



Online fashion shopping paradox: The role of customer reviews and facebook marketing



Fatema Kawaf^{a,*}, Doga Istanbuluoglu^b

^a University of Greenwich, Greenwich Business School, Old Royal Naval College, Park Row, London SE10 9LS, UK

^b University of Birmingham, Birmingham Business School, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Customer reviews
Fashion
Social Media
Facebook
Online retailing
Repertory grid
Online fashion shopping

ABSTRACT

The paper aims to investigate the relevance of social media marketing, particularly customer reviews and Facebook pages in online fashion shopping. This qualitative study adopts Personal Construct Theory and employs the repertory grid to investigate the question: ‘how do online fashion shoppers construct the relevance of social media marketing activities in their online shopping experience? Analysis of 25 repertory grid interviews reveal insights that challenge current understanding of the role and relevance of customer reviews and Facebook pages in online fashion shopping. The research contributes novel insights into the rising desire of individuality and the increasing lack of sociality on social media.

1. Introduction

Social media marketing¹ has become the buzz of the marketing world, attracting ever-increasing attention and booming interest from brands and businesses both large and small. Social media websites now receive the highest web traffic worldwide (Alexa, 2018) and one third of online time is spent on social media (GlobalWebIndex, 2018). There are 2.13 billion monthly active Facebook users (Facebook, 2018a), along with 60 million active business pages (Facebook, 2018b). It is safe to say that social media has gone ‘viral’.

More than 2.5 million businesses pay to use Facebook advertising, and 75% of brands pay to promote posts (Smith, 2016). However, a lack of purpose remains apparent in a number of business cases and across industries. For instance, the myopic focus on likes and follows rather than engagement has been a mistake for which many businesses are still paying the price (Walters, 2016). All facilitated by Facebook infrastructure of the so-called ‘Like Economy’ in which certain behaviors are encouraged, metrified and multiplied beyond their value (Gerlitz and Helmond, 2013).

It is a matter for concern, since the increasing popularity of social media has resulted in a rushed reaction from many businesses that hoped to jump on the bandwagon called social media marketing. Particularly, the risk of over generalization of social media functions

and relevance across industries is rising. The varying role of social media across industries and product categories is not accounted for, and a one size fits all approach seems apparent in current research and practices.

Scholars have attempted to critically evaluate the importance of social media and its employment in a business context, for instance, Quesenberry (2016) suggests that social media marketing is too important to be left to the marketing department solely, thus arguing that it requires a holistic business involvement.

Another key dimension to social media marketing is the radical shift in communication and how consumers produce, share and gather information online (Pitt et al., 2002; Yeh and Choi, 2011). Social media has become a space for individual expression, a tool for easier searching and better choices, and a marketing intelligence source to anticipating users’ preferences and behavior (Lamberton and Stephen, 2016). Particularly, in terms of online shopping, consumers rely on social media as a source of information which could come from strangers and anonymous users (Goldsmith and Horowitz, 2006; Schindler and Bickart, 2005; Sen and Lerman, 2007). This product/service-related information are shared on social media in the form of reviews. It is estimated that 78% of Internet users in the UK report reading product/service reviews online before buying a new technology product (Mintel, 2016), and more than two thirds of consumers report that they trust online reviews

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: f.kawaf@greenwich.ac.uk (F. Kawaf), d.istanbuluoglu@bham.ac.uk (D. Istanbuluoglu).

¹ Social media and social networking sites are often used interchangeably in the existing literature. In this paper, the term social networking sites is reserved for a specific type of social media where users create profiles and use these to connect with others (e.g. Facebook) (Boyd and Ellison, 2007). Other social media types include blogs, vlogs, microblogging and any user-created content, including customer reviews.

(Nielsen, 2015). In addition, consumers also easily and critically share independent reviews of products and services alike.

However, despite this research insights into customer reviews and Facebook likes, it remains unclear whether their role is relevant in industry specific context. For instance, customer reviews seem to be of great significance for technology products (Mintel, 2016), generalizing this to clothing and fashion is problematic. Indeed, it remains unclear how consumers, in the fashion industry, construct their experience of such social media related exposure and interactions.

Accordingly, this research critically investigates the role of social media marketing in an industry-specific context. Focusing on Personal Construct Theory (PCT) (Kelly, 1955), the perceived relevance and effectiveness of customer reviews and Facebook related marketing activities within the fashion industry are investigated as constructed by the consumers and using their own words. Our main aim is to answer the question: “Based on Personal Construct Theory, how do online fashion shoppers construct the relevance of social media marketing activities in their online shopping experience?” Indeed, this question would then open a window of opportunity to, first, contribute to the theoretical understanding of consumer perception and online shopping experience in the social media environment by using the foundations of personal construct theory to uncover such constructs. Second, it would result in insightful implications to the field of fashion marketing, explaining whether social media marketing activities in the fashion industry such as customer reviews and Facebook marketing are as influential as they appear to be in other industries.

2. Literature review

2.1. Online customer reviews

Online customer reviews have become an essential tool on most retailers' and service providers' websites. Existing research investigating customer reviews of products and services focuses on three key areas of inquiry: (1) reasons for writing reviews (e.g. Chen et al., 2011; Moe and Trusov, 2011; Schlosser, 2005), (2) reasons for reading reviews (e.g. Burton and Khammash, 2010), and (3) the effectiveness and influence of customer reviews (e.g. Chakraborty and Bhat, 2018; Dellarocas, Zhang and Awad, 2007; Frick and Kaimann, 2017; Folse et al., 2016; Sen and Lerman, 2007; Smith et al., 2005). Within the scope of this paper, the literature that is most relevant is the latter two: examining the reasons for reading reviews and their effectiveness and influence on the customer.

Reasons for reading reviews include factors relevant to purchase decision involvement (e.g. risk reduction) and product involvement (e.g. to learn about new products) (Burton and Khammash, 2010). In addition, personal reasons include self-involvement for instance to expand one's general knowledge or to satisfy curiosity and social involvement (e.g. belonging to an online community) (*ibid*). Whether reviews are read for personal or purchase-related reasons greatly influences how such reviews then impact on the customers.

In addition to exploring the motivations for reading customer reviews, a growing body of literature discusses the influence of these reviews and their effectiveness for business and consumers. Factors that contribute to the effectiveness of online customer reviews include (1) providing fast, easy and almost instantaneous communication which is accessible by the public and (2) easy identification of content with the help of search engines (Hong and Lee, 2005; Sparks and Browning, 2010). As reviews are made in the public domain, this may become a major concern for managers in the case of negative reviews and an important opportunity in the case of positive ones (e.g. Purnawirawan et al., 2015).

Research shows that customer reviews influence product sales in certain industries such as books, restaurants and technology products (e.g. Chevalier and Mayzlin, 2006; Frick and Kaimann, 2017; Moe and Trusov, 2011; Zhang et al., 2013). Moreover, reviews also influence

customers' willingness to pay in varying degrees (Wu and Wu, 2016) and also positively influence their offline purchase intentions (Flavián et al., 2016) and online purchases such as software downloads (Frick and Kaimann, 2017). Consumer reviews also known to influence formation of consumers' trust, particularly competence dimension of trust judgements (Stouthuysen et al., 2018). In spite of the important role of customer reviews as highlighted in the aforementioned literature, it is worth noting that the impact of reviews varies depending on the nature and effectiveness of the review (Chakraborty and Bhat, 2018; Cao et al., 2011; Kim and Gupta, 2012), and arguably the role of reviews may vary across industries and product categories. These two issues are vital in critically understanding the impact of customer reviews, and as such they are discussed in detail below.

