quality. Love/passion reflects brand irreplaceability. Self-connection
refers to the degree to which a brand expresses the important aspects of self. Interdependence reflects the intensity of consumption and interaction. Commitment refers to the intention to support relationship longevity. Intimacy reflects elaborative knowledge about the brand and belief in its superior product performance. Brand partner quality reflects overall relationship strength and satisfaction, which includes trust and accountability. However, prior research has also proposed definitions of CBR and its facets in studies, as illustrated in Table 4.1.

[Table 4.1]

Previous research has extensively focused on commitment influence (Garbarino & Johnson, 1999; Ingram et al., 2005; Johnson, Sivas, & Garbarino, 2008), while research on other facets of CBR is still limited. It has been argued that an understanding of the role of customer brand commitment in processing information can be used to predict customer behavioral intentions (Garbarino & Johnson, 1999). The elaboration likelihood model was adopted in prior research (Ahluwalia et al., 2000) to clarify the influence of involvement and commitment. Thus, this research applied the model to explain the role of cognition relating to CBR in evaluating information.

Petty and Cacioppo (1986) proposed the elaboration likelihood model to organize, categorize, and understand the underlying process of effective persuasive communication. They identified two distinct routes of persuasion: the central route (i.e., a thoughtful consideration of presented information) and the peripheral route (i.e., a simple cue in a persuasion context, including an attractive source). As elaboration likelihood is reduced, the peripheral cue intensifies its effect on the recipient’s attitude. Petty and Cacioppo (1986) also confirmed that, compared with attitudes originating from the peripheral route, attitudes originating from the central route tend to be unaffected by counterpropaganda. This research argued that the high-CBR Consumers has a high motivation level and employs the central route in processing information. High-commitment consumers tend to engage in counterarguments with negative information (Ahluwalia et al., 2000). They refute messages or negative information by identifying the effects of negative information on the target attribute while mitigating
its spillover to other attributes (Ahluwalia, 2000; Ahluwalia, Unnava, & Burnkrant, 2001).

4.2.2 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Social Influence and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

According to the social network theory, social influences emerge when a message receiver adjusts his or her behavior, attitude, or belief to match those of others in the social network (Leenders, 2002). Hence, the social environment influences consumer evaluation, particularly for loyal customers (Oliver, 1999). This research refers to social influence in online platforms as the influence from online community members (e.g., high-homophily sources) and public opinion (e.g., message consensus). Consumers become converted into brand followers as they become members of online brand communities. Online communities comprise members who share common interests (Zhou, 2011). Members who have similarity in the attributes that individuals possess is referred to as homophily (Brown & Reingen, 1987, p. 354).

Consumers are inclined to trust information from those who are similar to them (i.e., homophily; (Lee & Song, 2010). Therefore, the current research expected that consumers were likely to trust negative eWOM and crisis response strategy communicated via high-homophily sources. Furthermore, Kelman (1974) affirmed that compliance (i.e., to obtain positive reactions from others) influences consumer response. This finding reflected that consumers prone to agree with majority. Thus, eWOM consensus affects consumer brand evaluation (Lee & Song, 2010). Consensus on an Internet forum is defined as majority agreeing on the performance level of a product (Chiou & Cheng, 2003). Along the same lines, this study expected that consensus of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy would affect consumer brand evaluation.

4.2.3 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Crisis Response Strategies and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

Negative eWOM regarding service failure or unsatisfactory service recovery can lead to a brand crisis. A crisis is an unexpected incident that produces a threat to the organization’s reputation because it motivates customers to have a negative
attitude toward the organization (Coombs, 2007). Coombs (1998) proposed two dominant response strategies to recover from brand crisis: the defensive response strategy and the accommodative response strategy. Accommodative response strategy refers to a response strategy reflecting the acceptance of responsibility and the taking of remedial action (Coombs, 1998). In contrast, defensive response strategy refers to a response strategy reflecting the denial of responsibility (Coombs, 1998). Xia (2013) suggested that consumers with a strong brand relationship perceived that defensive responses are more appropriate than those with a weak relationship. However, Mattila (2004) proposed that accommodative strategies such as apologies and tangible compensation provoke attitude change among those with a high commitment more than among those with a low commitment.

Consumers will revise their attitudes and intentions after their previous evaluation (Oliver, 1980). Repeated incidents inducing a positive attitude toward a brand lead to brand loyalty and determination to defeat obstacles to repurchase (Oliver, 1999). Consumers with a high CBR quality tend to forgive their preferred brands for misconduct (Fedorikhin et al., 2008). Customers with a stronger relationship with the organization had fewer service recovery expectations after a service failure (Hess, Ganesan, & Klein, 2003).

4.3 Research Model and Hypotheses

This research investigated the role of the consumer-brand relationship in online crisis response strategy communication for crisis recovery, considering antecedents in processing information (i.e. social influence comprised of homophily sources, message consensus). The proposed framework in figure 4.1 illustrates the relationships among these variables. The hypotheses development is discussed in the following section.

[Figure 4.1]
4.3.1 The Role of CBR in Negative eWOM Effect and Crisis Response Strategy Effectiveness

Negative online product reviews have an influence on consumer-based brand equity and induce brand equity dilution, even though the consumer possesses a high level of brand knowledge (Bambauer-Sachse & Mangold, 2011). Under high involvement conditions, referred to as high CBR quality, receivers focus on the negativity of the message (Eisend, 2013; Maheswaran & Meyers-Levy, 1990) while remaining suspicious of a positive message, thus increasing the influence of the negative message (Doh & Hwang, 2009). Consumers with positive attitudes toward specific product information are prone to revise their impressions when confronted with negative attribute specific product information (Bambauer-Sachse & Mangold, 2011). As such, consumers with higher prior knowledge, such as those with high CBR quality, are more sensitive to negative messages than consumers with limited prior knowledge (Doh & Hwang, 2009).

However, when the proportion of negative information reaches a certain level, two-sided advertising induces positive effects on brand attitudes and intention (Eisend, 2013). Hence, the balance between negative eWOM and response strategy communication is essential for a positive effect. Crisis response strategy that intends to produce positive effects should be communicated to consumers to remedy the negative effects of negative eWOM. Zhang et al. (2010) extended the consumer evaluation further and affirmed that positive reviews were more persuasive than negative reviews for consumers who evaluate products with promotion consumption goals (i.e., positive bias, referring to high-CBR consumers). Conversely, negative reviews were more persuasive than positive reviews for consumers who evaluate products with prevention consumption goals (i.e., negative bias which referred to low-CBR consumers).

The CBR quality diminishes the negative effect on the brand when the brand is associated with negative incidents, as it has a positive impact on consumers’ post-failure emotions (Xie & Heung, 2012) and word of mouth transmission (Tho, Trang, & Olsen, 2016). Prior research has extended the six facets of the CBR (i.e., love/passion, self-connection, commitment, interdependence, intimacy, and brand partner quality) proposed by Fournier (1998). For instance, as the self-brand connection
leads to attachment (Fedorikhin et al., 2008), brand attachment can mitigate negative effects relating to brand evaluation and perceived risk of negative online information (Chiou, Chi-Fen Hsu, & Hsieh, 2013). A high level of attachment could intensify consumers’ forgiveness of brand mishaps and the recommendation of the brand to others (Fedorikhin et al., 2008).

Mattila (2004) confirmed that high affective commitment customers have a higher tendency to prolong loyalty than those with a lower level of affective commitment, even though they feel betrayed by a service provider that produces a service failure. Similarly, affective commitment (i.e., liking and identification) and continuance commitment (i.e., dependence and switching costs) influence loyalty (Fullerton, 2005). Johnson et al. (2008) also found that affective commitment has a negative influence on perceived risk.

Therefore, highly committed consumers tend to forgive service providers for unethical behavior when perceived harm is low (Ingram et al., 2005). High-commitment consumers are also inclined to seek indications that the advertisement of a competing brand is overstated, whereas low-commitment consumers are inclined to seek indications that support the claims of a competing brand’s advertising (Raju, Unnava, & Montgomery, 2009). This indicated the bias of consumers with different levels of CBR in evaluating information. Therefore, this research proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Under high CBR quality, negative eWOM and response strategy would have stronger impact on consumer brand attitude than under low CBR quality.

Hypothesis 1a: Under high CBR quality, negative eWOM would have stronger impact on consumer brand attitude than under low CBR quality.

Hypothesis 1b: Under high CBR quality, response strategy would have stronger impact on consumer brand attitude than under low CBR quality.

4.3.2 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Social Influence and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

Social media interaction is positively related to brand relationship quality (Hudson, Huang, Roth, & Madden, 2016). Experiential benefits of a brand’s
social network (e.g., online brand community, which is prone to have high homophily) that consumers perceive are able to positively influence the brand’s social network relationship quality. The quality of relationship with a brand’s social network leads to CBR quality (Park & Kim, 2014). As CBR comprises consumer commitment, self-brand connection, and loyalty, Warrington and Shim (2000) suggested that personal sources (i.e., high-homophily sources) induce a stronger effect than market sources (i.e., public) on products among consumers with a strong brand commitment. As the level of self-brand connection is positively influenced by the consistency of the brand image with the in-group (Escalas & Bettman, 2005) and the social image congruence effect on hotel brand loyalty (Back, 2005), the brand should ensure the consistency of brand image with the online community (i.e., high-homophily source) in order to enhance the level of self-brand connection. Hence, recovering from a brand crisis would sustain the brand image consistently, which would lead to positive effects on high-CBR consumers. However, information from online communities have strong effects on high-CBR consumers. Such effects may be stronger on low-CBR consumers as they are prone to evaluate eWOM with peripheral cues (i.e., high homophily) in the elaboration likelihood model. Therefore, this research proposed:

Hypothesis 2: Under low CBR quality, the relationship between homophily sources (both negative eWOM and response strategy) and the consumer-brand attitude will be different from high CBR quality.

Hypothesis 2a: Under low CBR quality, high-homophily sources of negative eWOM will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.

Hypothesis 2b: Under low CBR quality, high-homophily sources of response strategy will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.

Consensus ratings positively drive online trust (Benedicktus, 2011). Consumers are prone to accept information that a majority has approved, even though the majority may have disagreed with the information at first (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004). According to the elaboration likelihood model, high-CBR consumers evaluate information with a central route (i.e., message essence), while low-CBR consumers evaluate information with a peripheral route (i.e., message consensus). Therefore, this research proposed:
Hypothesis 3: Under low CBR quality, the relationship between high consensus (both negative eWOM and response strategy) and the consumer-brand attitude will be different from high CBR quality.

Hypothesis 3a: Under low CBR quality, high consensus negative eWOM will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.

Hypothesis 3b: Under low CBR quality, high consensus response strategy will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.

4.3.3 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Crisis Response Strategies and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

Though consumers with a high self-brand connection level perceive brand failure as a direct threat to their positive self-view, they still evaluate the brand with a service failure as a favorable brand (Cheng, White, & Chaplin, 2012). Customer affection as part of CBR has a stronger impact on customer trust than prior service failure and recovery (La & Choi, 2012). Service recovery is required as it impacts loyal customers the most (Robbins & Miller, 2004). Recovery satisfaction induces trust, eWOM, and the intention to revisit (Kim, Kim, & Kim, 2009). Trust recovery leads to loyalty restoration (La & Choi, 2012).

The CBR quality positively drives the recovery strategy’s effectiveness on the intention of reinitiating the relationship (Huang & Xiong, 2010), as well as service recovery satisfaction, purchase intention, and purchase behavior (Wang et al., 2014). CBR quality and transgressions differently influence the relationship between brand and customers with different levels of CBR quality (Aaker, Fournier, & Brasel, 2004).

