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Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information

Abstract

With the growing popularity of writing blogs as the way to share out personal comments to the Internet, new forms of promotion opportunities arise as the blogs are pretty good vehicles to transport these electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) information around the forums or social-networking sites. And so, we would like to ponder into the question on how these blog readers everywhere adopt these eWOM information? What are the factors that can encourage people to adopt what is told by a blogger?

To complete this task, a new set of research model is proposed and questionnaires are made. The whole survey collected responds from 209 people, and all these data are to be analysed using PLS.

The research result showed that eWOM adoption in blogging context largely depends on argument quality the bloggers and contributors can offer, and argument quality is closely related with message comprehensiveness, accuracy, argument strength, as well as recommendation consistency from blog comments or ratings. This research paper provides insights and directions to both individual and corporate bloggers, as well as marketing and PR practitioners on how to utilise the advantages from blogging.
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Title & Introduction

Research Title

Electronic Word-of-Mouth Adoption within Blog Platform: Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information

Research Background

Blogs are an increasingly popular in the Internet. According to statistic results from blog search engine Technorati, as of June 2008, about 10 years after the term was invented, 112.8 million blogs have been indexed by this web company. At the same time, blogs are generating a great deal of web traffic and public influence that is comparable, or sometimes even exceeding, what traditional media can deliver to. According to China Daily(2006), the world's most popular blog, written by Chinese actress Xu Jinglei(徐静蕾) received more than 50 million page views. In Hong Kong, there are already 418,183 blogs written by local people(Mok, 2007).

Electronic world of mouth is regarded as an important factor affecting consumers' buying decision making process. In collaboration with brands’ own websites, message boards and social networking sites(e.g. facebook.com), etc., these web systems are served as major platforms for customer contribution and discussion of any consumer products Nowadays. And clearly, since blogs have such an effective and easy-to-share platform to share these information, we shall find out the new ways to influence customers' believe and attitude.

In fact, there are growing numbers of advertisers compensate consumers to review their products in personal blogs(Werde, 2003; Blackshaw, 2006). In addition, there are some recent re-
searches on word of mouth marketing over the new media that proved the importance of blog in this new wave of media. According to Lee and Youn's research paper (2009), when compared to other platforms including marketer's websites, eWOM posted to personal blogs are more likely to be attributed to the product's actual performance and thus more influential because personal blogs are supposed to be more independent of marketers’ selling intents. The blog posts are actually serving as the key pivoting many viral effects, since it has all the contents for sharing out to all the rest web 2.0 tools.

Therefore, these recent phenomenons raise an interesting question to study: what are the factors that drives information adoption on this electronic platform, and to accomplish the objectives that cannot be done by other media platforms.

**Research Objective**

The purpose of the current study is to examine how blog readers evaluate and trust the message from a blog by discovering and testing which factors encourage information (eWOM) adoption inside a blog platform. Since we found out that instead of traditional advertising, people are trusting the testimonials from a blogger much more, "we want to uncover the ways how people digest these blog messages and to convert them to WOM information., by adopting research models such as Information Adoption Model, Elaboration Likelihood Model, as well as the Dual Process Theory. We believe that his study shall provide some useful inspirations for individual and corporate bloggers, as well as organisational and corporate clients to help better managing the online appearances and popularity of the individuals themselves, as well as the products/services offered by them."
Literature Review

In this literature review, we will first introduce the theoretical background of the electronic world of mouth (eWOM), research models like Information Adoption Model, Elaboration Likelihood Model as well as Dual Process Theory. With these theories and models we will cover how various factors might affect the eWOM adoption. We will also examine the relevant literature relating to eWOM adoption, argument quality and source credibility of a message.

Electronic World of Mouth (eWOM)

Electronic world of mouth, just like the word it is originated from (WOM), is regarded as an important element for affecting consumers' buying decision making process. Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) communication refers to any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, or former customers about a product or company, which is made available to a multitude of people and institutions via the Internet (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004).

The biggest difference between the traditional world of mouth and eWOM is that eWOM is in electronic form and without a face to face interaction with other people. The world of eWOM was created as the emergence of internet allows consumers to collect and spread products or services information from and to other consumers through viewing webpage (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004). The convenience brings from eWOM is that it can help people to gather more information during their information search stage and highly reduce their searching cost.

Besides the effectiveness from electronic transmission, another important observation about eWOM in this decade is that people seems adopting eWOM information differently. We can
observe such changes by reading a quote from the latest Nielsen Global Online Consumer Survey of over 25,000 Internet consumers from 50 countries (2009):

"Consumers Trust Real Friends and Virtual Strangers the Most."

It is reported from the result of the above survey that, ninety percent of consumers surveyed noted that they trust recommendations from people they know, while 70 percent trusted consumer opinions posted online, without any prior knowledge of who the writer is. On the next paragraph, we are going to discuss the fact that blogs can be the vehicles for transmitting these eWOM information.

WEBLOG (BLOG) AS A SOURCE OF EWOM

Blogs remains an increasingly popular culture in the Internet world a decade after the invention of the original term "weblog" by Jorn Barger on 17 December 1997. The term "blog" is short for "weblog". It is essentially an online journal where the author("blogger") often starts a conversation that can be continued by readers. Blog journal entries are generally short and include links to related information. Blogs can also be used to communicate news and announcements from multiple sources faster than other media outlets (Anders, 2007).