The first issue to explore is the nature of the review and what makes a review effective. Quality of the review is one of the most important factors that influence credibility of the review and ultimately consumers' future behaviors (Chakraborty and Bhat, 2018). Cao et al. (2011) assert that the unstructured nature of online reviews can create challenges for consumers in terms of how to interpret them, thus arguing that effective reviews must have a structure that allows ease of access and interpretation. For example, long and narrative reviews are not perceived as helpful, but overall ranking scores are (Filiéri et al., 2018). In addition, research suggests that emotional expressions in reviews also influence their impact (Felbermayr and Nanopoulos, 2016). For instance, Kim and Gupta (2012) suggest that a negative review consisting of negative emotional expressions is perceived as less valuable and less influential because of the association of the negative review with the negative state of the reviewer instead of the product or service being reviewed.

Furthermore, contextual information and reviewer details have an effect on the impact of reviews (Hu et al., 2008; Chakraborty and Bhat, 2018). For example, Cheng and Ho (2015) reveal that when reviewers have a large number of followers and a higher level of expertise, their reviews are perceived as being more practical and useful. Similarly, both the average score and word count of a review are found to influence sales of products (Cheng and Ho, 2015; Zhang et al., 2013). Accordingly, review effectiveness is linked to a number of issues that relate to the nature of the review and its content and context, in addition to the influence of the reviewer's status and the dynamics of the platform.

The second issue relates to reviews across industries and product categories (see Table 1 for the list of selected papers across industries). The role of reviews has been investigated in a number of industries, showing how certain consumption practices are affected. For instance, reviews seem to have an influential role in the entertainment and media industry (Godes and Mayzlin, 2004), movies (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2015), online book sales (Chevalier and Mayzlin, 2006), bath, fragrance and beauty products (Moe and Trusov, 2011), video gaming (Frick and Kaimann, 2017; Zhu and Zhang, 2010) and in the hospitality industry (e.g. TripAdvisor) (Bigné et al., 2016; Fong et al., 2017; Tan et al., 2018)

As existing literature focused on reviews within several industries such as the media and entertainment industry (e.g. TV shows and movies), the hospitality industry (e.g. restaurants and hotels), as well as video games, books, bath, fragrance and beauty products; the role of reviews is rooted within the industry context and their influence as such should be understood in light of said industry. It is therefore important to consider the role of customer reviews within this specific industry, and this paper focuses on the online fashion industry. Research in this area is extremely limited, with papers only briefly referring to reviews but with a completely different research focus (e.g. Dawson and Kim, 2010). It is, indeed, vital for research on online customer reviews to specifically focus on the fashion industry, given that fashion and clothing are associated with high emotional involvement (Levy, 1959), as they may carry strong symbolic meaning that relates to identity and social status in addition to their use as a commodity of core value (McCracken, 1986; Solomon and Douglas, 1987).

Table 1
Selected literature across industries.

Key Study	Social Media Type/ Website	Industry	Type of Industry (Hedonic or Utilitarian)	Country	Data Type and Sample Size	Method
– Sen and Lerman (2007); – Burton and Khammash (2010)	– Anonymous e-retailer website – Cjao.co.uk	Generic Products such as digital cameras, books and movies	Hedonic and utilitarian	– Not specified – United Kingdom	– Reviews of 100 items on retail website, 137 MBA students and 120 MBA students – 25 Cjao users	– Contingency Table Analysis – Regression – ANOVA – MANOVA – Template Analysis – ANOVA – Logistic Regression – Linear Regression – Content Analysis and Hierarchical Regression – Regression – Mediation analysis – ANOVA – T-test – Statistical Analysis
– Smith, Menon and Sivakumar (2005); – Cheng and Ho (2015); – Singh, Nishant and Kitchen (2016) – Tan et al. (2018)	– Simulation-based Experiment – ipeen.com.tw – Yelp – Simulation-based Experiment	Restaurants	Hedonic	– Not specified – Taiwan – Not specified – China	– 252 UG students and 150 UG students – 983 reviews – 10,000 Yelp users – 107 students (+ 36 students for pilot study) and 205 online panel members (+ 120 members for pilot study)	– ANCOVA – Forecasting Model – Incident Analysis – Structural Equation Model – Hazard Modeling
– Chen, Fay and Wang (2011)	– Epinions.com; Car and Driver, Autobytel, MSN, yahoo	Automobiles	Hedonic and utilitarian	– Not specified	– Reviews posted in 2001 and 2008	– Statistical Analysis
– Schlosser (2005); – Dellarcos, Gao and Narayan (2010); – Hennig-Thurau, Wiertz and Feldhaus (2015) – Folse et al. (2016)	– Simulation-based Experiment – Yahoo! Movies – Twitter	Movies	Hedonic	– English speaking participants – United States – North America	– 154 UG students and 137 UG students – 520 reviews in 2002 and 715 reviews in 2007–8 – Approximately 4 million tweets and 600 Twitter users – 161 undergraduate students and 213 Amazon Turk users – 3801 ratings	– ANCOVA – Forecasting Model – Incident Analysis – Structural Equation Model
– Moe and Trusov (2011)	– Simulation-based Experiment – Anonymous retailer website	Laptops	Utilitarian	– Not specified	– Reviews posted in 2001 and 2008	– Statistical Analysis
– Godes and Mayzlin (2004) – Bickart and Schindler (2001)	– Usenet – Anonymous corporate websites and anonymous consumer forums	Bath, Fragrance and Beauty Products TV Shows Cycling, Exercise Equipment, Nutritional Supplements, Photography and Stereo Equipment	Hedonic Utilitarian	– Not specified – United States – Not specified	– Usenet posts about 41 TV shows – 61 corporate website or consumer forum	– Regression – MANOVA
– Casalo et al. (2015); – Sánchez-Franco, Navarro-García and Rondán-Cataluña 2016 – Fong, Lei and Law (2017)	– Centraldereservas.com – Booking.com – Trip Advisor	Hotels	Hedonic	– Spain – Spain – United States (Las Vegas)	– 92 travel agency customers and 165 customers – 19,318 reviews – 500 reviews	– T-test – ANOVA – Omega squared – Text-mining – Content Analysis Log-linear Analyses – Multi-regression
– Zhang, Ma and Cartwright (2013) – Flavián, Gurrea and Orús (2016)	– Amazon.com – Simulation-based Experiment	Cameras	Utilitarian	– United States – Not specified	– 63,121 online reviews – 63 college students and 101 students	– ANOVA – T-test – Logistic Regression – Regression – Regression
– Zhu and Zhang (2010) – Frick and Katmann (2017)	– Gamespot.com (also known as videogames.com) – Apple App Store – Amazon.com – Simulation-based Experiment	Smartphones and mobile applications Video Games	Hedonic	– United States – Not specified	– 220 games – 32 applications, 5792 observations	– Regression – Regression
– Hu, Liu and Zhang (2008) – Stouthuysen et al. (2018)	– Amazon.com – Simulation-based Experiment	Books, DVDs and Videos DVDs	Hedonic Hedonic	– Not specified – West Europe	– Amazon reviews of 16,256 products – 336 students	– Regression – Structural Equation Model – Hierarchical Regression – Analysis – Text mining and text preprocessing – Logistic Regression
– Cao, Duan and Gan (2011)	– Download.com	Software Programs	Hedonic and utilitarian	– Not specified	– 3460 reviews	– Logistic Regression