Previous research has explored the disconfirmation paradigm and the equity paradigm (i.e., procedural justice, interactive justice, and distributive justice). Mattila (2004) affirmed that apologies and tangible compensation generate a stronger attitude change among those with a high commitment than those with a low commitment. A recovery strategy that causes distributional and procedural fairness will increase service quality, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, and trust (De Ruyter & Wetzel, 2000). Crisis response intends to induce a positive attitude toward the brand. Ahluwalia et al. (2000) examined the effects of two types of crisis response on
brand attitude among high-commitment and low-commitment consumers. They found that high-commitment consumers are influenced by the diagnosticity response strategy (i.e., accommodative strategy) more than the counterargument response strategy (i.e., defensive strategy), while the reverse is true for low-commitment consumers. This effect is due to information processing of replicated information, even though high-commitment consumers tend to counterargue against negative information. This finding aligns with Xia (2013), who found that consumers with a strong brand relationship perceived defensive responses as more appropriate than did those with a weak relationship. Therefore, this study proposed:

Hypothesis 4: Under high CBR quality, the relationship between response strategy and consumer-brand attitude recovery will be different from under low CBR quality

Hypothesis 4a: Under low CBR quality, the use of accommodative strategy has stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of accommodative strategy under high CBR quality.

Hypothesis 4b: Under high CBR quality, the use of defensive strategy has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of defensive strategy under low CBR quality.

High consensus and high homophily provoke intense negative effects of negative eWOM, while high-CBR consumers prefer a defensive strategy. Thus, defensive strategy is more effective on high CBR consumer when they perceive a high-consensus message from a high-homophily source. In contrast, low-CBR consumers prefer an accommodative strategy. However, low-CBR consumers tend to employ the peripheral route in processing information, which includes the intensity of homophily source and consensus message. Therefore, when the levels of homophily source and message consensus are low, this lessens the effectiveness of the response strategy on low-CBR consumers. This allows low homophily sources and low message consensus to produce greater effectiveness on high-CBR consumers.

Hypothesis 5: Under high CBR quality, the use of defensive strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily will have a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of defensive strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily under low CBR quality.
Hypothesis 6: Under high CBR quality, the use of accommodative strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily will have a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of accommodative strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily under low CBR quality.

This research explored the moderating role of CBR on the relationship between the social influence (i.e., homophily source, message consensus) of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy communication and customers’ attitude recovery. A high degree of homophily source and message consensus are perceived to be more persuasive, while CBR quality moderates the impact of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy effectiveness.

4.4 Methodology

The current research applied a factorial experimental design to investigate the influence of CBR quality in processing information on customers’ brand attitude recovery. The study explored the moderating role of CBR on the relationship between homophily source, message consensus, and crisis response strategy and customers’ attitude recovery.

This research required participants to be familiar with online social network platforms in processing information, including comments from different sources of information. Using undergraduate students as participants fulfilled all requirements as they are familiar with online social network platforms. Students were chosen to participate in this experiment, as Enis et al. (1972) proposed that consumer behavior research may employ students as the subjects as long as they conform to the research context while reflecting internal validity. The study adopted Ahluwalia et al. (2000) procedure in choosing the target service and target brand. A restaurant was selected as the target service category because participants were familiar with it. A well-known chain restaurant was chosen as the target brand because its CBR scores had a wide distribution.
4.4.1 Research Design and Procedure

Participants of this research were familiar with social networks and had service experiences with regard to their own purchase decisions for the well-known national franchise restaurant because the study aimed to explore customer attitude changes when they processed information in social networks. In this regard, this study discussed participants and design, independent variables and dependent variables, procedure, and manipulation.

4.4.1.1 Participants and Design

This research tested hypotheses by using 2 x 2 x 2, a between-subject design with two sources of information that have difference homophily levels (low and high), two consensus levels (low and high) of negative eWOM and crisis response strategies, and two response strategies (defensive and accommodative) among those who have two level of CBR. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight scenarios or cells in table 4.2 and figure 4.2. We collected the data from the sample of at least 50 participants in each scenario; thus, the total number of the participants is 424. Participants were undergraduate students from three universities in Thailand. Undergraduate students were recruited to attend this experiment because most of them are highly involved in and familiar with social media platforms and have their own experience with services. The students attended the experiments for extra credit.

[Table 4.2]
[Figure 4.2]

4.4.1.2 Independent Variables

CBR referred to the tie between a person and a brand that is voluntary or is enforced interdependently between the person and the brand (Chang & Chieng, 2006). Twelve items of four dimensions of CBR quality were adapted from (Roberts, Varki, & Brodie, 2003). The dimensions included trust in the partner’s honesty, trust in the partner’s benevolence, affective commitment, and satisfaction.

High homophily source referred to information sources where members have similar attributes (e.g., same or different social status; (Brown &
Reingen, 1987, p. 354). Homophily was measured in three items using a seven-point scale developed from (Lawrence et al. (2013); McCroskey et al., 1975). The three measurement items were “A person like me/not like me,” “Somebody I can relate to/cannot relate to,” and “Different from me/similar to me in many ways.”

Message consensus referred to when the majority agreed on the comments (Chiou & Cheng, 2003). Three measurement items of a seven-point scale were developed from Lee and Cranage (2012). The items were “A majority of the comments supported the original complaint about the restaurant,” “Overall, consumer reviews indicate a negative impression of the restaurant,” and “There is a great deal of agreement among all the consumer reviews, providing a bad impression of the restaurant.”

Accommodative response strategy referred to a response strategy reflecting responsibility acceptance and imposing remedial action (Coombs, 1998). Conversely, defensive response strategy referred to a response strategy reflecting a denial of responsibility (Coombs, 1998). Four measurement items, using a seven-point scale, were developed from Lee and Cranage (2012). The items include “The restaurant apologized for the problem,” “The restaurant admitted responsibility for the problem,” “The restaurant shifted the blame to others,” and “The restaurant disagreed and argued with complaining customer(s).”

4.4.1.3 Dependent variables

Brand attitude can be defined as an individual’s internal evaluation of an object, such as a branded product (Olson & Mitchell, 2000). Four measurement items were employed, using a seven-point scale developed by (Olson & Mitchell, 2000). The items were: good/bad, dislike very much/like very much, pleasant/unpleasant, and poor quality/high quality. Attitude recovery refers to the degree of attitude difference between attitudes after receiving negative eWOM and the response strategy.

The measurement items employed in this study originated from a diverse scale range. For instance, brand attitude is adapted from five-point scales. The current study employed a seven-point scale ranging from 1 to 7 to better monitor the variation and enhance participants’ familiarity with the response.
4.4.1.4 Procedure

Participants were assigned to one of the eight scenarios. Afterward, the experiment was performed as shown in figure 4.3, which can be explained as follows:

[Figure 4.3]

Step 1: Introduction

First, participants were informed of the purpose of the research as being part of a dissertation. The researcher distributed the questions booklet and asked participants to complete all questions. The directions on the questions booklet stated that participants were encouraged to answer questions however they felt like it, and there were no right or wrong answers. All responses were anonymous.

Second, participants were asked to read and sign the consent form at the end of the session. The consent form was on separate sheet from the questions booklet to maintain the anonymity of the responses.

Third, respondents completed the demographic and preliminary data regarding lifestyle, social media behavior, and target brand familiarity. They were also asked to complete CBR questions regarding the target brand.

Step 2: Manipulation and Measuring Customer Brand Attitude

The researcher instructed the participants to postulate that they were logging into their online social network account and that they would see the provided information on the questions booklet.

In the high homophily scenario, the respondents were assigned to be members of college students’ group. They were asked to read the information relating to student and campus life posted in this group. This was in contrast to the low homophily scenario, where respondents were assigned to be members of an overseas housewives group; they were asked to read information relating to immigration and parenting posted in the group. The key information was highlighted. The respondents were asked to complete homophily manipulation check questions after they finished reading.
Next, respondents were shown the original post of a complaint about unsatisfactory service recovery in the assigned group and were asked to read it. Next, they were also asked to read four comments in response to the original complaint before answering consensus manipulation check questions and their responses to the original complaint, including the customer brand attitude, in the booklet. This study employed Lee and Song (2010) testing technique to manipulate the consensus scenario. In the high consensus scenario, the respondents read three comments from people who had a similar experience or agreed with the original complaint and also read one comment that disagreed with the original complaint. In the low consensus scenario, the participants read three comments from those who had a dissimilar experience or disagreed with the original complaint and read one comment that agreed with the original complaint.

Afterward, they were shown the post of a corporate response strategy in the assigned group and were asked to read it. Then they were asked to read four comments relating to the response strategy before answering questions regarding the customer brand attitude in the booklet. Respondents were assigned to read either the accommodative response strategy or the defensive response strategy. Consensus of the response strategy was manipulated through comments similar to those of the original complaint. In the high consensus scenario, they read three comments that agreed with the corporate response strategy and one comment that disagreed with the response strategy. In the low consensus scenario, the participants read three comments of those who had a dissimilar experience or disagreed with the original complaint and one comment that agreed with the response strategy.

Thus, the questionnaire measured the customer brand attitude in three time periods. The first time period was before they read original complaints. The second time period was when the respondents had read the original complaints and comments. The third time period was when the respondents had read the corporate response strategy and comments. The change in the customer brand attitude reflected consumer attitude recovery.
Step 3: Closing
Respondents were debriefed, and the researcher thanked them for their cooperation. Duplication was checked to see whether respondents had attended this experiment before. Snacks were provided.

4.4.2 Questionnaire Pretest
Back-translation and a qualitative pretest were performed to ensure the comprehension and validity of the questionnaire by the experts. Next, manipulation checks were conducted on a group of students. After all experiment processes and questionnaires had been verified, the quantitative pretest was administered to 40 undergraduate students.

4.4.2.1 Qualitative Pretest
Three respondents took a qualitative pretest. They were introduced to research objectives and asked to complete the questionnaire during August 2016. They were also asked to mark parts that may need adjustment on words/phrases/sentences while confirming the back-translation. The revised questionnaires were sent to these three respondents to validate the corrections. The scenario was tested on three students to ensure their familiarity with the online platform (i.e., Facebook) and service experience (i.e., restaurant).

4.4.2.2 Quantitative Pretest
Forty undergraduate students attend the pretest. Eighteen respondents were in the low CBR quality group (score of CBR less than or equal to 4) with the mean of 3.47 and standard deviation value of 0.49, and 22 respondents were in the high CBR quality group with the mean value of 4.66 and the standard deviation value of 0.53. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 52.683, p = .000$). Negative eWOM induced stronger effects on those with low CBR quality. Respondents with low CBR preferred the accommodative response strategy to the defensive response strategy. A response strategy with high consensus also induced stronger attitude recovery, as did a response strategy communicated through a high-homophily source.
The experiment in this study manipulated three antecedents. The stimuli were homophily of information source, information consensus, and corporate response strategy. Thus, eight scenarios were tested on 40 respondents. The brand of chain restaurant was developed from 40 undergraduate students based on their familiarity with the brand. The Facebook platform was used in the experiment because all respondents had used it.

Brand familiarity was measured in three items of a seven-point scale developed from (Kent & Allen, 1994). The items are unfamiliarity/familiarity, inexperienced/experienced, and not knowledgeable/knowledgeable. Forty respondents completed the brand familiarity questions with the mean value of 3.3 and the standard deviation value of 1.68. Familiarity among eight groups was not statistically significantly different ($F = 553, p = .787$).

Information or posts were provided in two groups (i.e., high/low homophily), reflecting the lifestyle of the members of the group. The group of college students was assigned the “High Homophily” scenario. Posts in this group related to student life and campus life. In contrast, the housewives in the overseas group were assigned the low homophily scenario. Posts in this group related to parenting and immigration. Twenty respondents in the high homophily group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.48 and the standard deviation value of 1.11. Twenty respondents in the low homophily group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 2.72 and the standard deviation value of 0.92. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 30.196*, p = .000$).

Four comments in response to the original message were provided according to the assigned scenario. Three out of the four comments either agreed or disagreed with the original message. Twenty respondents in the low consensus group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.93 and the standard deviation value of 0.69. Twenty respondents in the high consensus group also completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 5.1 and the standard deviation value of 1.11. These two groups are significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 15.975*, p = .000$).