Being described as an effective platform to influence customers' believe and attitude, these communicators(i.e. bloggers) in fact occasionally post product review information on blogs – websites that contain personal diaries or journals (Thorson & rodgers, 2006). From the latest findings and discussions mentioned at the previous section, we are very interested in the fact that people simply trust bloggers more than they trust advertising, in a way just almost as personal as your friends (Nielsen 2009).
Base on the preceding discussions, we would like to ponder over the phenomenon of consumers’ treatment of these eWOM messages. Our research model is largely based on the information adoption model (Sussman and Siegal, 2003), elaboration likelihood model (ELM) (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986; Chaiken and Eagly, 1976) and Deutsch and Gerrard’s dual-process theory (1955).

**Information Adoption Model**

Pitta and Fowler (2005) suggested that a process in which people purposefully engage in using information. Information adoption behaviour is one of the principle activities that users seek to conduct in virtual communities. Sussman and Siegal (2003) suggests that the above process has two key propositions: argument quality (information quality) as the central influence and source credibility as the peripheral influence (Sussman and Siegal, 2003). Figure 1 below presents the information adoption model.

![Figure 1: the research model from Sussman and Siegal’s research paper](image)

**Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM)**

Sussman and Siegal also adopted the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) to explain how people are influenced to adopt information appeared in computer-mediated communication (CMC) contexts which is centrally and peripherally influence people’s attitude and behavior.
Centrally refers to the nature of argument in the message whereas peripherally refers to the issues and theme indirectly related to subject matter of the message (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986). According to elaboration likelihood model (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986; Chaiken and Eagly, 1976), we understand the two major routes human process the messages they receive. In fact, this model served as the foundation of the Information Adoption Model, and enables us to make predictions about the relative impact of various factors on information adoption (Sussman and Siegal, 2003).

**DUAL-PROCESS THEORY**

From the preceding 2 paragraphs, we can understand that researchers tend to categorise factors influencing our information processing into two major "routes" (normative factors vs. informational factors). The Dual-process theory also gives similar insights to us. When people receive the same information, their degree of the information adoption may be different (Chaiken and Eagly, 1976), due to people with different characteristics, personalities, perceptions, experience and sources. Thus, dual process theories are used to explain why people have difference in adopting information, idea and knowledge (Sussman and Siegal, 2003; Bhattacherjee and Sanford, 2006). Dual-process theory (Deutsch and Gerrard, 1955) considers how different types of influences affect the persuasiveness of on-line consumer reviews. Informational influence is based on the content of the reviews, whereas normative influence reflects the impact of social aggregation mechanisms available in today’s on-line consumer forums (Cheung, Luo, Sia, and Chen's research, 2009).
Research Model and Hypothesis

Figure 2 below shows the research model we propose for this study, which explains the determinants of eWOM adoption level in blog platform, based on the information adoption model and elaboration likelihood model (ELM). Our model is also inspired by Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn's research paper (2008) studying online opinion adoption. In addition, Cheung, Luo, Sia, and Chen's research (2009) used Deutsch and Gerrard's dual-process theory (1955) which depicted that both informational and normative factors that influence credibility judgments of online consumer recommendations, and we try to implement the normative influences into the model.

Figure 2: the research model
The information adoption model (Sussman and Siegal, 2003), as a form of information, eWOM shall be adopted based on information usefulness which is affected by both central (argument quality) and peripheral (source credibility) influences. Also, according to Cheung, Luo, Sia, and Chen's research model (2009), source credibility and argument strength are vital factors that were found to play a significant role in communication judgment.

In the context of blogging, since most of the blogs are article-based, we believe that it is suitable to adopt the above information model into it. In other words, people shall judging that particular piece of blog message base on either what the blogger has written actually, or who the blogger is. Therefore, our research model propose that the adoption of eWOM from blog sites should be positively related with argument quality as well as source credibility of the blog message:

**HYPOTHESIS 1.** The higher the perceived argument quality of an eWOM message from a blog, the higher level of adoption of the eWOM message will be achieved.

**HYPOTHESIS 2.** The higher the perceived source credibility of an eWOM message from a blog, the higher level of adoption of the eWOM message will be achieved.

**FACTORS AFFECTING ARGUMENT QUALITY**

Determined by the perceived quality of information and recommendation, argument quality is considered as the central influences of the blog message adoption. We borrowed several factors from Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn's research (2008) (accuracy and comprehensiveness) and Cheung,
Luo, Sia, and Chen's research (2009) (argument strength and recommendation consistency) and made adaptations to our research model in order to fit into blogging context. Therefore, we believe that the perceived argument quality is affected by the following factors based on readers' judgement and proactive interpretations.

Comprehensiveness of a blog message refers to the completeness of the recommendation/message received when viewing the blog. Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn's research (2008) suggested that the more comprehensive the messages are, the higher the perceived information usefulness of the message. Accuracy of a blog message refers to the content reliability and consistency. It also represents user's perception that the information is correct (Wixom and Todd, 2005). Argument strength of a blog message refers to the persuasiveness of the recommendation. It is the extent to which the message receiver views the argument as convincing or valid in supporting its position (Cheung, Luo, Sia, and Chen, 2009). Recommendation consistency indicates the extent to which the current eWOM recommendation is consistent with other contributors' experiences concerning the same product or service evaluation (Zhang and Watts, 2003). In our study, we would focus particularly on the blog readers' discussions following a blog message by commenting it.