(continued on next page)

Table 1 (continued)

Key Study	Social Media Type/ Website	Industry	Type of Industry (Hedonic or Utilitarian)	Country	Data Type and Sample Size	Method
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agnihotri and Bhattacharya (2016) - Chakraborty and Bhat (2018) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amazon.co.uk - Flipkart, Snapdeal and Amazon India 	Consumer electronics including tablet, printer, headphones and camera	Utilitarian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - United Kingdom - India 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1608 reviews - 1179 users of three selected e-commerce sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tobit Regression - Structural Equation Model

Indeed, the role and usefulness of customer reviews are linked to the type of product or service being reviewed (e.g. hedonic vs. utilitarian) (Sen and Lerman, 2007). Li and Gery (2000) distinguish between homogenous and heterogeneous products, arguing that the former are easier to buy online. Therefore, unlike standardized books, CDs, or airline tickets that can be bought online or offline with hardly any variation, clothing may have variations in attributes such as style, color, texture or size when presented on a website and when finally, in the hands of the customer. However, in the case of products that are hedonistic and/or heterogeneous in nature, such as fashion items, the relevance of reviews remains unclear.

Accordingly, this paper's first focus is on the role of reviews in online fashion shopping experiences to understand how they are constructed by the online fashion shoppers. Reasons for our selection of fashion products are twofold. First, fashion is one of the most popular industries leading in online shopping (Ashman and Vazquez, 2012; Kawaf and Tagg, 2012; Perry et al., 2013), therefore, presenting tailored results that are specific to advancing this industry is important. Second, despite the high popularity of online fashion shopping this industry was not fully explored in terms of the usefulness online reviews. Dennis et al. (2010) is one of the very few empirical papers studying in part the issue of customer reviews in the fashion industry. They argue that within a social shopping community site, being able to read customer reviews and receive style advice improved users' purchasing choices (Dennis et al., 2010). It is, however, not clear how online reviews influence consumers in general as their study's main focus is on social shopping rather than online retailing. Dawson and Kim (2010) also briefly advocate the importance of customer reviews in online fashion shopping as part of a larger study, but their argument is based on Wagner (2008), which does not specifically report on the importance of customer reviews in the specific context of online fashion shopping. Instead, Wagner's (2008) report is made within the broad context of online retailing as a whole.

2.2. Role of facebook in the online fashion industry

Facebook is the most popular social media, the second most visited website in the world (Alexa, 2018). With more than 2 billion monthly active users, over 60 million businesses have set up Facebook pages to communicate with their target (Facebook, 2018); thus, transforming businesses (Vladlena et al., 2015) and creating an additional marketing communications channel (Burton and Soboleva, 2011). The novelty of this channel is that businesses can use it to engage and collaborate with their consumers to encourage them to share and circulate positive sentiments, which then will increase the visibility of the business (Smith et al., 2012).

Research identifies that there are four main reasons for users to participate in Facebook pages: socializing, entertainment, self-status seeking and information seeking (Park et al., 2009). As consumers can also create their own content and share this with others, they now have the power of controlling the conversation (Abedin and Jafarzadeh, 2013). When consumers engage with brand-related content on Facebook, their online behaviors express their ideal self rather than their actual self (Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012; Kytö and McGookin, 2017). This means that users shape their behavior in a way that they believe is the ideal way of self-presentation. Smith et al. (2012) shows that consumers create apparel-related branded content on Facebook to support their self-presentation on profile pages. These findings signal the importance for consumers to engage with some brands and to avoid others.

In the context of fashion, consumers can interact with a Facebook page through various activities. These activities can take many shapes depending on the content type the company creates on their page. For example, if a company shares photos or videos (e.g. advertisement or behind the scenes), consumers can view these, like them, comment on them or share them on their profiles. In general, activities available for

consumers include commenting on the posts (e.g. text, photo, video, link or other), sharing the posts with their own networks, watching videos, sharing own photos of the products (e.g. outfit), interacting with polls, clicking the links to obtain more information, clicking the links to purchase products or liking the page, which is sometimes referred to as becoming a member or fan of the brand.

Liking a business page on Facebook is recognized as consumers' method of identifying brands that they like, and is believed to lead to higher loyalty. As a result, consumption-related activities on Facebook become part of social life and are used for personal and social gratifications such as seeking self-status or information. Businesses can use these pages to develop relationships with customers. In order to develop such relationships, they can provide useful content about the business, create interactive environments where users can also post and feel part of a community (Abedin and Jafarzadeh, 2013), and can use informal communication styles which increases the brand trust for familiar brands (Gretry et al., 2017). Companies can provide exclusive content or monetary incentives on their Facebook page and limit this content to those who like the page. This may help to increase likes on their pages. When companies create their content on Facebook, they mostly engage in five types of activity: direct marketing of products or services, promotion of sponsored events, surveys, informational announcements and fun postings (Dekay, 2012). Consumers who have liked the page will be notified about business posts on their homepage (i.e. news feed) whenever they log in to Facebook. It is known that among the posts that include a textual status message or a photo receives more attention from consumers compared to content containing only a link or video (Kwok and Yu, 2013). This way, business use Facebook pages to showcase their products akin to traditional product exhibitions (Athwal et al., 2018). However, the relationship between Facebook likes and consumer behavior is not clear. It is possible that some consumers who have liked a brand on Facebook do not actually interact with it, whereas others who have not liked the brand might be the loyal customers of that brand (Wallace et al., 2014).

This literature review has highlighted the existing discussion with regard to using Facebook as a business and communication channel as well as critically reviewing the nature and relevance of customer reviews across industries. Therefore, in addition to exploring the role of customer reviews, this paper investigates the case of social media pages, particularly Facebook. The second aim of this study is to investigate how customers perceive brands' social media marketing activities within the context of the online fashion industry. It is worth noting that this research has not included the use of influencers or fashion haulers as it focused mainly on anonymous reviews and Facebook pages of brands rather than those of influencers.

3. Methodology

This paper adopts the theoretical foundation of Kelly's (1955) personal construct theory (PCT) in order to address the research question: "Based on Personal Construct Theory, how do online fashion shoppers construct the relevance of social media marketing activities in their online shopping experience?"

The rationale for adopting PCT is related to the affordances of such approach. PCT is a humanistic approach of inquiry that accounts for the role of the person as a whole, and sees an individual as one who is capable of learning from his or her experiences and constructions of the world. As such, PCT is presented as a suitable approach to exploring how individual consumers construct the relevance and importance of reviews and social media marketing efforts in their own experiences using their own words.

PCT is an individual's personal inquiry and a psychology of the human quest (Bannister, 1970). It views humans as experts in their own experiences, and therefore as the best source to guide us into understanding their experiences in a holistic manner (Bannister and Fransella, 1986). Whilst PCT is not a popular approach in marketing

and consumer research, the method has been adopted and adapted both qualitatively and quantitatively as an exploratory tool, a tool for evaluating choices or decisions, or a method of inquiry into human perception, emotion and cognition (for example, see Kawaf and Tagg, 2017; Lemke, Clark and Wilson, 2011; Marsden and Littler, 2000; Richardson et al., 2002; Tagg and Wilson, 2012; Walker et al., 2003, among others). Indeed, researchers such as Kawaf and Tagg (2017) advocate the use of PCT for studying all human experiences and particularly digital customer experiences as the approach allows a level of individuality and personal understanding of such experiences. As such, PCT is adopted in this research as a suitable humanistic and structured approach to studying how online fashion shoppers construct the relevance of social media marketing activities in their online shopping experience.