Respondents were asked to read either the defensive strategy or accommodative strategy, according to the assigned scenario. Twenty respondents in the
defensive strategy group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.4 and the standard deviation value of 1.28. Twenty respondents in the accommodative strategy group also completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.7 and the standard deviation value of 1.07. These two groups are significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 12.117^*, p = .001$). A t-test was employed in the analysis for reliability test. This study also employed ANOVA on consumer attitude related to response strategy, homophily source, and message consensus. This study employed ANOVA on consumer attitude related to response strategy, homophily source, and message consensus. Cronbach’s alpha of all variables exceeded 0.7, reflecting internal consistency for reliability, as shown in table 4.3.

[Table 4.3]

4.4.3 Main Study Manipulation Check

A total of 424 undergraduate students attended the experiment. Of that number, 193 respondents were in the low CBR quality group (score of CBR less than or equal to 4.5) with the mean value of 3.806 and standard deviation value of 0.539, and 231 respondents were in the high CBR quality group (score of CBR more than 4.5) with the mean value of 5.115 and standard deviation value of 0.463. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 721.619^*, p = .000$).

Eight scenarios with two levels of homophily and consensus and two types of response strategies were tested on respondents. Information or posts were provided in two groups (i.e., high/low homophily), reflecting the lifestyle of the members of the group. The group of college students was assigned to a high homophily scenario. Posts in this group related to student life and campus life. In contrast, the housewives in the overseas group were assigned to a low homophily scenario. Posts in this group related to parenting and immigration. In the high homophily group, 212 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.63 and the standard deviation value of 1.43. In the low homophily group, 212 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 2.47 and the standard deviation value of 1.21. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 279.948^*, p = .000$).
Four comments in response to the original message were provided according to the assigned scenario. Three out of the four comments either agreed or disagreed with the original message. In the high consensus group, 214 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 5.07 and the standard deviation value of 1.19. In the low consensus group, 210 respondents completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.09 and the standard deviation value of 1.25. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 277.471^*, p = .000$).

Respondents were asked to read either the defensive strategy or the accommodative strategy according to the assigned scenario; 214 respondents in the defensive strategy group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 3.39 and the standard deviation value of 1.17, and 210 respondents in the accommodative strategy group completed the manipulation check with the mean value of 4.97 and the standard deviation value of 1.10. These two groups were significantly different at a 95% confidence interval ($F = 202.505, p = .000$).

**4.4.3.1 Validity and Reliability Test**

This study found that all domain variables have convergent validity and reliability. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) of homophily (0.892), consensus (0.831), response strategy (0.647), and CBR (0.452) are above 0.5, which confirms convergent validity. In addition, composite reliability and Cronbach’s alpha of all domain variables exceed 0.7, reflecting internal consistency for reliability, as shown in table 4.4. The loadings of all measurement items of each construct are above 0.541.

[Table 4.4]

**4.5 Findings**

**4.5.1 Respondent Profiles**

As this study aimed to explore the impact of negative eWOM and response strategy communication on attitude recovery, undergraduate students in the junior and senior levels were targeted in this research, as they tended to have more
experience in evaluating online information than students in lower level of education, and they were also familiar with the target brand in the experiment. A total of 505 undergraduate students of universities in Thailand attended the experiment at the end of their regular classes. Eighty-one respondents were excluded from the analysis due to incomplete information and manipulation doubts. Thus, 424 respondents remained in the analysis. Of those, 72.6% (308) were female and 27.1% (115) were male. Forty-two percent of respondents were age 21. Furthermore, 44.1% of respondents had experience in social media for four to six years, and 42.7% of them had experience in social media for more than seven years. The number of samples of all eight scenarios were above 50 respondents on average, and respondents with either high CBR (231) or low CBR (193) were randomly assigned to eight scenarios, as shown in table 4.5.

[Table 4.5]

4.5.2 The Role of CBR in Negative eWOM Effect and Crisis Response Strategy Effectiveness

To test hypothesis 1a, which suggested that negative eWOM would have stronger impact on consumer brand attitude with high CBR quality than those with low CBR quality, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with two levels of CBR was run on respondents’ attitudes before and after eWOM treatment. 210 respondents in all eight scenarios were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests confirmed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is not statistically significant ($F = 1.065, p = .303$). However, the main effect of eWOM treatment on respondent attitude is statistically significant ($F = 91.387*, p = .000$). Contrasting of the average attitude level before the eWOM treatment and after the eWOM treatment was employed to explore the effect ($\bar{X}_{NE}$). The results revealed that respondents with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE, Hi, CBR} = 0.335*, p = .000$) were more strongly affected than respondents with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE, Lo, CBR} = 0.269*, p = .000$). Thus, hypothesis 1a is supported. However, the overall attitude level of customers with high CBR remained at a higher level than the attitude of those with low CBR both before eWOM treatment ($A_0$) and after eWOM treatment ($A_1$), as shown in figure 4.4.

[Figure 4.4]
To test hypothesis 1b, which hypothesized that response strategy would have stronger impact on consumer brand attitude with high CBR quality than those with low CBR quality, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with two levels of CBR was tested on respondents’ attitudes before and after response strategy treatment. 210 respondents in all eight scenarios were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude was not statistically significant ($F = 1.104, p = .294$), and neither was the main effect of response strategy communication ($F = 0.148, p = .70$). However, the average attitude level before the response strategy treatment and after the response strategy treatment was contrasted to explore the effect ($\bar{X}_{RE}$). Respondents with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{RE,Lo-CBR} = 0.025, p = .652$) has a greater positive impact than respondents with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{RE,Hi-CBR} = -0.054, p = .288$); thus, hypothesis 1b is not supported.

However, the level of impact was stronger on respondents with high CBR than on those with low CBR. Also, the overall attitude level of customers with high CBR remained at a higher level than those with low CBR, both before the response strategy treatment ($A_1$) and after response strategy treatment ($A_2$), as shown in figure 4.5.

[Table 4.5]

4.5.3 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Homophily Source and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

Next, to test hypothesis 2a, which asserted that a high-homophily source of negative eWOM has more of an impact on brand attitude on those with low CBR quality than those with high CBR quality, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with high homophily and two levels of CBR were tested on respondents’ attitudes before and after eWOM treatment. 210 respondents in all eight scenarios were included in the analysis. 212 respondents in scenario 1 to 4 were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is not statistically significant ($F = 0.003, p = .960$). Still, the main effect of eWOM treatment on respondent attitude was statistically significant ($F = 81.137^*, p = .000$). The average
attitude level before the eWOM treatment and after the eWOM treatment was contrasted to explore the effect ($\bar{X}_{SE}$).

The eWOM from a low homophily source has a stronger impact on those with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE,Hi,CBR} = 0.260^*, p = .000$) than those with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE,Lo,CBR} = 0.154^*, p = .000$), while eWOM from high homophily enhances the impact on those with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE,Hi,CBR} = 0.400^*, p = .000$) to almost the same level as those with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE,Lo,CBR} = 0.404^*, p = .000$). However, to contrast the effect between high homophily and low homophily of those with high CBR and low CBR, the result showed that homophily effect is stronger on those with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE,Hi-HM} - \bar{X}_{NE,Lo-HM} = 0.250$) than those with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{NE,Hi-HM} - \bar{X}_{NE,Lo-HM} = 0.140$). Thus, hypothesis 2a is supported. Nonetheless, under high-homophily source, attitude levels of customers with high CBR remained at higher levels than those with low CBR, both before eWOM treatment ($A_0$) and after eWOM treatment ($A_1$), as shown in figure 4.6.

[Figure 4.6]

Next, to test hypothesis 2b, which asserted that a high-homophily source of response strategy has more impact on brand attitude on those with low CBR quality than on those with high CBR quality, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with high homophily and two levels of CBR was tested on respondents’ attitudes before and after response strategy treatment. 212 respondents in scenario 1 to 4 were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is not statistically significant ($F = 3.168, p = .077$). Still, the main effect of response strategy communication is statistically significant ($F = 4.104^*, p = .044$). A contrasting technique was adopted as previous hypothesis testing. A response strategy from a high-homophily source has a greater positive impact on those with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{RE,Lo-CBR} = 0.189^*, p = .013$) than on those with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{RE,Hi-CBR} = 0.012, p = .850$). Thus, hypothesis 2b is supported. Nonetheless, under high-homophily source, the attitude level of customers with high CBR remained at a higher level than that of those with low CBR, both before response strategy treatment ($A_1$) and after response strategy treatment ($A_2$), as shown in figure 4.7.
4.5.4 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Message Consensus and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

To test hypothesis 3a, which stated that high-consensus negative eWOM will have more impact on the brand attitudes of those with low CBR than on those with high CBR, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with high consensus and two levels of CBR were tested on respondent attitudes. 214 respondents in scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 5, and scenario 6 were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is not statistically significant \( (F = 2.071, p = .151) \). Still, the main effect of eWOM treatment on respondent attitude is statistically significant \( (F = 92.737*, p = .000) \). Contrasting the average attitude level before the eWOM treatment and after the eWOM treatment were employed to explore the effect \( (\bar{X}_{NE}) \). eWOM from high consensus has stronger impact on those with low CBR \( (\bar{X}_{NE, Lo.CBR} = 0.322*, p = .000) \) than those with high CBR \( (\bar{X}_{NE, Hi.CBR} = 0.296*, p = .000) \). Thus, hypothesis 3a is supported. However, under high consensus of negative eWOM, attitude level of customers with high CBR remain at higher level than those with low CBR both before eWOM treatment \( (A_0) \) and after eWOM treatment \( (A_1) \) as shown in figure 4.8.

Next, to test hypothesis 3b, which stated that a high consensus response strategy will have more impact on the brand attitude of those with low CBR than those with high CBR, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with high consensus and two levels of CBR was tested on respondents’ attitudes before and after response strategy treatment. 214 respondents in scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 5, and scenario 6 were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is statistically significant \( (F = 5.845*, p = .016) \). A high consensus response strategy has a greater positive impact on those with low CBR \( (\bar{X}_{RE, Lo.CBR} = 0.235*, p = .003) \) than on those with high CBR \( (\bar{X}_{RE, Hi.CBR} = -0.011, p = .873) \). Thus, hypothesis 3b is supported. However, under high consensus of negative eWOM,
attitude levels of customers with high CBR remained at higher levels than those with low CBR, both before eWOM treatment ($A_0$) and after eWOM treatment ($A_1$), as shown in figure 4.9.

[Figure 4.9]

4.5.5 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Crisis Response Strategy and Consumers’ Brand Attitude Recovery

To test hypothesis 4a, which stated that the use of accommodative strategy has a greater impact on brand attitude recovery for those with low CBR quality than for those with high CBR quality, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with accommodative response strategy and two levels of CBR was tested on respondents’ attitude before and after response strategy treatment. 210 respondents in scenario 2, scenario 4, scenario 6, and scenario 8 were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is statistically significant ($F = 13.694, p = .000$). Respondents with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{AC,Hi-CBR} = 0.376^*, p = 0.000$) are more strongly affected than respondents with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{AC,Lo-CBR} = 0.034, p = 0.584$), as shown in figure 4.10. Thus, hypothesis 4a is supported.