**HYPOTHESIS 3.** The higher the comprehensiveness of a blog message, the higher the argument quality will be perceived to be.

**HYPOTHESIS 4.** The higher the accuracy of a blog message, the higher the argument quality will be perceived to be.

**HYPOTHESIS 5.** The higher the argument strength of a blog message, the higher the argument quality will be perceived to be.
**HYPOTHESIS 6.** The higher the recommendation consistency of a blog message, the higher the argument quality will be perceived to be.

**FACTORS AFFECTING SOURCE CREDIBILITY**

In blogging context, be predict that other than the message content itself, the source of the blog shall also be considered during the adoption process. From Sussman and Siegal's paper (2003), Chaiken (1980) stated that source credibility refers to recipient's perception of the credibility of a message source, and that reflects nothing about the message itself. There are some researches suggest that source credibility played an important role in peripheral consumer judgements. In information systems research, source credibility has been shown to positively influence low-participation users' acceptance of recommendations made by knowledge-based systems (Mak and Lyytinen, 1997). On the Internet, perceptions of source credibility play an important role in our judgments of cognitive authority (Rieh and Belkin, 1998). Therefore, we believe that the perceived source credibility is affected by various factors based on readers' peripheral route, as stated by elaboration likelihood model (ELM) (Petty and Cacioppo, 1986; Chaiken and Eagly, 1976).

We also tried to pick up some factors affecting source credibility and fit it into blogging context. Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn's research paper (2008) suggested that source expertise and trustworthiness are the two key dimensions of source credibility. From Fogg et al.'s paper (2001), source expertise is defined by terms such as knowledgeable, experienced, competent, and so on. The expertise dimension of credibility captures the perceived knowledge and skill of the source; and source trustworthiness dimension of credibility captures the perceived goodness or morality of the source. Trustworthiness, a key element in the credibility calculus, is defined by the terms well-intentioned, truthful, unbiased, and so on. The trustworthiness di-
mension of credibility captures the perceived goodness or morality of the source (BJ Fogg, et al, 2001). Fogg et al.’s research paper (2001) also suggested that the presence of advertisement has been negatively associated with perceived credibility. Hong (2006) also stated in her research that the presence of Web advertisements, which include hyperlink, banner and other graphically-based ads, decreases perceived Web site credibility.

**HYPOTHESIS 7.** The higher the perceived source expertise (e.g. writer or information agency) of the blog, the higher the source credibility of the blog will be.

**HYPOTHESIS 8.** The higher the perceived trustworthiness of a blog message source, the higher the source credibility of the blog will be.

**HYPOTHESIS 9.** The presence of advertisement in the blog site will negatively affect the source credibility of the blog.
Research Methodology

Our research will focus on the factors affecting eWOM message adoption within blogging platform, the research model will be tested based on an existing blog site, 3C Music (http://3cmusic.com/).

3CMusic.com (3C Music 中文唱片評論) is an online platform established at year 2006. It consists of a selected group of bloggers for writing reviews on Chinese Pop Music CD Albums and Singles. Apart from giving critical comments on those CDs, the blog also shares updated information about Pop music industry in Pan-China region.

Figure 3: the front page of 3CMusic.com, a banner advertisement linking with our questionnaire is added on the centre column of the web page.
Data Collection

To examine the factors affecting eWOM adoption from the blog site, a sample in total of 209 web-based questionnaires were used during the 5-week survey period starting from 19th of February, 2010. The target respondents of this research were individuals who had visited the above virtual opinion platform and are influenced by the recommendations, discussions and comments shared within the blog site.

The questionnaire is divided into several parts. The extent of eWOM(recommendation) adoption was asked in the questionnaire, to see if those review information will be adopted by the blog readers or not, which may ultimately affect their buying behaviour. Demographic information was asked as well. These includes monthly income or music product purchasing habits, etc. Most of these questions shall be measured on a seven-point Likert scale.

At the same time, in order to facilitate public participation of our survey, we have done the following two measures: first, we contacted the administrator of 3CMusic.com, Mr. Damon Chan to ask for reserving a space in the blog for promoting our survey, and eventually we came up with an agreement to allow us to post up a small banner advertisement asking for public contribution to our survey(as shown in figure 3 above). Also, with the support from our supervisor Dr. Christy Cheung, we held a lucky draw(using 3 supermarket coupon as the gifts) as an incentive to encourage survey participation rate. In addition, bi-lingual versions of questionnaire(Chinese and English) are used for easier understanding.
Survey Responses

A total of 209 responses were collected in this study. Among the 209 respondents, we have more than a half males participating the survey (46.15% for female), and most of the participants are in younger age group (180 out of the 209 participants are in age of 19 to 30). We had a fairly positive response from them, with only 29.81% of them haven't visited 3CMusic.com while the rest (143 people, about 70.19%) have paid visit to the web site at least for one time.

Among the blog readers, almost half of them (62 out of 143 positive responds) visit the blog 5-12 times a month, and almost half (59 of them) use this blog as the primary source of Chinese Music critics and news. Besides that, many respondents also use Internet forums, other private blogs, as well as radio channels as the major source of Chinese Music.