The methodological companion of PCT is the repertory grid technique. This is a technique that has been developed by Kelly (1955) to help the individual to unveil his or her constructs and experiences. Unlike other types of measurement, the grid does not impose any content dimensions on the participants. Instead, the participants are invited to use their own words to construct their experiences and their understanding of these experiences (Bannister and Mair, 1968). Therefore, in order to critically explore consumers' perceptions of social media marketing and their relevance within the online fashion industry, a form of repertory grid structured interviews was used as discussed below.

3.1. Data collection method

For the purpose of addressing the research question, in-depth interviews were conducted. In the first part of the interview, repertory grids were produced, the second part then followed an unstructured in-depth interview style. In this section, the method of repertory grid production is further explained.

Every repertory grid consists of a topic, elements, constructs, and ratings. As Jankowicz explains: "people have constructs about anything and everything. A grid is always conducted about a particular topic, with the intention of eliciting just those constructs which the person uses in making sense of that particular realm of discourse - that particular slice of their experience" (2005, p.12). The grids studied here were collected for a wider research project focusing on the online shopping experience. The participants were asked to choose the elements of the grids with respect to different web atmospherics and characteristics. Once the elements were chosen, construct elicitation began. Any means of element comparison can result in construct elicitations (e.g., dyads, triads, etc.). However, Kelly (1955) suggests the use of triads as the most appropriate method. This study follows Easterby-Smith et al.'s Minimum Context Card Form in which "the cards are normally drawn randomly from the pack and triads are presented until time runs out or the person 'dries up'" (1996, p.9).

In this research, three elements cards were picked by each participant, who was asked to say in which way two of these cards (elements/websites) were similar and different from the third, in terms of their own experience. The participant's answer for the similar (common factor) between two of the cards was recorded on the very left-hand side of the grid as the "emergent" pole of the construct. In contrast, the participant's answer regarding how the two cards differed from the third was recorded on the right-hand side of the same row to represent the "implicit" pole of the same construct. After eliciting the construct, each participant rated all the elements of the grid on a 5-point Likert scale of the construct itself (emergent pole represents rating of 1 and implicit pole represents rating of 5).

Another construct elicitation process called "laddering/pyramiding" follows, wherein "the person is able to indicate the hierarchical integration of their personal construct system" (Bannister et al., 1968, p.50). In this process, in-depth questioning about the initial construct ("why" and "in what way") results in further constructs (Jankowicz,

Table 2
Repertory Grid Example.

Construct's Emergent Pole	Grid Elements											Construct's Implicit Pole
	Search Facilities	Customer Reviews	Catwalk Videos	Product Image + /3D	Web Layout	Social Network Pages	Web Design	Return Policy	Chat with Adviser	Info on Model Size		
It brings a good alternative to store service	5	3	2	4	4	3	1	1	2	5	The minimum basics	
Glad and happy	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	1	2	4	Disappointed	
Make me easily buy more	1	3	2	1	4	5	1	1	2	4	Only buy if the product is really good	
Low risk	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	1	2	1	High risk	
Vital, Essential	1	5	3	1	1	5	1	1	5	1	Useless	
At ease	1	4	3	1	2	3	1	1	4	1	Scared	
Comfortable	1	5	3	1	2	5	1	1	5	1	Unsettled	

2005). Table 2 below shows an example of the resulting grid.

As seen in Table 2, the elements of the grid appear at the top of the grid, in this particular example these include: Search Facilities, Customer Reviews, Catwalk Videos, Product Image +/3D, Web Layout, Social Network Pages, etc. The elicited constructs include: (It brings a good alternative to store service – the minimum basics), (Glad and happy – disappointed), and so on. The ratings then indicate for each of the constructs above how the elements were rated. For instance, looking at the first line of the grid, the construct is (It brings a good alternative to store service – the minimum basics). The rating of 5 for ‘search facility’ indicates it is rated toward the ‘minimum basics’ implicit pole of the construct, whereas ‘web design’ is rated as 1 indicating it relates to the emergent pole of the construct (e.g. ‘it brings a good alternative to store service’) and so on.

In addition, accompanying the grids, is the transcribed in-depth interviews that include the conversations in relation to all these constructs as discussed by the participants. This paper is part of a wider research project and so some of the elements of the grid (e.g. search facilities, images, catwalk videos, etc.) are not included in this particular study.

3.2. Research sample

Sampling techniques are classified into two distinctive types; probability and non-probability samples (Saunders et al., 2009). While the former relies on probability theory, it is the latter that is widely used in qualitative research mostly in the form of purposive or judgmental sampling (Creswell, 2009; Goulding, 1999). Using purposive sampling, members are chosen based on the judgement of the researcher and in relation to the research problem. The selection criteria included that a person must have recurrent experiences of online fashion shopping, including purchase and post-purchase experiences, in order to participate. In addition, the participants’ familiarity with a number of online fashion retailers was an important criterion in order to avoid discussions that revolve around a single brand. This also excluded fashion shopping on generic retailing websites such as Amazon and eBay due to the wide variety of product categories that can be found on such websites. The sampling approach is in line with Goulding’s rationale that “the participants are selected because they have ‘lived’ the experience under study, and therefore sampling is planned and purposive” (1999, p 868).

A total of 25 individual repertory grid interviews were conducted (See appendix A for a grid example), of which 23 were recorded and analyzed. Most of the participants were within an age range of 18–34 years old with 76% females to 24% males reflecting on the already established higher popularity of online fashion shopping among females more than males (Mintel, 2017). Appendix A presents a detailed table of participants information, all the participants were recruited and interviewed in the United Kingdom where online shopping is in high popularity. For the purpose of this paper, the transcribed interviews along with the repertory grids were analyzed using thematic analysis, the results are explained and discussed in detail below.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Customer Reviews: No black and white; shades of grey

The research findings challenge the effectiveness and relevance of customer reviews in online fashion shopping and show their fluid nature. Although different views and comments were made regarding customer reviews, a clear voice was unavoidably noticeable in the data that the relevance of customer reviews is a fluid concept and no framework could capture this fluidity rather it is best understood in terms of how the individuals express their views.

Various examples could be used to illustrate this point from the data, for instance one participant suggests: “I don’t look for reviews. See if

I'm buying something to do with technology, like more expensive, I'd look ... but not for clothes" (Joe, Interview 06). Another participant, Sara, comments: *"Customer reviews ... I'd never actually looked at that at all (...). If I found something I really like and I watched the catwalk video of it and I read product information and I liked it then I'd just go ahead and buy it. I would maybe look for customer reviews in something to do with like technology or something like that but not for clothes. Because, everybody is different anyway. Not everybody like the same clothes that I like so it is not something I'd look at. [...] Even if there are negative reviews, I'd still take the risk especially if I'd been on the website before. It's not really the end of the world. I can always return it. [...] It might make me feel uneasy or uncertain, it would be at the back of my mind but I would probably still buy it"* (Sara, Interview 04).

Such quotes challenge the current view of an influential role of customer reviews in the shopping experience. This comes surprising given that existing research has strongly emphasized the importance and essential role of reviews year after year (e.g. Bickart and Schindler, 2001; Dawson and Kim, 2010; Dellarocas et al., 2007; Felbermayr and Nanopoulos, 2016). Moreover, by re-examining Table 2 of the example grid, the ratings of the elements (reviews and social media pages) seem to constantly attract a rating of 3 further supporting this notion of the fluid role of review in the online fashion shopping experience.