[Figure 4.10]

To test hypothesis 4b, which stated that the use of defensive strategy has more impact on brand attitude recovery for those with high CBR quality than those with low CBR quality, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with defensive response strategy and two levels of CBR was tested on respondents’ attitudes before and after response strategy treatment. 214 respondents in scenario 1, scenario 3, scenario 5, and scenario 7 were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is not statistically significant ($F = 2.902, p = .090$), while the main effect of response strategy on respondents’ attitudes is statistically significant ($F = 18.424^*, p = .000$). Respondents with high CBR ($\bar{X}_{DF,Hi-CBR} = -0.139^*, p = .056$) are more positively affected than respondents with low CBR ($\bar{X}_{DF,Lo-CBR} = -0.323^*, p = .000$, as shown in figure 4.11. Thus, hypothesis 4b is supported.
To test hypothesis 5, which stated that the use of defensive strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily has a stronger impact on attitude recovery of those with high CBR than those with low CBR, two-way repeated measure ANOVA with two levels of consensus, two levels of homophily, two response strategies, and two levels of CBR was tested on respondents’ attitudes before and after response strategy treatment. 424 respondents in all eight scenarios were included in the analysis. Within subject effect tests revealed that the interaction effect of CBR and attitude is not statistically significant ($F = 0.718, p = .397$) while the main effect of response strategy on respondents’ attitudes is not statistically significant ($F = 0.022, p = .882$). Defensive strategy with high consensus from a high-homophily source has a greater positive impact on respondents with high CBR ($X_{DF-Hi-CBR} = 0.350^*, p = .006$) than those with low CBR ($X_{DF-Lo-CBR} = 0.011, p = .946$). Thus, hypothesis 5 is supported. In addition, the use of defensive strategy with low consensus from low homophily source has greater positive impact on respondents with high CBR ($X_{DF-Hi-CBR} = 0.369^*, p = .007$) than those with low CBR ($X_{DF-Lo-CBR} = -0.654^*, p = .000$), as shown in figure 4.12.

The same technique was adopted to test hypothesis 6, which stated that the use of accommodative strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily has a stronger impact on attitude recovery for those with high CBR than those with low CBR. The study confirmed that the use of accommodative strategy with low consensus from a low homophily source has a greater positive impact on respondents with high CBR ($X_{AC-Hi-CBR} = 0.352^*, p = .020$) than those with low CBR ($X_{AC-Lo-CBR} = 0.072, p = .574$). Thus, hypothesis 6 is supported. However, accommodative strategy with high consensus from high-homophily source has a greater positive impact on respondents with low CBR ($X_{AC-Lo-CBR} = 0.891^*, p = .000$) than those with high CBR ($X_{AC-Hi-CBR} = 0.003^*, p = .980$). Figure 4.13 illustrated that those with high CBR quality retain higher attitude levels than those with low CBR. However, the level of impact depends on homophily source, consensus information, and response
strategies. Defensive strategy tends to receive negative responses compared to accommodative strategy. Still, the level of effectiveness depends on CBR quality as well.

4.6 Discussions and Conclusion

4.6.1 The Role of CBR on Consumer Information Processing

Service failure leads to various patterns of outcomes, including strengthened relationship, renegotiated relationship, forced stay, exit, avoidance, revenge, and loss of faith (Wortman, 2008). This study confirmed the role of CBR in processing information as well as the impact of crisis response strategy in recovering the brand attitude. This study found that negative eWOM has a greater negative impact on consumers with high CBR than those with low CBR, while response strategy communication has less of a positive impact on consumers with high CBR than on those with low CBR. Brand misconduct leads to a stronger deterioration effect in the high relationship quality group than in the low relationship quality group. Therefore, high brand relationship quality did not weaken the negative effects of brand misconduct (Agyeman & Ponniah, 2014). Higher emotional attachment to a brand leads to greater loss of trust after the revelation of a covert marketing message (Ashley & Leonard, 2009). Relationship quality is positively related to perceived betrayal, and perceived betrayal produces a desire for revenge and a desire for avoidance (Grégoire, Tripp, & Legoux, 2009).

Formerly loyal brand customers may be tempted to hurt the brand without any specific cause (Etter & Vestergaard, 2015). Even a brand’s most connected consumers are not immune to the unfavorable effects of negative brand actions (Etter & Vestergaard, 2015). Customers with a strong emotional bond with the service provider exhibit substantial attitude diminishing, regardless of the service recovery outcome (Mattila, 2004). Furthermore, although Ahluwalia et al. (2000) found that consumer commitment level buffers the impact of negative information, this effect may not apply when consumers are exposed to extreme information (i.e., life-threatening consequence) as such treatment of the current paper. It may be hard for even committed consumers to diminish the impact of this extreme information, as extreme information
is perceived to be more diagnostic than moderate information and is weighted more in overall evaluations (Ahluwalia et al., 2000).

Negative disconfirmation has a greater impact on satisfaction and repurchase intentions than positive disconfirmation (Anderson & Sullivan, 1993). Oliver (1999) referred to the expectation disconfirmation paradigm and suggested that loyal customers are likely to overcome obstacles to repurchase; however, the highly committed customers may become extremely disappointed after incidents involving severe failure, which will induce a negative response (Ahluwalia et al., 2000). Satisfaction and behavioral intentions for high-equity brands decrease at a faster rate than for low-equity brands, reflecting disappointment and feelings of betrayal (Brady, Cronin Jr, Fox, & Roehm, 2008). A high psychological contract (i.e., relationship) and high service failure induce higher levels of psychological contract breach than did those in the lower conditions. Psychological contract breach enhances feelings of betrayal and anger and lowers customers’ evaluation of a service provider’s partner quality (Su, 2014). Hence, some CBRs involving negative emotions toward the brand may lead to increased brand-self distance (Fournier & Alvarez, 2013).

4.6.2 The Role of CBR on Relationships Between Social Influence and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

This study affirmed that homophily source and information consensus have a greater impact on consumers with low CBR than on those with high CBR. The elaboration likelihood model is used to explain the persuasive effect of the proportion and quality of reviews. As the proportion of negative online consumer reviews increases, high-involvement consumers tend to conform to the perspective of reviewers, depending on the quality of the negative online consumer reviews; in contrast, low-involvement consumers tend to conform to the perspective of reviewers regardless of the quality of the negative online consumer reviews (Lee et al., 2008). Hence, consumers with low CBR evaluate information based on reviewer credibility (i.e., homophily leads to high credibility) and comments of other reviewers (i.e., message consensus). In addition, Chaiken (1980) asserted that low-involvement consumers have a greater impact on opinion change and persuasion from likable
communicators (i.e., high homophily) than unlikable communicators (i.e., low homophily), reflecting the employment of a heuristic processing strategy among them.

Low-commitment consumers who experience high message consensus tend to agree with the message writer and place blame on the brand (Chang & Wu, 2014). People who retrieved little attitude-relevant information (i.e., low CBR) were likely to be less capable of validating message arguments. Therefore, they would evaluate information based on a more superficial analysis of persuasion cues and focusing on attributes like message length (Wood, Kallgren, & Preisler, 1985). Martin, Hewstone, and Martin (2007) argued that when message elaboration is low, participants will be steered by peripheral cues, which will lead to agreement with the majority and rejection of the minority. Accuracy-motivated processing (i.e., high CBR) employs a low-effort reliance on consensus inferences to determine attitudes. In contrast, impression-motivated participants tended to incorporate their partners’ views into their consensus inferences and engaged in “social action” with their partners in anticipation of interacting with them (Chen et al., 1996)

4.6.3 The Role of CBR in Relationships Between Crisis Response Strategy and Consumers’ Brand Attitudes

This study found that accommodative strategy elicited more positive effects on consumers with low CBR than on those with high CBR, while defensive strategy produced a more positive impact on consumers with high CBR than on those with low CBR. Similar results involving consumers with high CBR and those with low CBR apply in conditions of high consensus and high homophily. In conditions of high consensus and high homophily, the use of accommodative strategy had a more positive effect on consumers with low CBR than on those with high CBR, while defensive strategy produced a more positive impact on consumers with high CBR than those with low CBR. However, in conditions of low consensus and low homophily, both accommodative strategy and defensive strategy are more effective on consumers with high CBR than on those with low CBR. In addition, in conditions of low consensus and low homophily, the use of accommodative strategy is more effective than defensive strategy, both on consumers with high CBR and low CBR.
Consumers with strong brand relationships are more likely to prefer defensive strategy than are those with weak brand relationship (Xia, 2013). High-commitment consumers are likely to counterargue against negative information (Ahluwalia et al., 2000). Hence, homophily and consensus intensify the effect.

Although high-relationship-quality customers feel more betrayed when no recovery was offered, this perception and their desire for revenge are greatly diminished by an apology and a modest post-complaint recovery with no monetary compensation. This is found in contrast to low-relationship-quality customers, who are more focused on monetary compensation (Grégoire et al., 2009). The type of crisis response strategy used has a greater effect on low homophily sources than high-homophily sources, and accommodative strategy is preferred over defensive strategy (Park & Cameron, 2014b). Hence, the effect of low consensus is stronger than the effect of CBR, which prefers defensive strategy.

4.6.4 Theoretical Contribution

First, previous research adopted an elaboration likelihood model (ELM) to explore the role of involvement (Petty et al., 1983) and brand commitment (Ahluwalia et al., 2000) on consumer information processing. According to Petty and Cacioppo (1986), consumers with high motivation to process information are likely to employ a central route more than a peripheral route, and vice versa for consumers with low motivation to process information. The current study extended the ELM to understand how consumers with high consumer brand relationship (CBR) and low CBR evaluate information based on their motivation to process information. High CBR consumers employ a central route focusing on the essence of the message, while low CBR consumers focus on peripheral cues when evaluating information. This study encourages researchers to explore the role of consumer characteristics using ELM to understand consumer information processing in social media.

Second, prior research explored the effectiveness of crisis response strategy (Park & Cameron, 2014a), yet few studies included consumer characteristics, such as CBR, in the analysis. This research explored the moderating role of CBR on attitude recovery and suggests that high CBR consumers focus on the essence of negative eWOM when processing information. Life-threatening negative eWOM
impacts high CBR consumers more strongly than it does low CBR consumers. However, response strategy has a stronger impact on low CBR consumers (compared to high CBR consumers), since low CBR consumers are less concerned with merit (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Although the essence of the response strategy statement expressed positive intent to recover consumer attitudes, it included both a defensive strategy and an accommodative strategy in general and did not focus on specific treatments to rebuild consumer attitudes; thus, a response strategy that may or may not lead to remedy is not the concern of low CBR consumers. As such, response strategy in general produces a stronger impact on low CBR consumers.

In contrast, high CBR consumers focus on the essence of the message when they process a crisis response strategy, either a defensive strategy or an accommodative strategy. They are motivated to process each response strategy. Since Petty and Cacioppo (1986) asserted that highly motivated consumers tend to be resistant and attempt to confirm their own correctness, high CBR consumers prefer a defensive strategy more than low CBR consumers do. In contrast, an accommodative strategy is more effective with low CBR consumers. Low CBR consumers also employ peripheral cues, which include message consensus and homophily source, when processing negative eWOM and response strategy. This study contributes to customer relationship management in sustaining and recovering consumer attitudes affected by negative eWOM.

### 4.6.5 Managerial Implications

The findings of the current research can be applied to customer relationship management along three dimensions: Mainly contribution is on relationship recovery, follow by relationship maintenance, and lastly relationship development.

#### 4.6.5.1 Relationship Recovery

It would be better to market services to existing customers rather than investing to attract a target market that is not familiar with the brand, since current customers who are already familiar with a brand likely already have a positive feeling toward that brand (Priluck, 2003). Hence, consumers with high CBR are
essential to the brand for enhancing brand equity, and marketers should especially concentrate on recovering their attitudes toward the brand. The current research found that negative eWOM can have a severely negative impact on high CBR consumers. They are likely to feel disappointed when their trusted brand causes a life-threatening service failure. Attempting to recover brand attitudes for high CBR consumers is therefore quite challenging.

Although high CBR consumers may feel disappointed with the brand, they still prefer that the brand deploy a defensive strategy, particularly when there is high consensus of negative eWOM transmitted through a high-homophily source. The intense negative effect of negative eWOM was increased through high consensus and a high-homophily source; still, the positive effect of a defensive strategy exceeded the prior negative effect of negative eWOM through high consensus and a high-homophily source as well. Therefore, a defensive strategy was the crisis response strategy that produced greater effectiveness in recovering brand attitudes among high CBR consumers. In addition, CBR can be restored when consumers observe consistent, trustworthy actions (Schweitzer, Hershey, & Bradlow, 2006). For instance, consumers may consider the corporate social responsibility of a brand as reflecting trustworthy actions and thus its capability to restore CBR (Choi & La, 2013).