In table 1 and 2, the demographic information as well as usage habits of respondents are shown.
Demographic statistics of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18 or below</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>73.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 or above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical worker</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Servicing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Demographic statistics of the respondents
### Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information

#### Usage Habit of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited 3CMusic.com</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>70.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of time on reading 3CMusic</td>
<td>less than a month</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more than a month, less than 3 months</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more than 3 month, less than 6 months</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more than 6 month, less than a year</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more than a year, less than 2 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 years or above</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left comments experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>72.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of visiting 3CMusic.com per month</td>
<td>less than 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 or above</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set 3CMusic as homepage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>95.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Usage habit of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add 3CMusic.com as your favourite/bookmark</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>57.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscribe 3CMusic.com's RSS feed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use 3CMusic.com as the primary source</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>59.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source(s) of Chinese Music critics and news</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet forums</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Network Sites</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

The measures are adopted from prior research papers and questionnaires, with minor modification of wordings to fit into our research topic and contexts (studying 3CMusic blog). Multi-item measures were used, and each of the construct inside the research model was measured by multiple items for validity and reliability. Measurements for Argument Quality, Source Credibility, and Information Adoption were phrased on seven-point Likert scale, e.g. from strongly agree(1) to strongly disagree(7), seldom and frequent, reliable and not reliable.

These measures are also printed in Appendix 1, while the complete set of questionnaire is attached in Appendix 2.
Data Analysis And Results

Data analysis was performed using Partial Least Squares (PLS). PLS is a structural modelling technique widely used among IS research, and it is a structural modelling technique which is for developing highly complex predictive models (Lohmoller, 1989; Barclay et al., 1995; Chin, 1998). We picked up SmartPLS over similar analysis softwares like SPSS because the research models of SPSS can only have one construct linking with one construct. It allows researchers to perform regressions to analyse structural models with multiple-item-constructs and direct and indirect paths. Loadings between items and constructs, as well as standardised regression coefficients between constructs will also be analysed. Two-step analytical procedures, measurement model and structural model (Hair et al., 1998) are involved in this analysis to ensure the relationship is drawn with a desirable psychometric properties.

Measurement Model

Convergent Validity

Convergent Validity extents to which indicators (measurement items) of a specific construct coverage or share a high proportion of variance in common that is theoretically related should correlate highly. Composite Reliability (CR) is the measure of reliability and internal consistency of the measured variables representing a latent construct. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is a summary measure of convergence among a set of items representing a latent construct, which is the average percentage of variation explained among the items. Table 2 (Psychometric Properties of measures) summarises the result of the measurement model in terms of CR and AVE of the factor loadings, t-value, mean, standard deviation, composite reliability
and average variance. The critical values of CR and AVE are 0.7 which represent sufficient convergence or internal consistency and 0.5 suggest sufficient convergent validity respectively (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). All CR and AVE values achieve the recommend levels, CR ranges from 0.797 to 0.982 and the AVE ranges from 0.631 to 0.965. Loading is to test how well a measurement item can explain the latent factor where T-value is to find the significance of the measurement items. T-value supposes to be larger than 2 in orders to show significance. Loading is from 0.661 to 0.983 while t-value is from 5.44 to 240.395, both of them success to show significance. Table 3 below summarises the loading, t-value, mean, standard deviation, composite reliability and average variance extracted of measures.

**Psychometric Properties of Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St.Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument Quality</td>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.96, AVE=0.82</td>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>51.53</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>98.67</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>93.23</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>53.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.80, AVE=0.67</td>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>63.48</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.96, AVE=0.89</td>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>91.91</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>83.73</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument Strength</td>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>130.91</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.96, AVE=0.90</td>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>79.33</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>70.32</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation Consistency</td>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.90, AVE=0.75</td>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>62.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>86.84</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Credibility</td>
<td>Q38</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>86.58</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.96, AVE=0.88</td>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>38.77</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Expertise</td>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>92.40</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.96, AVE=0.92</td>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>65.90</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>80.47</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.98, AVE=0.97</td>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>203.18</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Advertisement</td>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.96, AVE=0.90</td>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>94.43</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>93.27</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eWOM adoption</td>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR=0.89, AVE=0.63</td>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q57</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CR - Composite Reliability, AVE - Average Variance Extracted**

Table 3. Psychometric Properties of Measures
**Discriminant Validity**

Discriminant Validity is the extent to which a construct is truly distinct from other constructs and does not reflect the other factors. It is indicated by low correlations between the measure of interest and the other constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Discriminant Validity can be determined by taking the square root of AVE for a construct which should be greater than the correlations between the constructs and all other constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

Table 4 shows that the square root of AVE for each construct is greater than the correlations estimate. In the measurement model, it strongly supports the measurement of convergent validity, reliability, and discriminant validity. In other words, Discriminant Validity is the extent to which the measure is not a reflection of some other variable.

**Correlations of Constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AQ</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>POA</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>EWM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>0.8315</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.8129</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>0.7913</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.7761</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POA</td>
<td>-0.274</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.7276</td>
<td>0.7533</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.8325</td>
<td>0.8055</td>
<td>0.8726</td>
<td>0.7425</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>0.7721</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.7141</td>
<td>0.5824</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>0.5982</td>
<td>0.7184</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>0.7379</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.6935</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.8053</td>
<td>0.7554</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWM</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.5625</td>
<td>0.5507</td>
<td>0.5291</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.5085</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.5692</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Correlations matrix presenting psychometric properties of key construct
Structural Model

Bootstrap re-sampling procedure is used to test the significance of all paths included path coefficients and t-values. Exogenous variables explain 32.5% of the variance in eWOM adoption, 75.2% of the variance in the argument quality and 68.6% of the source credibility. Reflecting the significance of the paths along the model, the structural model which shows the path coefficients, t-values and R-Square values are shown in figure 4 below.