By focusing specifically on reviews in the context of fashion rather than a generic understanding of reviews across all product and service categories this research presents the following findings as an explanation to the lack of perceived relevance of reviews in online fashion shopping experience.

4.1.1. Fashion and the individuality corollary

One explanation of the fluidity and perceived lack of relevance of reviews in online fashion shopping experience can be explained by Kelly's PCT individuality corollary; "People have different experiences and therefore construe events in different ways" (1955, p46). Individuality in fashion could be best explored in relation to self-presentation and identity (Levy, 1959; McCracken, 1986; Solomon and Douglas, 1987), evident in the participants' comments *'fashion is very personal'* (Joe, Interview 06) and *'everybody is different anyway'* (Sara, Interview 04). The individuality corollary explains the theoretical underpinning of such views; people experience fashion differently, and indeed people have different tastes, styles, personalities, body shapes and preferences; thus, making the reviews made by others less relevant and less important.

However, the relevance of reviews might be different when the reviews are made by opinion leaders, influencers, or fashion haulers due to their influential status rather than the power of customer reviews in general (Cheng and Ho, 2015) as credibility of the source is an important factor that influences consumers (Chakraborty and Bhat, 2018). Accordingly, despite existing research views on fashion as a social phenomenon (Kang, 2009), this research shows, by focusing on a theory of personality, that fashion is closely relevant to the individuality of the shopper and how they construe their experiences. Fashion is down to the individual and their 'liking' of garments, an issue that is highly subjective. Therefore, many shoppers seem to place much less value on customer reviews on apparel websites.

4.1.2. The lure of free returns

In addition to the theoretical concept of the individuality corollary that challenges the relevance of customer reviews due to the fluidity and individuality of fashion experiences, another simple explanation is given by the participants themselves: *"even if there are negative reviews, I'd still take the risk especially if I'd been on the website before. It's not really the end of the world. I can always return it"* (Sara, Interview 04). Indeed, the practicalities of a prospering online fashion retailing sector is the need for easy and often free return policies. Pure players have recognized that, albeit expensive, easy and free returns are a game changer for most online retailers (National Retail Association, 2016)

Accordingly, despite positive and negative reviews, with the increasingly easy and free options of returning unwanted items, the risks associated with online fashion shopping are decreasing. However, the practicality and convenience of delivery and returns do not mask some of the tension created by negative reviews; one participant explains: *"Negative reviews make me disappointed ... tension between me liking the product and the negative reviews ... I might go to actual store. If I really like it, I might take a chance ... it is also about the price. [...] I'd feel guilty if I buy something that customer reviews said it wasn't good. Hahaha"* (Lin, Interview 08).

The emotional states Lin expressed in the case of encountering negative customer reviews despite liking the product are feelings of guilt, tension and disappointment. However, in spite of these emotions her decision remains the same, she would buy the products and deal with the consequences later. As previously discussed in the literature review section, emotional expressions in online customer reviews influence how such reviews are perceived (e.g. Felbermayr and Nanopoulos, 2016; Kim and Gupta, 2012). Accordingly, the review's value of information is argued to be compromised when using negative emotional expressions.

As the literature review highlighted the role of online reviews across a number of industries, it is interesting to see how the fashion industry compares. Whilst research on reviews in the entertainment industry (TV and movies) suggests that reviews have an important influence on consumer behavior and choice (e.g. Godes and Mayzlin, 2004; Hennig-Thurau et al., 2015), this research does not support that the same would apply in the case of fashion shopping. In addition, unlike the direct influence on buying decisions in the sales of bath, fragrance and beauty products (Moe and Trusov, 2011), anonymous reviews of fashion products do not influence whether or not a customer will buy the reviewed products. Some reviews may appear to have informative values that help the customer choose between sizes or colors, rather than influencing whether or not they buy the product. In this instance, the influence of reviews may have a similar effect to that of the tourism industry, in some cases, in which customers use the reviews as an aid for information searching (Smith et al., 2005).

Having discussed the role of customer reviews and their relevance in online fashion shopping, the next section discusses the role of social networking business pages on Facebook and explores their relevance to online fashion shopping.

4.2. Facebook for business or online begging for likes?

The findings of this research reveal an issue of a perceived lack of sociality on social media as well as a desire for exclusivity in fashion choices as discussed below:

4.2.1. The lack of exclusivity in a connected world

Sharing on social media, namely Facebook, proved less popular than expected. The participants in this research seem to intentionally avoid sharing on Facebook the fashion products they intend to buy. Across all interviews there was no indication that any of the participants used (or will be using) the option to share a product or an outfit on Facebook. Indeed, the structure and functionality of Facebook and most fashion shopping websites allow users to easily share their outfits with their friends and network.

This sharing function has proved popular across various product categories, for example, sharing an experience of eating in a café or a restaurant, or checking in to a hotel or a holiday destination have been very popular in recent years. Yet, sharing of fashion products and outfits have not been as popular. One participant suggests *"I don't want anyone to know where I buy my stuff from, or how much they cost me"* (Jill, Interview 12). Another participant, Liz, looked at the product page for a T-shirt she was considering buying, she noticed the links to Facebook and Twitter, and explained that she has never seen it before and that she would not interact with it (Liz, Interview 15).

An explanation to the lack of interest in sharing on Facebook is explained in another comment from a participant saying: “I have all sorts of ‘people’ on my Facebook, but I will never ask their opinion on my clothes!” (Isla, Interview 24). The nature of fashion and its links to identity, class and self-presentation (Hollenbeck and Kaikati, 2012; Smith et al., 2012) explains the desire for exclusivity in fashion shopping. Sharing fashion choices on Facebook intervenes with the shoppers need to maintain exclusivity in their purchase decisions.

Hollenbeck and Kaikati (2012) argue that the online behavior of customers on Facebook expresses their ideal self rather than their actual self. The participants’ rationale for not sharing included comments that referred to not wanting to compromise their image among their connections. On the other hand, although the findings of this paper do not show that consumers share apparel content on Facebook as Smith et al. (2012) suggest, an explanation is perhaps available in the same work, as they link this to self-presentation, and so avoiding sharing outfits may be for the same reason. It is the need to maintain exclusivity in fashion choices, withholding information on where an outfit is from or how much it is bought for has long been associated with fashion shopping. Therefore, it is thought that perhaps sharing outfit choices may compromise this exclusivity making a fashion choice less unique.

4.2.2. Fashion in the like economy

Brand pages on Facebook seem to attract a large number of fans and followers. For instance, the Facebook page of ASOS.com had attracted more than 5.3 million likes as of early 2018. The findings of this research questions the influence of such likes and argues against their relevance. Despite liking business Facebook pages, a number of participants in this research showed no direct link between liking such pages and how they viewed a brand. Even those who like some pages explained motivations for doing so do not necessarily relate to being ‘fans’ of a brand. For instance, Steph expressed her detailed perspective on this matter: “I follow a couple (...) it is useful cuz it just comes up on your homepage [Newsfeed] and you can kinda almost browsing the website without actually going on the website. You can see what’s new in and if you’re sitting on the bus and you’re looking through Facebook on your phone, you can just look at things. It’s not like you’re actually shopping, so I think social network pages are quite a good idea. And it can, it lets you know about competitions and I (for some) if you like them on Facebook and enter the code using your Facebook page you get 10% off! So, umm, probably good for things like that” (Steph, Interview 16).