For marketers who perceive that crisis damage is greater on low CBR consumers and accordingly attempt to restore a positive image among them, the brand should deploy an accommodative strategy. The positive effect of an accommodative strategy would be magnified through a high-consensus message communicated via the online communities in which it is a member. Hence, a message-framing strategy in an online community platform should be planned out carefully.

Still, not all relationships are important to a brand all the time. Some may already be coping well, while others may be important but neglected; further, some marketing is best handled as transaction marketing—the one-time deal. Hence, brands should set goals and determine activities to develop such a relationship (Gummesson, 1994).
4.6.5.2 Relationship Maintenance

Communication effectiveness is essential to maintaining relationships with customers. Two-way communications reflect that the brand is concerned with customers’ welfare. Communication intensity leads customers to perceive themselves as special persons and have a closer relationship with the brand as a result (Berry, 1995).

The interaction process, planned communication process, and value process are key elements of relationship marketing (Grönroos, 2004). Thus, besides effective communication strategy, the interaction process is crucial to maintaining relationships with customers. Top management must be customer-oriented and promote that orientation among employees. Furthermore, employees must be trained in customer service. Training sessions allow employees to learn to deal with particular service issues that may come up in the workplace. It is important for firms to have a customer service system in place that not only responds to consumer complaints but also encourages consumers to complain (Priluck, 2003).

4.6.5.3 Customer Relationship Development

Brands may employ online communities on social media as a platform to develop relationships with customers, since doing so enhances positive effects on both high CBR and low CBR consumers. Meanwhile, brands should monitor consumer dissatisfaction through a service quality information system that allows management to understand consumer complaints, track performance, reward good service, and determine what is important to consumers (Priluck, 2003). Public opinion (i.e., high consensus) on social media and among online community members plays an important role in mitigating the negative effects of negative eWOM on high CBR consumers. Framing the direction of comments and reviews in online community platforms while communicating with high CBR consumers via online communities in which they are members would enhance the positive effect for the brand.

4.6.6 Limitations and Recommendation for Future Research

The current research studied the role of online communities in social media, agreement among consumers, crisis response strategy, and CBR quality on
consumer attitude recovery. Further research should explore other aspects of consumer characteristics, such as susceptibility and self-construal, to understand how consumers process information on social media. Consumers with high susceptibility may employ a central route in an ELM when they process information, as they are highly motivated to evaluate information. Hence, negative eWOM may strongly influence those with high susceptibility.

Furthermore, self-construal may moderate the impact of negative eWOM and response strategy on consumer attitudes as well. Consumers with interdependent self-construal tend to conform with society according to the cognitive dissonance concept. As such, negative eWOM and response strategy may have a stronger impact on them. Future research could also study the impact of social media on purchase intention to build another aspect of business contribution.
Table 4.1 The consumer-brand relationship definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related literature</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Facets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fournier (1998)</td>
<td>Brand Relationship Quality: The strength of the connection formed between the consumer and the brand toward a prediction of relationship stability over time.</td>
<td>6 facets: love/passion, self-connection, commitment, interdependent, intimacy, brand partner quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts et al. (2003, p. 191)</td>
<td>Relationship quality: A measure of the extent to which consumers want to maintain relationships with their service providers.</td>
<td>Trust in integrity, trust in benevolence, commitment, affective conflict, and satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang and Chieng (2006)</td>
<td>Brand Relationship Quality: The tie between a person and a brand that is voluntary or is enforced interdependently between the person and the brand. Individual as well as shared experiences work through brand association, brand personality, brand attitude, and brand image to shape a consumer–brand relationship.</td>
<td>Functional, Love, Commitment, Attachment, Connection, Partner Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetscherin and Heinrich (2014)</td>
<td>Brand Relationship Quality: The strength of the connection formed between the consumer and the brand toward a prediction of relationship stability over time.</td>
<td>Brand connection matrix (functional-based and emotional-based), brand feeling matrix (strengths of relationships, consumers’ feeling toward the brand)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Experimental scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Homophily Source</th>
<th>Low Homophily Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Consensus</td>
<td>Low Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodative Response strategy</td>
<td>- Accommodative Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Consensus</td>
<td>- Low Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accommodative Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
<td>- Low Homophily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Consensus</td>
<td>- High Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Response Strategy</td>
<td>- Defensive Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Homophily</td>
<td>- Low Homophily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Consensus</td>
<td>- High Consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Consensus | Low Consensus | High Consensus | Low Consensus |
Accommodative Response |
- Accommodative Response |
- High Homophily |
- High Consensus |
- Accommodative Response |
- High Homophily |
- High Consensus |
- Defensive Response |
- High Homophily |
- High Consensus |
- Defensive Response |
- Low Homophily |
- High Consensus |
- Defensive Response |
- Low Homophily |
- Low Consensus |
- Defensive Response |
- Low Homophily |
- Low Consensus |
Table 4.3 Reliability test of pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homophily</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Strategy</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Strategy</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Brand Relationship</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Validity and reliability test of main study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homophily</td>
<td>&gt;.938</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>&gt;.855</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Strategy</td>
<td>&gt;.746</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Brand Relationship</td>
<td>&gt;.541</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 The number of respondents per scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Homophily</th>
<th>Low Homophily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High CBR</td>
<td>Low CBR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Consensus</td>
<td>Low Consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Homophily</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Homophily</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodative</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low CBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1 CBR and consumer attitude recovery in online communities’ model

$X_{NE}$ refers to mean value of brand attitude after reading negative eWOM, $X_{RE}$ refers to mean value of brand attitude after reading response strategy.

Figure 4.2 Experimental design diagram
Figure 4.3 Experimental process
See post of response strategy in assigned group

Accommodative Response Strategy

High consensus: read 3 comments that agree with response strategy & one comment that disagrees with

Consensus manipulations check and brand attitude questions completion

Defensive Response Strategy

Low consensus: read 3 comments that disagree with response strategy & one comment that agrees with

Read four comments regarding response
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Debrief

Figure 4.3 (continued)
Figure 4.4 Overall attitude level from negative eWOM of customers with high CBR and low CBR

Figure 4.5 Attitude Pattern from negative eWOM and response strategy of high CBR and low CBR

Figure 4.6 Attitude level of customer from negative eWOM with high CBR and low CBR under high homophily source
Figure 4.7 Attitude pattern from negative eWOM and response strategy of high CBR and low CBR under high homophily

Figure 4.8 Attitude level of customer from negative eWOM with high CBR and low CBR under high consensus eWOM

Figure 4.9 Attitude pattern from negative eWOM and response strategy of high CBR and low CBR under high Consensus
Figure 4.10 Pattern of attitude recovery under accommodative strategy

Figure 4.11 Pattern of attitude recovery under defensive strategy

Figure 4.12 Attitude recovery from response strategies
Figure 4.13 Summary of attitude pattern
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Discussion

Previous research confirmed the influence of information source, information characteristics, and consumer characteristics in processing negative eWOM information and induction of negative impact on brands. This study found that prior research explored crisis response strategy in diverse dimensions, including crisis response strategy in social media, crisis response strategy relating to information sources, and crisis strategy relating to consumer characteristics. Still, there was limited exploration of the integrating effects of information source, information characteristics, and consumer characteristics on consumers’ brand attitudes. Therefore, this research provided empirical evidence of integral antecedents of consumer information evaluation in relation to brand crisis that include information characteristic (i.e., message consensus), information source (i.e., homophily source), and consumer characteristic (i.e., CBR).

This study also attempted to seek service recovery strategies (i.e., defensive response strategy, accommodative response strategy) to resume from brand crisis. This research portrayed the changing pattern of consumer brand attitude before and after the negative eWOM as well as before and after response strategy. The betrayal emotion was found in consumers with high CBR.

This research suggested that negative eWOM from high-homophily sources elicits a stronger negative impact on consumer attitudes; such an effect is consistent with the impact of crisis response strategy communicated from high-homophily sources that produces a greater positive effect on consumer attitude. The findings showed that homophily prime with trustworthiness of information (Wang et al., 2008). Likewise, a high consensus of negative eWOM elicits a stronger negative influence on consumer attitudes, while a high consensus of crisis response strategy has a greater positive effect on consumer attitudes. This is consistent with Cialdini and Goldstein (2004), who proposed the likelihood of the majority to accept high-consensus information.
Furthermore, information source has a stronger impact than information characteristics, as information from a high-homophily source has greater influence on consumer attitude than high-consensus information. This is aligned with Chaiken (1980), who suggested that a likable source (i.e., homophily) would have a greater impact on opinion change than argument consensus.

With regard to imposed crisis response strategy, this study affirmed that accommodative strategy is more effective when a high consensus of negative eWOM is communicated through a high-homophily source. In contrast, defensive strategy is more effective when a low consensus of negative eWOM is communicated through a low homophily source. However, there was limited research indicated the role of CBR in the effect of message consensus, homophily source, and crisis response strategy on consumers’ brand attitude recovery. This study proposed that CBR quality moderates the impact of both negative eWOM and crisis response strategy on consumer attitude. The current research found that when the crisis is related to life-threatening issues, the negative effect of negative eWOM is stronger on consumers with high CBR, and the positive effect of the crisis response strategy is lower on them. Customers with high commitment may be tremendously disappointed with severe service failure, which may generate a negative response (Ahluwalia et al., 2000).

Nonetheless, message consensus and homophily source enhance the negative effect of negative eWOM and the positive effect of crisis response strategy on consumers with low CBR, as they process information via a peripheral route (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Therefore, CBR mitigates the impact of high consensus and high homophily on consumer attitude. In addition, high-commitment consumers tend to counterargue against negative information (Ahluwalia et al., 2000). Hence, high-CBR consumers prefer the use of defensive strategy, while low-CBR consumers prefer accommodative strategy. Consumers with a robust brand relationship favor defensive strategy more than those with a weak brand relationship (Xia, 2013).

Highlighting the crisis response strategy effectiveness on high-CBR consumers, communicating defensive strategy with high-consensus information through a high-homophily source is more profoundly effective on them, whereas communicating accommodative strategy with low-consensus information through a low homophily source is also effective on them.
5.2 Theoretical Contributions

First, the current research extends the body of knowledge on social network theory to crisis response strategy communication, since prior research has mainly focused on antecedents of eWOM in social networks (Brown et al., 2007). This research highlights the role of social influence, which includes homophily source and message consensus. Social influence magnifies the positive effect of crisis response strategy on consumer attitude recovery. This study calls for researchers to apply a social network paradigm to communication on social media for service recovery.

Second, prior research studied the effect of negative eWOM and crisis response strategy through a narrow lens of either negative eWOM effect or response strategy effect, whereas the present study explored the phenomenon from a holistic view that included both negative eWOM effects and response strategy effects. This may lead to findings inconsistent with Lee and Cranage (2012), who focused only on consensus of negative eWOM and its effects while ignoring consensus of crisis response strategy. This research portrays a different pattern of attitude recovery based on message consensus and homophily source; consequently, researchers are encouraged to apply the holistic view to service recovery.

Third, prior research studied the effectiveness of response strategy in only one episode of service recovery (Neale & Murphy, 2007). Few studies have examined the effect of second recovery attempts after an initially insufficient recovery. This research suggests that personal apologies constitute insufficient recovery and therefore require further remedies, either a defensive strategy or an accommodative strategy. Still, the effectiveness of a response strategy is based on social influence as well, since the high degree of social influence (i.e., message consensus, homophily source) enhances the positive effect of response strategy. This study emphasizes service failure and service recovery while urging researchers to explore more complicated levels of crisis response strategy.