According to the statistics, **argument quality is found strongly significant to eWOM adoption** with the path coefficient at 0.44. However, the perceived source credibility to eWOM adoption is not significant statistically.
**Message comprehensiveness, accuracy, and argument strength** are found statistically very significant to argument quality with the path coefficient at 0.23, 0.32, and 0.25 respectively. **Recommendation consistency** is statistically significant to that construct as well (with path coefficient at 0.14).

Source expertise is found statistically significant to source credibility with the path coefficient at 0.24, and source trustworthiness is even more significant (with path coefficient at 0.61). Presence of advertisement, on the other hand, posting negative effects to source credibility, just passing through the requirements to become statistically significant (with path coefficient at -0.10).

Summary of the above hypothesis test is shown in table 5 below.
## Summary of Hypothesis Tests

Note: *p<0.10, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01, n.s. = not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Argument Quality → eWOM adoption</td>
<td>0.435 (t=3.839)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Source Credibility → eWOM adoption</td>
<td>0.158 (t=1.141) n.s.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Comprehensiveness → Argument Quality</td>
<td>0.229 (t=3.174)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Accuracy → Argument Quality</td>
<td>0.324 (t=3.507)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Argument Strength → Argument Quality</td>
<td>0.25 (t=2.994)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Recommendation consistency → Argument Quality</td>
<td>0.141 (t=2.415)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Source Expertise → Source Credibility</td>
<td>0.237 (t=2.498)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Source Trustworthiness → Source Credibility</td>
<td>0.606 (t=10.001)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Presence of Advertisement → Source Credibility</td>
<td>-0.098 (t=2.101)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Summary of hypothesis tests
Discussion of research results

Our research model aims at finding the factors determining eWOM adoption level in 3CMusic blog based on the information adoption model, elaboration likelihood model (ELM), as well as Deutsch and Gerrard's dual-process theory. The statistical results showed that argument quality of the blog posts major effects on blog readers' electronic word-of-mouth(eWOM) adoption. However, source credibility of the blog was not shown as an important factor to eWOM adoption, which violated our initial prediction.

E W O M A D O P T I O N O F B L O G P L A T F O R M

The information adoption model is largely based on the model developed by Sussman and Siegal (2003) choosing email as the analysis target. In our research, however, source credibility failed to post any statistic significance to information(eWOM) adoption.

As predicted, argument quality(H1) remains statistically important (p<0.01) to eWOM adoption and this finding is consistent with Sussman and Siegal's research paper. Since most of the blog posts here in 3CMusic contains points of arguments and critics, it is expectable that consumers/readers can evaluate these messages by reading and digesting these music reviews themselves. This result shows that besides organisational contexts, similar information adoption processes is also founded in blog platform, under the central route of Elaboration Likelihood Model.


In contrast with some previous papers, H2 is statistically not supported. Put forwarded by Sussman and Siegal's research, the traditional "trust an expert" concept which was plausible in
working context does not work in our research. We believe that such result is caused by the anonymous and free-to-publish nature of blog sites: unlike having prior knowledge on the information source(e.g. the name and biography of bosses) under working context, blog posts in 3CMusic are written by “someone” we don't actually know in the internet. In other words, since it is difficult for most blog readers to gain knowledge on these web content contributors, it is more likely for these readers to ignore the perceived source credibility and focus on judging the eWOM message(i.e. the post published on 3CMusic) on the argument points itself. Interestingly, from other recent papers, it was seen that under internet context, users are shifting from more traditional “authority” methods of credibility determination, where users cede determinations to trusted third parties, to a “reliability” approach where users seek commonalities and coherence among multiple information sources(Lankes, 2007).

From our structural model analysis, exogenous variables explain 32.5% of the variance in eWOM adoption, this result is basically consistent with Sussman and Siegal's research(2003) as well.

Determinants on Argument Quality of Blog Posts

From previous section, H3, H4, H5, H6 are statistically supported. reflecting blog readers' thinking on what establishes a good-quality review article.

For informative determinants(H3 to H5), statistic result basically reflects with the similar findings from Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn's research(2008): Message comprehensiveness and accuracy remains very strong significance(p<0.01) to argument quality of the blog, because 3CMusic have similar objective on delivering online messages just like any other web
sites being studied. This result also aligns with the theories put forward by Wixom and Todd (2005).

Persuasiveness of the recommendation (i.e. argument strength) is found to be significant on the evaluation of WOM information form online discussion forum (Cheung, Luo, Sia, and Chen, 2009), and another previous study of a virtual shopping mall site containing user-generated contents (Park, Lee and Han, 2007). In our research, this factor also showed very strong significance ($p < 0.01$) to argument quality evaluation.

Recommendation consistency (H6), which are originated from blog comments, showed strong significance to argument quality evaluation, though in lesser extent ($p < 0.05$) comparing with the previous three factors. Being taken as an normative factor, similar research finding was done from previous paper (Cheung, Luo, Sia, and Chen, 2009). Therefore, it is clear that readers also read the comments and discussion along with the blog posts, looking at the consistency between arguments to rate that music review article in their mind.