This quote reveals intrinsic motivations relating to learning about fashion trends and staying up to date on what a fashion brand has to offer. There is a factor of convenience in having continuous access to the fashion world even without intentionally starting an online shopping task. This motivation, however, fades over time for most liked pages due to overcrowded newsfeeds and declining relevance over time. In this instance, liking or following a page on Facebook does not necessarily equate to any long-term engagement or exposure; this indeed is supported by Gerlitz and Helmond’s (2013) concept of the ‘Like’ economy and the declining relevance of such behaviors over time. The continuous push by brands to initiate a ‘like’ behavior also appear as an unpleasant distraction of sociality, one participant, Jack, called this type of push for likes a form of “online begging” in which brands are mindlessly begging for more likes despite any further value or relevance of such likes (Jack, Interview 22).

In other instances, liking and following Facebook pages of fashion brands is linked to financial motivations. For example, some participants who followed certain brands on Facebook were motivated by access to discounts, vouchers, and competitions resulting in financial gains. However, despite this, major resistance to social media marketing activities was apparent throughout the data, and mostly the participants did not believe in the so-called ‘social’ aspect of it. Many viewed it as another suspect way for companies to push their advertising messages onto them, a form of online begging; while others distrusted customer reviews or at least thought they were of no value to

their online fashion shopping experience.

One of the illusions of the virtual world of social networking is that fans follow pages because they ‘like’ them, and are attached to them; that fans are proud of their relationship with the brands they like that they want to show this to their friends and relatives. However, as discussed in the literature review, the relationship between Facebook likes and consumer behavior remains unclear. This research therefore confirms Wallace et al.’s (2014) stance on the possibility that some consumers who like a brand on Facebook may not actually interact with it, whereas others who have not liked it may be its most loyal customers. This might be one of the examples where consumers use Facebook for hedonic rather than utilitarian motivations, as explained in the literature (Xu et al., 2012) and it is indeed strongly supported by Gerlitz and Helmond’s (2013) like economy.

5. Conclusion

This research critically investigated the role of social media marketing in an industry-specific context. Based on Personal Construct Theory, the research contributes to the field of fashion marketing and social media by unraveling some of the many fashion specific dimensions of online shopping experiences and its links to social Media. Unlike existing research that suggest a high relevance of both customer reviews and Facebook marketing in several industries such as entertainment, hospitality, beauty (e.g. Bigné et al., 2016; Chevalier and Mayzlin, 2006; Godes and Mayzlin, 2004; Moe and Trusov, 2011), this research brings different insights suggesting that, in the fashion industry, the relevance of such activities is uniquely different and worthy of further investigation.

Due to the nature of fashion and its association with identity, social links, and self-presentation, it seems that conventional uses of social media activities proved less effective. Specifically, this research shows that the perceived relevance of customer reviews in online fashion shopping is far from distinctive black and white, and that the fluid nature of online shopping experience as supported by Kawaf and Tagg (2017), resonates with this lack of relevance of reviews. The research presented two explanations for this, one links to ‘fashion and the individuality corollary’ (Kelly, 1955) and another less complex one linking to the ‘lure of free returns’ and the current built mechanism of easy and almost free delivery and returns resulting in drastically reduced risks.

In addition, in terms of Facebook marketing, the value of liking a business page is challenged in this research. Whilst few indicated that following such pages helps them stay up to date on fashion trends and latest offerings, a strong voice suggested that the ‘like’ behavior loses relevance over time and that sometimes it is only due to financial motivations such as accessing discounts and vouchers. This is supported by Gerlitz and Helmond’s (2013) concept of the like economy and the lost sociality of social media. Moreover, the issue of sharing outfits with the Facebook network has been found to be rarely relevant or effective to any of the participants of this study. Fueled by the desire to maintain exclusivity in their fashion choices and outfits the participants of this study showed no interest in this act of sharing.

Accordingly, this research contributes to a clear understanding of the perceived relevance of social media marketing activities, namely, customer reviews and Facebook pages in online fashion shopping. In light of the rise of popularity of social media marketing, it is apparent that many brands and businesses have rushed in to catch the technology wave in recent years, leaving behind any planned marketing and branding strategy. Even though one could argue that businesses have been doing such activities for years, this does not guarantee any value of such uses. Indeed, after years of embedding star ratings and customer reviews as well as links to sharing outfits on Facebook, the major fashion retailer ASOS has recently launched a new website (ASOS, 2018) omitting all reviews and Facebook links and focusing on learning and social interactions for fashion in a community based forum on a

Table A1
Table of participants' profiles.

No.	Demographics	Browse for clothes	Shop for clothes	Familiar fashion websites
3	Female (18–24) year old	Very! Once a week!	Very often!! I love shopping online	Many!! Rather all.
4	Female (18–24) year old	Everyday	Once/twice a month	5–6
5	Female (18–24) year old	2–3 times a week	At least once a week	10
6	Male (> 50) year old	3–4 times a month	6–8 times a year	3–4
7	Male (18–24)	Once a week (sometimes even more)	Once every 1 or 2 months	10–12
8	Female (18–24) year old	Almost everyday	5–10 times a year	8
9	Female (18–24) year old	Around once a month	It depends how much money I have	4–5
10	Female (18–24) year old	Once a week or more	3–4 times a month	15 or more
11	Female (25–35) year old	Everyday	Every week	20 +
12	Female (25–35) year old	Regularly	Rarely	6–7
13	Male (18–24) year old	2–3 times a week	Once a month	6
14	Female (18–24) year old	2–3 times a week	Once a month	10
15	Female (18–24) year old	Everyday	Once a week	20
16	Female (18–24) year old	Once/twice a week	Once a month	5–10
17	Male (18–24) year old	1–2 times a week	1–2 times every 2–3 months	10
18	Female (18–24) year old	Once or twice per day	Once a week	10
19	Female (18–24) year old	3 times a week	Once a month	7
20	Female (36–50) year old	Almost every week	Every month	Too many (over 30)
21	Male (18–24) year old	3 Times a week	Once a month	9
22	Male (18–24) year old	Weekly	Every few months	15
23	Female (18–24) year old	Once every 2– 3 weeks (less or more depending on my needs)	Every 1–2 months	3–4
24	Female (18–24) year old	Daily	Fortnightly	At least three
25	Female (25–35) year old	Once a week	Once every (–3) months	10

separate part of the website steering away from conventional star ratings and anonymous reviews.

Since this study adopted a research design with individual participants who were experienced in online fashion shopping, its findings can only be regarded as relevant to this population, and cannot be extended to novice shoppers who are unfamiliar with online fashion shopping. Moreover, this paper used purposive sampling to identify candidates with prior recurrent experience of online fashion shopping, a decision which might arguably influence the generalizability of the findings; an issue that further research should address. This study is also limited to examining customers' perception of social media activities that are directly linked to a brand or a business, such as customer reviews, brand

social media pages, or the options to share products on one's timeline. Other social media, such as platforms that are not connected to a retailer website, are important topics for investigation to further understand the role of social media in online fashion shopping. Examples of these include blogs and YouTube vlogs led by 'fashion haulers'. Future research may further incorporate the influence of fashion haulers and the effectiveness of their integration into online fashion websites.

Declarations of interest

None.

Appendix A. – Repertory grid example

See Appendix Table A1.