Fourth, previous studies on the role of involvement (Petty et al., 1983) and brand commitment (Ahluwalia et al., 2000) on consumer information processing have used the elaboration likelihood model (ELM). This study extended the model and included CBR in the analysis. According to Petty and Cacioppo (1986), consumers
highly motivated to process information are likely to focus on the essence of the message, while less motivated consumers tend to focus on peripheral cues. As such, high CBR consumers highly motivated to process information focus on the response strategy statement, while low CBR consumers focus on peripheral cues, such as homophily source and message consensus. This study calls on researchers to apply ELM to explore the role of consumer characteristics on information processing outcomes, since doing so would enhance understanding of consumer motivations to process information.

Fifth, a prior research study assessed the effectiveness of crisis response strategy (Park & Cameron, 2014a), yet few studies have included consumer characteristics, such as CBR, in the analysis. This study explored the moderating role of CBR on attitude recovery. Since Petty and Cacioppo (1986) asserted that highly motivated consumers tend to be resistant and attempt to confirm their own correctness, high CBR consumers prefer a defensive strategy more than low CBR consumers do, while low CBR consumers prefer an accommodative strategy. This study contributes to customer relationship management in sustaining and recovering consumer attitudes.

5.3 Managerial Implications

This research demonstrates the role of social influence on social media on attitude recovery, particularly the role of online community members on social media who share common interests. Thus, brands should employ online communities on social media to remedy and develop closer relationships with consumers. Sponsored online communities and consumer-generated online communities are available on social media. For instance, Sephora is a beauty brand that focuses on content marketing as well as on developing an online community and a social community management strategy. It actively includes all conversations in their Beauty Talk community (*The Guardian*, 2013). This allows Sephora to sustain relationships with customers through customer engagement in the online community on social media. Another example is Commonwealth Bank, which has attempted to develop a meaningful relationship with customers by creating a community that allows customers to share investment tips,
write content, access analyst information, and share their own investment portfolios (*The Guardian*, 2013).

The current research proposes that marketers should manage online communities, including online community building, sustaining, and monitoring, as well as employee training. In addition, marketers should understand relationship development, relationship maintenance, and relationship recovery.

### 5.3.1 Online Community Building

Building a strong online community would produce positive effects on service recovery. A high degree of membership and agreement by online community members allow brands to recover from crises. Brands should encourage consumers to perceive that they are community members or partners (McWilliam, 2000). To produce brand community value, marketers should engage in social networking, impression management, and community engagement (Schau et al., 2009). Highly engaging social media campaigns related to user-generated content are inclined to produce consumer brand commitment and loyalty (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010).

### 5.3.2 Online Community Sustaining

Brands could use online communities as tools to communicate and cope when a crisis occurs while at the same time sustaining relationships with online community members. Brands may communicate to customers with public relations, news, articles, previews, reviews, and critics (i.e., paid reviews referred to as advertorial, non-paid reviews) via sponsored online communities and consumer-generated online communities on social media. Nonetheless, brands should declare sponsorship to avoid negative effects, such as boycotts (Hoffman & Fodor, 2010). This study suggests that message consensus intensively influences consumer attitudes; however, brands should be aware that consumers prefer user-controlled mediums, as they want to control the relationship. Hence, overly controlling the discussion or dialogue in online communities would lead to loss of interest among their members (McWilliam, 2000).
5.3.3 Online Community Monitoring

This research highlights the role of message consensus since the sentiment of consensus can produce either positive or negative effects. Therefore, tracking technology can facilitate the monitoring of eWOM on social media and obtain sentiments about a brand by analyzing the number of good or bad online conversations (Ang, 2011). Brands should respond to all comments within 24 hours. In addition, brands should follow up negative comments with proper solutions, while responding with a simple “thank you” for positive comments. When negative comments become a brand crisis, the brand should deploy an accommodative strategy, particularly when there is high consensus of negative eWOM. In addition, brands should seek out the most influential members in the online community and carefully nurture them (Ang, 2011).

5.3.4 Employee Training

In addition to online communication, hiring, training, and empowering front-line employees would improve successful service recovery (Tax & Brown, 1998). Top management must be customer-oriented and promote that orientation among employees. Moreover, employees must be trained in customer service. Training sessions allow employees to learn to deal with particular service issues that may come up in the workplace. It is important for firms to have a customer service system in place that not only responds to consumer complaints but also encourages consumers to complain (Priluck, 2003). Marketers should identify when service failures occur, resolve customer problems, communicate and classify service failures, add integrating data, and improve overall service (Tax & Brown, 1998). They should also develop effective recovery programs that include an accommodative strategy and improve the service system to enhance service quality and boost customer value and profitability (Tax & Brown, 1998).

5.3.5 Relationship Development

Marketers may develop relationships with customers via online communities on social media, since doing so would enhance positive effects on both
high CBR and low CBR consumers. In addition, brands should monitor consumer dissatisfaction through a service quality information system that helps the brand understand consumer complaints, track performance, reward good service, and determine what is important to consumers (Priluck, 2003). The public opinions (i.e., high consensus) of online community members on social media can mitigate the negative effects of negative eWOM on high CBR consumers. Therefore, framing the sentiments of comments and reviews in online community platforms while communicating with high CBR consumers via the online communities in which they are members would enhance the positive effects for the brand.

5.3.6 Relationship Maintenance and Recovery

Communication effectiveness is essential to maintaining relationships with customers. Two-way communications reflect that the brand is concerned with customers’ welfare. Communication intensity leads customers to perceive themselves as special persons and have a closer relationship with the brand as a result (Berry, 1995).

For relationship recovery, it would be better to market services to existing customers rather than to invest in attracting a target market that is not familiar with the brand, since current customers who are already familiar with the brand likely already have a positive feeling toward that brand (Priluck, 2003). Negative eWOM toward a brand, particularly regarding life-threatening incidents, has a strong impact on consumers with high CBR, requiring massive effort to regain their positive attitude. Thus, marketers should employ various strategies to extend the adopted response strategy to recover from distrust or feelings of betrayal among consumers.

Brands should communicate to high CBR consumers via their online communities to boost positive attitudes toward the brand, although this effect is stronger on low CBR consumers. In addition, monitoring consumer reactions on social media, such as comments and reviews, would help a brand to rebuild its reputation, as high-consensus information generates greater effects on low CBR consumers.

Marketers should communicate an accommodative strategy targeting low CBR consumers while communicating a defensive strategy targeting high CBR
consumers. Particularly, when brands recognize that a high degree of consensus on social media has been reached regarding the situation, they should communicate a defensive strategy to high CBR consumers via their online member communities, while communicating an accommodative strategy to low CBR consumers via their online communities. This may depend on the vulnerability of the target group and brand focus. However, when brands realize that there is disagreement in online communities in which they are not members, they should communicate an accommodative strategy via such online communities.

5.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The current research provided empirical evidence of consumer information processing in crisis response strategy communication, emphasizing the role of online communities in social media, agreement among consumers, crisis response strategy, and CBR quality. This paper employed a life-threatening crisis that had a strong impact on high CBR consumers, since the essence of the negative eWOM was relatively intense according to the elaboration likelihood model (ELM). Further research should explore crises with lower severity to observe the role of CBR when consumers process information. The essence and vividness of negative eWOM may differentially influence consumer attitudes. Also, the current research employed only two dominant response strategies (i.e., defensive strategy, accommodative strategy) to explore their impact on consumer attitudes. Future research could apply multiple levels of crisis response strategies to provide a more specific remedy strategy.

In addition, other aspects of consumer characteristics should be examined, such as susceptibility, self-construal, and the longevity of brand relationships, to gain insights into consumer information processing on social media. Susceptibility impacts how consumers process information. They may employ a central route in ELM when they process information, as they are highly motivated to evaluate information. Hence, negative eWOM may strongly influence those with high susceptibility. Furthermore, self-construal may moderate the impact of negative eWOM and response strategy on consumer attitudes as well. Negative eWOM and response strategy may impact consumers with interdependent self-construal greater than consumers with independent...
self-construal, since consumers with interdependent self-construal are likely to conform with society according to the cognitive dissonance concept. Also, to extend the role of CBR quality, the longevity of brand relationships may impact information evaluation, as those with high longevity of brand relationships may employ a central route in ELM when they process information, as they are highly motivated to process information.

Further studies should also explore the role of involvement and switching cost on consumer evaluation of negative eWOM and response strategy on social media. High involvement and high switching cost may employ a central route in ELM to evaluate information, as such consumers are highly motivated to process information. Prior attitudes toward a brand may also impact consumer attitudes when processing negative eWOM and response strategy according to cognitive dissonance. Future research could study the impact of social media on purchase intention to build another aspect of business contribution.
Table 5.1 Hypotheses Testing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Attitude change ($\bar{x}<em>{NE}$ or $\bar{x}</em>{RE}$, P-value)</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Negative eWOM communicated through high-homophily sources induce a</td>
<td>9.683, .002</td>
<td>Low Homophily (.208, .000) &lt; High Homophily (.402*, .000)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stronger effect on brand attitude than when communicated through low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homophily sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: Crisis response strategies communicated through high-homophily</td>
<td>8.979</td>
<td>Low Homophily (-.124, .016) &lt; High Homophily (.094, .068)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources induce a stronger effect on brand attitude than when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicated through low homophily sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2a: High consensus of negative eWOM has a stronger effect on brand</td>
<td>.004, .947</td>
<td>Low Consensus (.303, .000) &lt; High Consensus (.307, .000)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude than low consensus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2b: High consensus of crisis response strategy has a stronger effect</td>
<td>10.522</td>
<td>Low Consensus (-.133, .01) &lt; High Consensus (.103, .045)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on brand attitude recovery than low consensus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a: Negative eWOM communicated through high-homophily sources induces a</td>
<td></td>
<td>High Consensus (.307, .000) &lt; High Homophily (.402*, .000)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stronger effect on brand attitude than high consensus negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b: Crisis response strategy communicated through high-homophily</td>
<td>5.344</td>
<td>High Consensus (.103, .045) &gt; High Homophily (.094, .068)</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources induces a stronger effect on brand attitude than high consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crisis response strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Attitude change ($X_{NE}$ or $X_{BE}$, P-value)</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| H4: The use of accommodative strategy in online communitiess with high consensus and high homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than defensive strategy. | .011, .043  | High Consensus and High Homophily:  
Defensive (.223, .032) $<$ Accommodative (.361, .000)  | Supported       |
| H5: The use of defensive strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than accommodative strategy. | .011, .043  | Low Consensus and Low Homophily:  
Accommodative (.190, .062) $<$ Defensive (-.506, .000)  | Not Supported   |

**Chapter 4**

H1a: Under high CBR quality, negative eWOM would have stronger impact on consumer brand attitude than under low CBR quality.

1.065, .303 High CBR (.335, .000) $>$ Low CBR (.269, .000)  | Supported       |

H1b: Under high CBR quality, response strategy would have stronger impact on consumer brand attitude than under low CBR quality.

1.104, .294 High CBR (-.054,.288) $<$ Low CBR (.025, .652)  | Not Supported   |

H2a: Under low CBR quality, high-homophily sources of negative eWOM will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.

.003, .960 High Homo:  
High CBR (.400, .000) $<$ Low CBR (.404, .000)  | Supported       |

H2b: Under low CBR quality, high-homophily sources of response strategy will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.

3.168,.077 High Homo:  
High CBR (.012, .850) $<$ Low CBR (.189, .013)  | Supported       |

H3a: Under low CBR quality, high consensus negative eWOM will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.