In short, like the other web sites, blog readers of 3CMusic tend to evaluate argument quality of messages from a blog site by using both informative and normative determinants mentioned above.

To sum up, the above research findings remind us the article quoted previously, stating these Social Broadcasters' role on bringing awareness only - in the sense that their followers will click on the contents they share but still perform their own evaluation of the data (Barb 2010).
Despite the insignificance of source credibility affecting eWOM adoption, source expertise, trustworthiness and presence of advertisement do have significance to source credibility judgement. H7, H8, and H9 are supported by statistics.

Source expertise and trustworthiness have positive effects on source credibility, while the presence of advertisements has negative effect on this factor, this research results are just consistent with previous studies (Mak and Lyytinen, 1997, BJ Fogg, et al, 2001 and Hong, 2006).

The presence of advertisement, on the other hand, post negative effect on source credibility.

However, from the figures it seems that this negative effect is rather limited.

In addition, from the open-ended answers written by respondents, it is also found that many of them do not relate source trustworthiness and expertise with anything but those blog posts these readers have gone through. This finding seems coherent with what we have come up from the preceding section.

**Conclusion**

In blogging context, this research result shows that, eWOM adoption largely depends on argument quality the bloggers and contributors can offer, and argument quality is closely related with message comprehensiveness, accuracy, argument strength, as well as recommendation consistency from blog comments or ratings.
Limitations and Future Research

In the study, we omitted some important variables. From the research result, only about 32.5% of the variance of eWOM adoption, which means that some other factors may contribute to this phenomenon, which brings room for further researches in the future.

Besides that, the problem of insufficient sample size is encountered. Compare with the current sample size (209 respondents, with only 143 set of response from those who visited the blog can be used for analysis), a larger sample size will help better interpretation and representativeness of the research model.

Moreover, the blog site (3CMusic.com) we picked up for research is reviewing music - a typical example of experiential product, which leads to argument points written based on concepts and feeling. Since the comments and discussions about these products are more passionate and might not comparable like other types of physical products, people's feeling towards these music articles can be subjective, or sometimes having very personal judgement on information adoption. In short, the results may be not representative or applicable of other types of blogs or websites. Also, for future research, we suggest the researcher can study different types of blog for better comparison and analysis, and to increase the reliability of the research findings and implications.

Another bias is that our target respondents are mainly students which is about 60% of the total respondents. Since our research findings are bond with students. Ideally, it is advised to have random samples from different occupation and geographic locations in the future researches so that to achieve a more reliable implication.
Implication for research and real-world contexts

This research has the following theoretical and practical contributions in conceptual and empirical understanding of eWOM adoption under blogging and internet contexts. This paper provides important insights and implications for researchers and practitioners.

**Implication for Researchers**

The overall model has satisfactory explanatory power, which can explain 32.5 percent of the variance of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) adoption. This research result can provide more understanding on the way blog readers adopting information. Our study combines preceding research models and builds further upon these research works and apply these concepts into blogging context empirically, in order to contribute to the existing researches on online messages, as well as to bring new inspirations to further studies on online behaviour. The integration of this multidisciplinary research provides more perspective of future studies on this topic.

**Implication for Bloggers and Business Organisations**

The empirical findings of this research reveals that blog readers tend to focus on evaluate and absorb information using the central route, and they do putting efforts decoding implicit promotion messages. Therefore, instead of putting up the official product/company news, we suggest bloggers should focus more on how to **deliver a more comprehensive blog contents in a way that it looks more personal to their readers**. From the respondents’ answers, we also notice that their judgements on whether trusting a source or not are heavily rely on word-
of-mouth either from those they friend with, or from the independent sources/web pages/facebook account that they might not know before clicking the “follow” button.

Besides that, **consistency and reliability of blog messages as well as recommendations will further strengthen the perceived trustworthiness and persuasiveness of the blog**, and this shall encourage frequent visits of that blog site.

As for the marketing or public relations practitioners, on one hand we should have our minds freed that **it might not be necessary to invite the so-called ‘popular bloggers’ in higher costs to take part in the blogger events**. On the other hand, since people nowadays can trust a blog messages from anyone we don't know at all, very likely just because of peer recommendation through facebook, then we shall pay more attention, or considering paying for related services on search engine and social network monitoring to track out any seed of ‘viral WOM outbreaks’.

After all, since informationally based determinants significantly influenced argument quality which will ultimately affect the perceived eWOM credibility, we believe that hosting a blog can be something very similar to doing a traditional media - where content is the King.
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Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information