References

- Abedin, B., Jafarzadeh, H., 2013. Attracting and Retaining Customers on Facebook Business Pages: a Content Analysis of an Online Discussion Forum. *International Journal of Technology Marketing* 8. pp. 304–315.
- Agnihotri, A., Bhattacharya, S., 2016. Online review helpfulness: role of qualitative factors. *Psychol. Mark.* 33 (11), 1006–1017.
- Alexa, 2018. "Alexa Site Info: Facebook" <<http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/facebook.com>>. (accessed February 2018).
- Ashman, R., Vazquez, D., 2012. Simulating attachment to pure-play fashion retailers. *Int. J. Retail Distrib. Manag.* 40 (12), 975–996.
- ASOS, 2018. <<https://www.asos.com>>. (accessed February 2018).
- Athwal, N., Istanbuluoglu, D., McCormack, S.E., 2018. The allure of luxury brands' social media activities: a uses and gratifications perspective. *Inf. Technol. People (Online Publ.)*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-01-2018-0017>.
- Bannister, D., 1970. *Perspectives in Personal Construct Theory*. Academic Press, London.
- Bannister, D., Mair, J.M., 1968. *Evaluation of Personal Constructs*. Academic Press.
- Bannister, D., Fransella, F., 1986. *Inquiring Man: The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. Routledge, London.
- Bickart, B., Schindler, R., 2001. Internet forums as influential sources of consumer information. *J. Interact. Mark.* 15 (3), 31–40.
- Bigné, E., Caplliure, E.M., Miquel, M.J., 2016. Ewom on travel agency selection: specialized versus private label. *Psychol. Mark.* 33 (12), 1046–1053.
- Boyd, D.M., Ellison, N.B., 2007. Social Network Sites: definition, History, and Scholarship. *J. Comput. Mediat. Commun.* 13 (1), 210–230.
- Burton, J., Khammash, M., 2010. Why do people read reviews posted on consumer-opinion portals? *J. Mark. Manag.* 26 (3–4), 230–255.
- Burton, S., Soboleva, A., 2011. Interactive or reactive? Marketing with twitter. *J. Consum. Mark.* 28 (7), 491–499.
- Cao, Q., Duan, W., Gan, Q., 2011. Exploring Determinants of voting for the "helpfulness" of online user reviews: a text mining approach. *Decis. Support Syst.* 50 (2), 511–521.
- Casaló, L.V., Flavián, C., Guinalú, M., Ekinci, Y., 2015. Avoiding the dark side of positive online consumer reviews: enhancing reviews' usefulness for high risk-averse travelers. *J. Bus. Res.* 68 (9), 1829–1835.
- Chakraborty, U., Bhat, S., 2018. The effects of credible online reviews on brand equity dimensions and its consequence on consumer behavior. *J. Promot. Manag.* 24 (1), 57–82.
- Chen, Y., Fay, S., Wang, Q., 2011. The role of marketing in social media: how online consumer reviews evolve. *J. Interact. Mark.* 25 (2), 85–94.
- Cheng, Y.-H., Ho, H.-Y., 2015. Social influence's impact on reader perceptions of online reviews. *J. Bus. Res.* 68 (4), 883–887.
- Chevalier, J., Mayzlin, D., 2006. The Effect of Word of Mouth on Sales: Online Book Reviews. *Journal of Marketing Research* 43. pp. 345–354.
- Creswell, J.W., 2009. *Research Design: qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Dawson, S., Kim, M., 2010. Cues on apparel web sites that trigger impulse purchases. *J. Fash. Mark. Manag.: Int. J.* 14 (2), 230–246.
- DeKay, S.H., 2012. How Large Companies React to Negative Facebook Comments. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 17. pp. 289–299.
- Dellarocas, C., Zhang, X., Awad, N.F., 2007. Exploring the value of online product reviews in forecasting sales: the case of motion pictures. *J. Interact. Mark.* 21 (4), 23–45.
- Dellarocas, C., Gao, G., Narayan, R., 2010. Are consumers more likely to contribute online reviews for hit or niche products? *J. Manag. Inf. Syst.* 27 (2), 127–158.
- Dennis, C., Morgan, A., Wright, L.T., Jayawardhena, C., 2010. The influences of social E-shopping in enhancing young women's online shopping behaviour. *J. Cust. Behav.* 9 (2), 151–174.
- Facebook, 2018a. *Company Info* <<http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/>>. (accessed February 2018).
- Facebook, 2018b. *Facebook Pages* <<https://en-gb.facebook.com/business/products/>>