2.071, .151 High Consensus:  
High CBR (.296, .000) $<$ Low CBR (.322, .000)  | Supported       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Attitude change ($\bar{X}<em>{NE}$ or $\bar{X}</em>{BE}$, P-value)</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H3b: Under low CBR quality, high consensus response strategy will have more impact on brand attitude than under high CBR quality.</td>
<td>5.845, .016</td>
<td>High Consensus: High CBR (-.011, .873) &lt; Low CBR (.235, .003)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: Under low CBR quality, the use of accommodative strategy has stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of accommodative strategy under high CBR quality.</td>
<td>13.694, .000</td>
<td>Accommodative: Low CBR (.376, .000) &gt; High CBR (.034, .584)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: Under high CBR quality, the use of defensive strategy has a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of defensive strategy under low CBR quality.</td>
<td>2.902, .090</td>
<td>Defensive: Low CBR (-.323, .000) &lt; High CBR (-.139, .056)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Under high CBR quality, the use of defensive strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily will have a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of defensive strategy in online communities with high consensus and high homophily under low CBR quality.</td>
<td>.718, .397</td>
<td>High consensus, High Homophily, Defensive: Low CBR (.011, .946) &lt; High CBR (.350, .006)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Under high CBR quality, the use of accommodative strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily will have a stronger impact on brand attitude recovery than the use of accommodative strategy in online communities with low consensus and low homophily under low CBR quality.</td>
<td>.718, .397</td>
<td>Low consensus, Low Homophily, Accommodative: Low CBR (.072, .574) &lt; High CBR (.352, .020)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A
TREATMENT SCENARIO

Negative eWOM

“Two celeb kids were admitted at the hospital, the reoccurrence incident at the famous restaurant”

On August 31, 2017, one celebrity posted on his facebook that his kids got sick because of food poison after eating food at restaurant A and were bought to the hospital.

We found that a lot of customers posted the complaint on social media that they got similar symptom after eating at the same restaurant. Some customers said that they received an apology phone call from the restaurant branch manager. However, the official statement from the restaurant has not been published.”

Defensive Response Strategy

“According to the incident on August 31 that some customers complaint of acute food poison from our restaurant, we confirmed that all of our served dishes were hygiene and meet standard quality. We strictly follow our standard in cooking and cleaning. All ingredients are up to the specified standard. Due to the incident was not the failure of our restaurant, we are not obligated to response to the situation. Nonetheless, we regret for such incident.”

Accomodative Response Strategy

“According to the incident on August 31 that some customers complaint of acute food poison from our restaurant, we confirmed that all of our served dishes were hygiene and meet standard quality. We sincerely apologize for the incident that may affected some customers. We will responsible for the incurred medical expense and full refund of the served dish. Please be assured that we determined to provide the best service and serve high quality dishes to our customers. We had overhaul our kitchen and change the suppliers of our ingredients. We are now reopen and ready to serve our beloved customers.”
High Homophily Treatment

“Have you ever count of how many more times you have to take the exam to graduate?”

“Steps of studying for the exam: 1.) Reading; 2.) Getting bored; 3.) Surf the internet on cell phone”

“Sometimes, it takes so long for grades to be available on the system”

Low Homophily Treatment

“Legal options for Thai to obtain permit in USA.”

“Abnormality of new born baby that needed to be checked with 24 hours after birth”

“Those who stay in New York and lose social security card, please follow these steps.”

High Consensus on Negative eWOM Treatment

“Too bad, this restaurant again”

“I have never had any problem with it. I just went there last month.”

“I used to have problem with staff at this branch. I made a complaint and there is still no response.”

“I used to experience the same thing. It took me really bad.”

Low Consensus on Negative eWOM Treatment

“I have never had any problem with it. I just went there last month.”

“I used to experience the same thing. It took me really bad.”

“Actually. I and my girlfriend are really like this restaurant. It is very tasty”

“I still go to this restaurant. It is easy to go there and the food is not bad.”

High Consensus on Response Strategy Treatment

“I still go to this restaurant. I used to have problem with this restaurant and the manager came to apologize which I am satisfy with it.”

“I don’t believe that. I found that most restuarants always give official statement like this. After a few months, we will find online comments on food hygiene problems again.”

“It’s good that they give official statement. I still go to this restaurant because my kid like it. Also, I have never found any problems at the branch that I visited.”

“I still eat at this restuarant because I think the food is ok.
Low Consensus on Response Strategy Treatment

“I don’t believe that. I found that most restaurants always give official statement like this. After a few months, we will find online comments on food hygiene problems again.”

“It’s good that they give official statement. I still go to this restaurant because my kid like it. Also, I have never found any problems at the branch that I visited.”

“I disagree with the official statement like this. The restaurant will wait till the news to be faded away and there’s nothing much to process. When it happened again, they will give the same official statement. That’s easy for them.

“I really don’t believe that. After awhile, attention on this story will be declined as usual. So sad.”
แบบสอบถาม เรื่องพฤติกรรมการใช้งาน Social Media

ข้อมูลที่นักศึกษาจะตอบต่อไปนี้ ผู้ที่จะใช้ในการปรับปรุงองค์ความรู้ด้านการตลาดให้ดีขึ้น และเมื่อทำเสร็จหมดทุกข้อของนักศึกษาจะส่งต่ออาจารย์ผู้สอน **ให้นักศึกษาตอบคำถามตามความรู้สึก หรือข้อมูลที่เป็นจริงเท่านั้น ถ้าข้อมูลที่ตอบไปไม่ถูกต้อง ให้หนึ่งข้อที่ระบุไว้นี้จะยังดีกว่าการตอบไป**

โดยในแบบสอบถามนี้ให้ตอบตามความสำคัญ ดังนี้

Social Media หมายถึง เวปไซต์ หรือ application ที่ให้ผู้ใช้งาน สร้างและเผยแพร่ข้อมูล หรือมีส่วนร่วมในเครือข่ายสังคมออนไลน์ เช่น Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Line

Online Community หมายถึง ชุมชนออนไลน์ ที่สมาชิกสามารถสื่อสารผ่านทางอินเตอร์เน็ต โดยอยู่ในรูปแบบของ ป็อปโฟ้ร หรือ group ในเฟสบุ๊ค

ออนไลน์รีวิว หมายถึง ข้อมูลการประเมิน หรือการร้องเรียน ต่อสินค้าหรือบริการ ที่มีเผยแพร่บนอินเตอร์เน็ต เช่น ป็อปโฟ้ร หรือ group ในเฟสบุ๊ค

ค่าที่ตอบแบบสอบถามประกอบด้วย 4 ส่วน โดยให้ตอบคำถามตามลำดับ ดังนี้

1. ให้ตอบคำถามในส่วนที่ 1 และส่วนที่ 2
2. หลังการตอบคำถามในส่วนที่ 2 เรียบร้อยแล้ว ให้ยุติการตอบคำถามแบบสอบถาม หรือตอบคำถามส่วนที่ 3
3. หลังการตอบคำถามในส่วนที่ 3 เรียบร้อย ให้ตอบคำถามส่วนที่ 4
4. หลังการตอบคำถามในส่วนที่ 4 เรียบร้อย ให้ตอบคำถามส่วนที่ 5

โดยให้นักศึกษาทำเครื่องหมาย ✓ ลงในช่อง เพียง 1 ตัวเลือกในแต่ละคำถามที่แสดงคล้องกับตนเอง ยกเว้นคำถามที่ระบุให้ตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ตัวเลือก
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ส่วนที่ 1: ข้อมูลทั่วไปของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม

1. เพศ (Gender):  □ 1. ชาย  □ 2. หญิง
3. เบี้ยเลี้ยงต่อเดือน (Allowance):  □ 1. 3,000 – 6,000 บาท  □ 2. 6,001 – 11,000 บาท  □ 3. มากกว่า 11,000 บาท
4. ความถี่ในการรับประทานอาหารในร้านที่มีสาขา เช่น KFC MK (Fq eat):  □ 1. ทุกวัน  □ 2. วันเว้นวัน  □ 3. สัปดาห์ละ 2-3 วัน  □ 4. สัปดาห์ละครั้ง  □ 5. เดือนละครั้งหรือน้อยกว่า
6. ประเภทอาหารที่รับประทานบ่อยที่สุด (Food Type):  □ 1. อาหารไทย  □ 2. อาหารญี่ปุ่น  □ 3. อาหารเกาหลี  □ 4. อาหารจีน  □ 5. อาหารอิตาเลียน  □ 6. อาหาร Fast food
7. ความถี่ในการรับประทานอาหารประเภทที่เลือกในข้อก่อนหน้านี้ (Fq food):  □ 1. ทุกวัน  □ 2. วันเว้นวัน  □ 3. สัปดาห์ละ 2-3 วัน  □ 4. สัปดาห์ละครั้ง  □ 5. เดือนละครั้งหรือน้อยกว่า
8. โดยส่วนใหญ่ คุณได้รับข้อมูลข่าวสาร ผ่านช่องทางใดมากที่สุด (Info Ch):  □ 1. โทรทัศน์  □ 2. วิทยุ  □ 3. หนังสือพิมพ์  □ 4. สื่อออนไลน์  □ 5. เพื่อน/ครอบครัว  □ 6. อื่นๆ โปรดระบุ ___________
9. ความถี่ในการใช้ Social Media โดยเฉลี่ย (Fq SM):  □ 1. ทุกๆ ชั่วโมง  □ 2. ทุกสองชั่วโมง  □ 3. สองครั้งต่อวัน  □ 4. หนึ่งครั้งต่อวันหรือน้อยกว่า
10. ความถี่ในการโพสข้อความบน Social media (Fq post):  □ 1. ทุกชั่วโมง  □ 2. ทุกสองชั่วโมง  □ 3. สองครั้งต่อวัน  □ 4. หนึ่งครั้งต่อวันหรือน้อยกว่า
11. คุณใช้เวลาโดยเฉลี่ยนานเท่าใดบน Social Media (SM Min):  □ 1. น้อยกว่า 5 นาที  □ 2. 5 – 15 นาที □ 3. 16 – 30 นาที □ 4. 31 – 60 นาที □ 5. มากกว่า 60 นาที
12. คุณใช้ Social Media นานเท่าใดแล้ว (SM Expr):  □ 1. น้อยกว่า 6 เดือน  □ 2. 6 – 12 เดือน □ 3. 1 - 3 ปี  □ 4. 4 - 6 ปี  □ 5. มากกว่า 7 ปี
14. คุณใช้ Social Media ผ่านอุปกรณ์ใด (ตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ) (Appliance):  □ 1. โทรศัพท์มือถือ □ 2. แท๊บเล็ต □ 3. คอมพิวเตอร์
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15. คุณเป็นสมาชิก online community ในด้านใด (ตอบได้มากกว่า 1 ข้อ) (CM Member):
- ☐ 1. ครอบครัวและวิถีชีวิต
- ☐ 2. การทำงาน
- ☐ 3. งานอดิเรก
- ☐ 4. จิตใจ ธรรมะ และสุขภาพ
- ☐ 5. การเมือง
- ☐ 6. กลยุทธ์ทางธุรกิจ
- ☐ 7. การศึกษา
- ☐ 8. ความสว่างความงาม

ส่วนที่ 2: ลักษณะของผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม
ให้นักศึกษาอ่านแต่ละคำถามต่อไปนี้ พิจารณาถึงระดับความเห็นต่อถูกแต่ละข้อความ ที่เครื่องหมาย (✔) ลงในช่องที่ตรงกับความรู้สึกแรกของนักศึกษาที่มีต่อข้อความนั้นๆ (ข้อความละ 1 ช่องเท่านั้น)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>เลือกตัวถึงร้านอาหาร KFC คุณ...</th>
<th>น้อยที่สุด</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างน้อย</th>
<th>ปานกลาง</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างมาก</th>
<th>มาก</th>
<th>มากที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 มีความคุ้นเคย...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 มีการใช้บริการบ่อย...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 มีความรู้สึกว่ามีข้อมูลของร้านนี้...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ตามประสบการณ์ของคุณแล้ว คุณมีความสัมพันธ์อย่างไรกับร้านอาหาร KFC ในลักษณะใด ให้อย่างข้อความต่อไปนี้ พิจารณาระดับความเห็นต่อถูกแต่ละข้อความ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>เลือกตัวถึงร้านอาหาร KFC มีความจริงใจในการแก้ไขปัญหา</th>
<th>น้อยที่สุด</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างน้อย</th>
<th>ปานกลาง</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างมาก</th>
<th>มาก</th>
<th>มากที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 เมื่อเกิดปัญหา ร้านอาหาร KFC มีความจริงใจในการแก้ไขปัญหา</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 ร้านอาหาร KFC มีความสุจริต</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 ร้านอาหาร KFC มีความน่าไว้วางใจ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 ร้านอาหาร KFC ใส่ใจในสวัสดิภาพของนักบริการที่มีอยู่ในร้าน</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 เมื่อมีปัญหาที่เกิดขึ้นขณะที่ฉันใช้บริการในร้านอาหาร KFC ฉันรู้ว่า ร้านอาหาร KFC จะตอบสนองต่อปัญหาด้วยความเข้าใจ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 ฉันสามารถไว้วางใจ ร้านอาหาร KFC ได้เมื่อพิจารณาถึงผลกระทบที่ฉันไม่ได้รับจากพฤติกรรมของร้านอาหาร KFC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. code: 25605502310062FUA
3. คุณมีทัศนคติต่อแบรนด์ร้านอาหาร KFC อย่างไร ให้อานข้อความต่อไปนี้ พิจารณาดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>เงื่อนไข</th>
<th>น้อยที่สุด</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ค่อนข้าง</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ปานกลาง</th>
<th>มาก</th>
<th>มากที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. เมื่อพูดถึงร้านอาหาร KFC คุณ ..............