Appendix
### Appendix I Measurement Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is complete</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is consistent</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is accurate</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is convincing</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is credible</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Comprehensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Review (the blog articles) includes both pros and cons of the music/ CDs</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Review includes only one-sided comments</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>The review (blog posts in 3C Music.com) are accurate</td>
<td>Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>The blog posts in 3C Music.com are correct</td>
<td>Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>The blog posts in 3C Music.com are reliable</td>
<td>Cheung, Lee and Rabjohn 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>To what extent do you think the blog arguments are convincing</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>To what extent do you think the blog arguments are strong</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Items</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>To what extent do you think the blog arguments are persuasive</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation consistency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q33</th>
<th>Comments under review (blog articles) are consistent with the review above.</th>
<th>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q34</td>
<td>Based on the comments, the review article was found to be favorable by other audiences.</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>Based on the review rating, review article is highly rated by other audiences.</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recipient Expertise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q36</th>
<th>How informed are you on the subject matter (music) of the issue (mentioned by the blog article)</th>
<th>Sussman and Siegal 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>To what extent are you an expert on the topic of these blog posts</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source Credibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q38</th>
<th>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is reputable</th>
<th>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is highly rated by other site participants</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40</td>
<td>The information in this blog site (3CMusic) is trustworthy</td>
<td>Cheung, Luo, Sia and Chen 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source Expertise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q41</th>
<th>To what extent is the person who wrote this message an expert on the blog message topic is expert</th>
<th>Sussman and Siegal 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42</td>
<td>How knowledgeable is the person who wrote the blog post/commentary on the topic of Pop Music</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source Trustworthiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q44</th>
<th>How trustworthy are the authors who wrote the blog messages</th>
<th>Sussman and Siegal 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>How reliable are the authors who wrote the blog messages</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>How reliable are the authors who wrote the blog messages?</td>
<td>Sussman and Siegal 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello! We are a group of year 3 students studying Information System Management in HKBU. We are now conducting a survey about the blog posts from 3CMusic.com. Please kindly spend about 5 minutes to answer the following questions. The information you provided will be used for academic purpose only.

In addition, in order to encourage participations, we are glad to announce that once you can provide complete and reliable answers to the questionnaire, you are eligible to join the lucky draw and have the chance to win a shopping coupon from us! If you have any question, please contact Mr. Au-Yeung via email: 08023468@hkbu.edu.hk. Thank you for your cooperation.

The questionnaire constitutes part of a student's academic research work for an Honours Project in partial fulfillment of the BBA graduation requirement. While the HKBU respects and abides by the Privacy Data Ordinance, it is the student's responsibility to comply with the Ordinance during every aspect of the project. Please contact the sender of this questionnaire for specific details. Please ignore this questionnaire if you have responded or are not interested in responding the questionnaire. Thank you!
PART I. USAGE AND EXPERIENCE OF THE 3 CMUSIC BLOG SITE

第一部分: 關於3CMUSIC博客的使用量與使用體驗:

1. Have you ever visited 3CMusic.com? (y/n)
你有否瀏覽過3CMusic博客？（是/否）

2. (if yes for previous question) How long have you read the commentary/review articles from 3CMusic.com? (___years)
（承上題）你閱讀了3CMusic博客的音樂評論文章多久？（年）

3. Have you ever left comments in 3CMusic.com? (y/n)
你可曾在3CMusic博客的文章中流過你的個人意見？（是/否）

4. On average, how often do you visit 3CMusic.com per month?
（less than 1, 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-24, 25 or more）
你每月平均瀏覽3CMusic博客幾多次？
（少於一次，一至四次，五至八次，九至十二次，十三至十六次，十七至二十次，二十一至二十四次，二十五次以上）

5. Do you set 3CMusic.com as your home page? (y/n)
你有否將3CMusic博客設為你的瀏覽器的首頁？（是/否）

6. Do you add 3CMusic.com as your favourite/bookmark? (y/n)
你有否把3CMusic博客設置為你的瀏覽器書籤/我的最愛？（是/否）

7. Do you subscribe 3CMusic.com's RSS feed to your blog reader(e.g. google reader)? (y/n)
你有否在你的RSS閱讀器（比如Google Reader）上訂閱3CMusic博客？（是/否）

8. Do you use 3CMusic.com as the primary source of Chinese Music critics and news? (y/n)
你是否視3CMusic博客為你首要的中文音樂資訊及評論來源？（是/否）

9. (from previous question) Why?
（承上題）為什麼？

10. In the past 6 months, which one(s) are your source(s) of Chinese Music critics and news?
（TV, radio, magazines, internet forums, blog, social network sites, others(specify)）
在過去六個月內，那個/那些是你的中文音樂資訊及評論來源？（可多選）
（電視、電台、雜誌、網上討論區、博客、社交網站、其他（請指明））

11. (from previous question) Why?
（承上題）為什麼？

Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information
12. Rank the following reasons for using the services provided from 3CMusic.com by placing a 1 beside the best, a 2 beside the second best one, and so on.
以下那些是你使用3CMusic博客的主要原因？请排序。
（1代表最主要的原因，2代表次要，如此类推）
- convenient 方便
- cheap 便宜
- social interactions 社群互动性
- quickly updated information 犷取最新资讯
- depth of content/critics 文章内容深度
- others(please specify and rank accordingly) 其他（请注明并排序）

PART 2. ARGUMENT QUALITY OF CONTENTS FROM 3CMUSIC.COM

第二部分：3CMusic博客的论据素质：

13. Please rate the content of this blog on the following scales in general, as in:
"the information in this blog site(3CMusic) is ________"
請就以下有关3CMusic博客内文章内容进行概括性评分：
“3CMusic博客提供的资讯是 ________”
- complete 全面的 1234567 incomplete 不全面的
- consistent 一致的 1234567 inconsistent 不一致的
- accurate 準確的 1234567 inaccurate 不正確的
- convincing 使人信服的 1234567 unconvincing 不人信服的
- credible 可信的 1234567 not credible 不可信的

14. Please rate the content of this blog on the following scales in general:
請就以下有關3CMusic博客内文章内容进行概括性评分：
Review articles includes both pros and cons of the music/CDs:
評論文章內包含該唱片的優點和缺點：
同意 agree 1234567 不同意 not agree
Review articles includes only one-sided comments:
評論文章內只有片面的評價：
同意 agree 1234567 不同意 not agree

15. Please rate the content of this blog on the following scales in general:
請就以下有關3CMusic博客内文章内容进行概括性评分：
The review(blog posts in 3C Music.com) are accurate.
3CMusic博客内的评论文章是准确的
Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information

The blog posts in 3C Music.com are correct.