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>เงื่อนไข</th>
<th>น้อยที่สุด</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ค่อนข้าง</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ปานกลาง</th>
<th>มาก</th>
<th>มากที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** พักการตอบคำถาม ***

[Figure of Homophily Treatment]
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4. ให้อ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้: พิจารณาระดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ จากการอ่านข้อมูลใน Online Community กลุ่มนี้ ฉันคิดว่าคนใน Online Community กลุ่มนี้........

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>น้อยที่สุด</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ค่อนกลาง</th>
<th>มาก</th>
<th>มากที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 คนในกรุ๊ปที่ฉันได้อ่านนี้ มีความใกล้เคียงกับฉัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 คนในกรุ๊ปที่ฉันได้อ่านนี้ มีประสบการณ์ใกล้เคียงกับฉัน</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 คนในกรุ๊ปที่ฉันได้อ่านนี้ มีความเหมือนฉันมาก</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** พักการตอบคำถาม ***

[Figure of Negative eWOM Treatment]
ส่วนที่ 3: หลังจากอ่านข้อมูลเหตุการณ์ที่เกิดขึ้นและการแก้ไขปัญหา ให้ตอบคำถามตามความรู้สึก โดยให้อ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้ แล้วพิจารณาระดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ

1. ให้อ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้ แล้วพิจารณาระดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>คอลัมน์</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 คอมเมนท์ของคนส่วนใหญ่ในรูปที่ถูกต้องได้อย่างน้อยในการร้านอาหาร KFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 โดยรวมแล้ว คอมเมนท์ของคนส่วนใหญ่ในรูปที่ถูกต้องได้อย่างน้อย มีภาพลบต่อร้านอาหาร KFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 คอมเมนท์ของคนส่วนใหญ่ในรูปที่ถูกต้องได้อย่างน้อยเป็นไปในทิศทางเดียวกัน ซึ่งสร้างภาพลบต่อร้านอาหาร KFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. คุณมีทัศนคติต่อแบรนด์ร้านอาหาร KFCอย่างไร ให้อ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้ ฟังการระดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ชื่อเรื่อง</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 คิดว่าเป็นบริการที่ดี</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 มีความชอบต่อร้าน KFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 มีความพึงพอใจต่อร้าน KFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 คิดว่าเป็นร้านที่มีคุณภาพ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** พักการตอบคำถาม ***

[Figure of Response Strategy Treatment]
ส่วนที่ 4: หลังจากอ่านคําชี้แจงของร้านอาหาร KFC ให้ตอบคําถามตามความรู้สึก โดยให้อ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้ แล้วพิจารณาระดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ

1. ให้อ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้ แล้วพิจารณาระดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>จากการอ่านคําชี้แจงของร้านอาหาร KFC คุณคิดว่า......</th>
<th>น้อยที่สุด</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างน้อย</th>
<th>ปานกลาง</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างมาก</th>
<th>มาก</th>
<th>มากที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 คําชี้แจงของร้านอาหาร KFC แสดงถึงการขอโทษต่อปัญหาที่เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 คําชี้แจงของร้านอาหาร KFC แสดงถึงความรับผิดชอบต่อปัญหาที่เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 **คําชี้แจงของร้านอาหาร KFC แสดงถึงความมั่นคงและพึงพอใจต่อผู้บริการที่เกิดขึ้น</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 **คําชี้แจงของร้านอาหาร KFC แสดงถึงความตั้งใจที่จะแก้ไขข้อร้องเรียนของลูกค้า</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. คุณมีทัศนคติต่อแบรนด์ร้านอาหาร KFC อย่างไร ให้อ่านข้อความต่อไปนี้ ฟิวจารณาระดับความเห็นด้วยกันแต่ละข้อความ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>เมื่อพูดถึงร้านอาหาร KFC คุณ............</th>
<th>น้อยที่สุด</th>
<th>น้อย</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างน้อย</th>
<th>ปานกลาง</th>
<th>ค่อนข้างมาก</th>
<th>มาก</th>
<th>มากที่สุด</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 คิดว่าเป็นร้านอาหารที่ดี</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 มีความชอบต่อร้าน KFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 มีความพึงพอใจต่อร้าน KFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 คิดว่าเป็นร้านที่มีคุณภาพ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**เหตุการณ์ในแบบสอบถามนี้ เป็นเหตุการณ์ที่สร้างขึ้นและไม่ได้เกิดขึ้นจริง**

***ขอบคุณที่ให้ความร่วมมือในการเข้าร่วมครั้งนี้ ***
APPENDIX B2
QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)

No. _________
Assigned Group_______________
Venue_______________
Start time ________ End time______

Questionnaire on Consumer Behavior in using Social Media

Data that you will answer will be beneficial to the researchers and the preliminary findings will be utilized to make recommendations to improve marketing plan. When you finish, please submit to your instructor.

** Please feel free to answer all questions regarding your true feelings or fact about yourself because there is no right or wrong answers for this set of questionnaire**

Definitions

Social Media refer to website or application that allow user to generate and publicize information or engaging in online network such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Line.

Online Community refer to online community that members employ to communicate over internet such as fan page or group in Facebook.

Online Review refer to evaluation information or complaint on product or service that available on online.

Direction This questionnaire consisted of 4 parts. Please answers each part accordingly.

1. Answer questions in part 1 and part 2.
2. After completed with part 2, information for part 3 will be provided.
3. After finished reading provided information, complete the questions in part 3.
4. After completed with part 3, read the provided information.
5. After finished reading provided information, complete the questions in part 4.
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Indicate your information by marking ✓ in the most appropriate box □ provided.

Part 1: Preliminary Questions

1. Gender:  □ 1. Male □ 2. Female
3. Allowance:  □ 1. THB 3,000 – 6,000 □ 2. THB 6,001 – 11,000 □ 3. More than THB 11,000
4. Frequency of visiting franchise restaurant:
   □ 1. Everyday □ 2. Every other day □ 3. A few times a week □ 4. Once a week □ 5. Once a month or less
5. Expense franchise restaurant per meal:
6. Cuisine that you frequently take:
7. Frequency of taking mentioned cuisine:
   □ 1. Everyday □ 2. Every other day □ 3. A few times a week □ 4. Once a week □ 5. Once a month or less
8. Source of information that you frequently receive from:
9. Frequency of using Social Media in average:
   □ 1. Every hour □ 2. Every two hours □ 3. Twice a day □ 4. Once a day or less
10. Frequency of posting on Social Media in average:
    □ 1. Every hour □ 2. Every two hours □ 3. Twice a day □ 4. Once a day or less
11. Duration of time spent on Social Media each time:
    □ 1. Less than 5 minutes □ 2. 5 – 15 minutes □ 3. 16 – 30 minutes □ 4. 31 – 60 minutes □ 5. More than 60 minutes
12. Your experience in Social Media:
    □ 1. Less than 6 months □ 2. 6 – 12 months □ 3. 1 - 3 years □ 4. 4 - 6 years □ 5. More than 7 years
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13. Application frequently used in Social Media (you can choose more than 1 answer)
   - 1. Facebook
   - 2. Instagram
   - 3. Line
   - 4. Twitter
   - 5. WeChat
   - 6. WhatsApp
   - 7. Other please specify

14. Appliance for Social Media (you can choose more than 1 answer)
   - 1. Mobile Phone
   - 2. Tablet
   - 3. Computer

15. Member of online community (you can choose more than 1 answer):
   - 1. Family and Life
   - 2. Profession
   - 3. Hobby
   - 4. Mind, Body and Soul
   - 5. Politic
   - 6. Business Strategy
   - 7. Education
   - 8. Beauty

Part 2: Respondent Characteristics

Indicate your level of agreement by marking ✓ in the most appropriate box provided □.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Regarding KFC restaurant, you are …..</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly Low 2</th>
<th>Low 3</th>
<th>Moderately 4</th>
<th>High 5</th>
<th>Very High 6</th>
<th>Extremely High 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. According to your experience, how is your relationship with KFC? Indicate your level of agreement on each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.1 My service provider is honest about problems</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly Low 2</th>
<th>Low 3</th>
<th>Moderately 4</th>
<th>High 5</th>
<th>Very High 6</th>
<th>Extremely High 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.2 My service provider has high integrity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 My service provider is trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 My service provider is concerned about my welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref. code: 256055502310062FUA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly Low 2</th>
<th>Low 3</th>
<th>Moderately High 4</th>
<th>High 5</th>
<th>Very High 6</th>
<th>Extremely High 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 When I confide my problems to my service provider, I know they will respond with understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 I can count on my service provider considering how their actions affect me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 I feel emotionally attached to my service provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 I continue to deal with my service provider because I like being associated with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 I continue to deal with my service provider because I genuinely enjoy my relationship with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1 I am delighted with performance of my service provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2 I am happy with my service provider’s performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3 I am content with my service provider’s performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. What is your attitude toward KFC? Indicate your level of agreement on each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding KFC restaurant, you are …</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly Low 2</th>
<th>Low 3</th>
<th>Moderately 4</th>
<th>High 5</th>
<th>Very High 6</th>
<th>Extremely High 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Like very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 High Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** PAUSE ***

[Figure of Homophily Treatment]
4. According to provided information in online community, I think that the members of this online community are…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Extremely High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 This person is similar to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 This person shares my values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 This person has a lot in common with me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** PAUSE ***

[Figure of Negative eWOM Treatment]
### Part 3: After reading the incident and solution, indicate your level of agreement on each statement

1. Indicate your level of agreement on each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Extremely High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 A majority of the comments supported the original complaint about the restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Overall, consumer reviews indicate a negative impression of the restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 There is a great deal of agreement among all the consumer reviews, providing a bad impression of the restaurant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your attitude toward KFC? Indicate your level of agreement on each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding KFC restaurant, you are ….</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Extremely High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Like very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 High Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** PAUSE ***

[Figure of Response Strategy Treatment]
Part 4: After reading the official statement of KFC, indicate your level of agreement of each following statement.

1. Indicate your level of agreement of each following statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>According to official statement of KFC, you think…</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly Low 2</th>
<th>Low 3</th>
<th>Moderately 4</th>
<th>High 5</th>
<th>Very High 6</th>
<th>Extremely High 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The restaurant apologized for the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The restaurant admitted responsibility for the problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 The restaurant shifted the blame to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 The restaurant disagreed and argued with complaining customer(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your attitude toward KFC? Indicate your level of agreement on each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding KFC restaurant, you are ….</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Slightly Low 2</th>
<th>Low 3</th>
<th>Moderately 4</th>
<th>High 5</th>
<th>Very High 6</th>
<th>Extremely High 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Like very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 High Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** The incident in the questionnaire is created for research only so it did not happen. **

*** Thank you for your kind cooperation ***
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