The blog posts in 3C Music.com are reliable.

16. To what extent do you think the blog arguments are convincing?

17. To what extent do you think the blog arguments are strong?

18. To what extent do you think the blog arguments are persuasive?

19. (from previous question) Why?

20. Please rate the content of this blog on the following scales in general:

21. How informed are you on the subject matter (music, etc) of the issue mentioned by the blog article?

22. To what extent are you an expert on the topic of these blog posts?
PART 3. SOURCE CREDIBILITY OF 3CMUSIC.COM

第三部分：3CMUSIC博客的资讯源可靠程度：

23. Please rate the content of this blog on the following scales in general, as in:
   "the information in this blog site(3CMusic) is ________"
   請就以下有關3CMusic博客內的文章內容進行概括性評分：
   “3CMusic博客提供的資訊是。。。”
   Reputable.
   值得信賴的。
   同意 agree 1234567 不同意 not agree
   Highly rated by other site participants.
   受其他討論參與者高度評價。
   同意 agree 1234567 不同意 not agree
   Trustworthy.
   可以信任的。
   同意 agree 1234567 不同意 not agree

24. To what extent is the person who wrote this message an expert on the blog message topic?
   你認為這些博客文章的作者是在有關領域的專家嗎？
   expert 專家 1234567 non expert 非專家

25. How knowledgeable is the person who wrote the blog post/commentary on the topic of Pop Music?
   你認為這些博客文章的作者對中文音樂在行嗎？
   knowledgeable 在行 1234567 not knowledgeable 不在行

26. (from previous question) Why?
   （承上題）為什麼？

27. How trustworthy are the authors who wrote the blog messages?
   你認為那些博客文章的作者可靠嗎？
   trustworthy 可靠 1234567 not trustworthy 不可靠

28. How reliable are the authors who wrote the blog messages?
   你認為那些博客文章的作者可信賴嗎？
   reliable 可信賴 1234567 not reliable 不可信賴

29. (from previous question) Why?
   （承上題）為什麼？
30. How often did you notice an advertisement(s) in the blog?
你可曾留意到這個博客上的廣告嗎？
- seldom 絕少
- 1234567 frequently 經常

31. How often did you read an advertisement(s) in the blog?
你可曾閱讀過這個博客上的廣告嗎？
- seldom 絕少
- 1234567 frequently 經常

32. How often did you click on an advertisement(s) in the blog?
你可曾點擊過這個博客上的廣告嗎？
- seldom 絕少
- 1234567 frequently 經常

**PART 4. INFORMATION (E WOM) ADOPTION**

第 四 部 分 : 資 訊 ( E WOM ) 采 納 : 

33. To what extent do you agree with the writer's suggestions and commentaries in the blog?
你認為你有多同意那些作者在這個博客上寫的評論和意見嗎？
- agree 同意
- 1234567 not agree 不同意

34. (from previous question) Why?
（承上題）為什麼？

35. Have you acted according to the content of the blog (e.g. buy/download the music)? If yes, How closely did you follow their suggestions?
你可曾根據博客上的內容去行動（比如說購買、下載那些音樂）？如果是，請問你的決定跟他們的建議有多貼近？
- not close 不貼近
- 1234567 very close 貼近

36. (from previous question) Why?
（承上題）為什麼？

37. Please rate the content of this blog on the following scales in general:
請就以下內容進行概括性評分:
This blog site made me easier to make music purchase/download decision.
這個博客令我更容易為購買或下載音樂進行決定。
- not agree 非常不同意
- 1234567 very agree 非常同意
Information from review contributed to my knowledge of discussed music/CDs.
這個博客的內容和討論增進我對那些音樂產品上的知識。
- not agree 非常不同意
- 1234567 very agree 非常同意
Review has enhanced my effectiveness in making purchase/download decision.
這個博客提升了我在購買或下載音樂決定上的有效性。
Factors Affecting Blog Readers to Adopt Information

Review motivated me to make purchase/download action.

Part 5. Personal Information 個人資料

Age 年齡: (18 or below, 19-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-44, 45 or above)
Sex 性別: (M/F)
Education Level 教育程度:
(Primary, Secondary, College, Undergraduate, Postgraduate, Others)
Occupation 職業:
(Student, Clerical worker, Professional, Self-Employed, Servicing, Management, Retired, Others)

Please fill in the following if you want to participate the lucky draw (optional):
如欲參加抽獎，請提供以下資料（非必要）:
Name 姓名:
Telephone no. 聯絡電話:
Email address 電郵:

Thank you for your participation! We shall contact you through email and telephone no. if you are eligible for the lucky draw prize!
感謝你的參與！抽獎結果將以電郵和電話方式通知得獎參與者！