- pages/>. (accessed February 2018).
- Felbermayr, A., Nanopoulos, A., 2016. The role of emotions for the perceived usefulness in online customer reviews. *J. Interact. Mark.* 36, 60–76.
- Filieri, R., Hofacker, C.F., Alguezaui, S., 2018. What makes information in online consumer reviews diagnostic over time? The role of review relevancy, factuality, currency, source credibility and ranking score. *Comput. Human. Behav.* 80, 122–131.
- Flavián, C., Gurrea, R., Ortús, C., 2016. Choice Confidence in the Webrooming Purchase Process: the Impact of Online Positive Reviews and the Motivation to Touch. *J. Consum. Behav.* 15 (5), 459–476.
- Folse, J.A.G., Porter III, M., Godbole, M.B., Reynolds, K.E., 2016. The effects of negatively valenced emotional expressions in online reviews on the reviewer, the review, and the product. *Psychol. Mark.* 33 (9), 747–760.
- Fong, L.H.N., Lei, S.S.L., Law, R., 2017. Asymmetry of hotel ratings on TripAdvisor: Evidence from single-versus dual-valence reviews. *J. Hosp. Mark. Manag.* 26 (1), 67–82.
- Frick, B., Kaimann, D., 2017. The impact of customer reviews and advertisement efforts on the performance of experience goods in electronic markets. *Appl. Econ. Lett.* 24 (17), 1237–1240.
- Gerlitz, C., Helmond, A., 2013. The like economy: Social buttons and the data-intensive web. *New Media Soc.* 15 (8), 1348–1365.
- GlobalWebIndex, 2018. *Gwi Social* <<https://insight.globalwebindex.net/social>>. (accessed February 2018).
- Godes, D., Mayzlin, D., 2004. Using online conversations to study word-of-mouth communication. *Mark. Sci.* 23 (4), 545–560.
- Goldsmith, R., Horowitz, D., 2006. Measuring motivations for online opinion seeking. *J. Interact. Advert.* 6 (2), 1–16.
- Goulding, C., 1999. Consumer Research, Interpretive Paradigms and Methodological Ambiguities. *Eur. J. Mark.* 33 (9/10), 859–873.
- Gretry, A., Horváth, C., Belei, N., van Riel, A.C., 2017. “Don’t pretend to be my friend!” When an informal brand communication style backfires on social media. *J. Bus. Res.* 74, 77–89.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Wiertz, C., Feldhaus, F., 2015. Does twitter matter? The impact of microblogging word of mouth on consumers’ adoption of new movies. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 43 (3), 375–394.
- Hollenbeck, C.R., Kaikati, A.M., 2012. Consumers’ Use of Brands to Reflect Their Actual and Ideal Selves on Facebook. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 29. pp. 395–405.
- Hong, J., Lee, W., 2005. Consumer Complaint Behavior in the Online Environment. In: Gao, Yuan (Ed.), *Web Systems Design and Online Consumer Behavior*. Idea Group Inc, London, pp. 90–105.
- Hu, N., Liu, L., Zhang, J.J., 2008. Do online reviews affect product sales? The role of reviewer characteristics and temporal effects. *Inf. Technol. Manag.* 9 (3), 201–214.
- Jankowicz, D., 2005. *The easy guide to repertory grids*. Wiley, England.
- Kang, J., 2009. *Social Shopping for Fashion*. Doctoral dissertation, Seoul National University.
- Kawaf, F., Tagg, S., 2012. Online shopping environments in fashion shopping: an SOR based review. *Mark. Rev.* 12 (2), 161–180.
- Kawaf, F., Tagg, S., 2017. The construction of online shopping experience: a repertory grid approach. *Comput. Human. Behav.* 72, 222–232.
- Kelly, G.A., 1955. *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*. W. W. Norton, New York.
- Kim, J., Gupta, P., 2012. Emotional expressions in online user reviews: how they influence consumers’ product evaluations. *J. Bus. Res.* 65 (7), 985–992.
- Kwok, L., Yu, B., 2013. Spreading Social Media Messages on Facebook an Analysis of Restaurant Business-to-Consumer Communications. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* 54. pp. 84–94.
- Kytö, M., McGoogin, D., 2015. Kytö and McGoogin. Investigating user generated presentations of self in face-to-face interaction between strangers. *Int. J. Human-Comput. Stud.* 104, 1–15.
- Lamberton, C., Stephen, A.T., 2016. A thematic exploration of digital, social media, and mobile marketing: research Evolution from 2000 to 2015 and an Agenda for Future Inquiry. *J. Mark.* 80 (6), 146–172.
- Lemke, F., Clark, M., Wilson, H., 2011. Customer experience quality: an exploration in business and consumer contexts using repertory grid technique. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* 39 (6), 846–869.
- Levy, S., 1959. Symbols for sale. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* 37 (4), 117–124.
- Li, Z.G., Gery, N., 2000. E-tailing—For all products? *Bus. Horiz.* 43 (6), 49–54.
- Marsden, D., Littler, D., 2000. Exploring consumer product construct systems with the repertory grid technique. *Qual. Mark. Res.: Int. J.* 3 (3), 127–144.
- McCracken, G., 1986. Culture and consumption: a theoretical account of the structure and movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods. *J. Consum. Res.* 13 (1), 71–84.
- Mintel, 2016. *Digital Trends Spring - UK* <<http://academic.mintel.com/display/748654/>>. (accessed September 2017).
- Mintel, 2017. *UK Online sales of clothing, fashion accessories and footwear grow by 17% in 2017* <<http://www.mintel.com/press-centre/fashion/uk-online-sales-of-clothing-fashion-accessories-and-footwear-grow-by-17-in-2017>>.
- Moe, W.W., Trusov, M., 2011. The value of social dynamics in online product ratings forums. *J. Mark. Res.* 48 (3), 444–456.
- National Retail Association, 2016. “Free Returns Lure New Customers” <<https://www.nra.net.au/free-returns-lure-new-customers/>>.
- Nielsen, 2015. *Global Trust in Advertising: Winning Strategies for an Evolving Media Landscape* <<http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/reports/2015/global-trust-in-advertising-2015.html>>. (accessed September 2017).
- Park, N., Kee, K.F., Valenzuela, S., 2009. Being Immersed in Social Networking Environment: facebook Groups, Uses and Gratifications, and Social Outcomes. *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 12. pp. 729–733.
- Perry, P., Blazquez, M., Padilla, S., 2013. “Translating the Need for Touch to Online Fashion Shopping Via Digital Technology. In: *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Digital Technologies for the Textile Industries 1–11*.”
- Pitt, L.F., Berthon, P.R., Watson, R.T., Zinkhan, G.M., 2002. The Internet and the birth of Real ConsumerPower. *Bus. Horiz.* 45 (4), 7–14.
- Purnawirawan, N., Eisend, M., De Pelsmacker, P., Dens, N., 2015. A meta-analytic investigation of the role of valence in online reviews. *J. Interact. Mark.* 31, 17–27.
- Quesenberry, A.K., 2016. *Social Media Is Too Important to Be Left to the Marketing Department*, Harvard Business Review. Available at: <<https://hbr.org/2016/04/social-media-is-too-important-to-be-left-to-the-marketing-department>> (accessed November 2017).
- Richardson, M., Baird, J.A., Ridgway, J., Ripley, M., Shorrocks-Taylor, D., Swan, M., 2002. Challenging minds? Students’ perceptions of computer-based World Class Tests of problem solving. *Comput. Human. Behav.* 18 (6), 633–649.
- Sánchez-Franco, M.J., Navarro-García, A., Rondán-Cataluña, F.J., 2016. Online customer service Reviews in urban hotels: a data mining approach. *Psychol. Mark.* 33 (12), 1174–1186.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., Thornhill, A., 2009. *Research methods for business students*. Pearson Education.
- Schindler, R., Bickart, B., 2005. Published Word of Mouth: Referable, Consumer-Generated Information on the Internet, In: *Online Consumer Psychology: Understanding and Influencing Consumer Behavior in the Virtual World*, Karen A. Machleit Curtis P. Haugtvedt, Richard Yalch, eds. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., 35–62.
- Schlosser, A.E., 2005. Posting versus lurking: communicating in a multiple audience context. *J. Consum. Res.* 32 (2), 260–265.
- Sen, S., Lerman, D., 2007. Why are you telling me this? An examination into negative consumer reviews on the web. *J. Interact. Mark.* 21 (4), 76–94.
- Singh, V.K., Nishant, R., Kitchen, P.J., 2016. Self or simulacra of online reviews: an empirical perspective. *Psychol. Mark.* 33 (12), 1112–1118.
- Smith, A.N., Fischer, E., Yongjian, C., 2012. How Does Brand-Related User-Generated Content Differ across YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter? *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 26. pp. 102–113.
- Smith, D., Menon, S., Sivakumar, K., 2005. Online peer and editorial recommendations, trust, and choice in virtual markets. *J. Interact. Mark.* 19 (3), 15–37.
- Smith, K., 2016. *Marketing: 47 Facebook Statistics for 2016*. BrandWatch. (Available online at). <<https://www.brandwatch.com/2016/05/47-facebook-statistics-2016/>>.
- Solomon, M.R., Douglas, S.P., 1987. Diversity in product symbolism: the case of female executive clothing. *Psychol. Mark.* 4 (3), 189–212.
- Sparks, B.A., Browning, V., 2010. Complaining in Cyberspace: the motives and forms of hotel Guests’ complaints online. *J. Hosp. Mark. Manag.* 19 (7), 797–818.
- Stouthuysen, K., Teunis, I., Reusen, E., Slabbinck, H., 2018. Initial trust and intentions to buy: the effect of vendor-specific guarantees, customer reviews and the role of online shopping experience. *Electron. Commer. Res. Appl.* 27, 23–38.
- Tagg, S., Wilson, F., 2012. Construing business owners: are men and women really different? *Int. J. Gen. Entrep.* 2 (1), 68–82.
- Tan, H., Lv, X., Liu, X., Gursoy, D., 2018. Evaluation nudge: effect of evaluation mode of online customer reviews on consumers’ preferences. *Tour. Manag.* 65, 29–40.
- Vladlena, B., Saridakis, G., Tennakoon, H., Ezingard, J.N., 2015. The role of security notices and online consumer behaviour: an empirical study of social networking users. *Int. J. Human-Comput. Stud.* 80, 36–44.
- Wagner, M., 2008. *The Power of Customer Reviews, Internet Retailer*, available at <<https://www.internetretailer.com/2008/01/31/the-power-of-customer-reviews>> (accessed November 2017).
- Walker, B.M., Harper, J., Lloyd, C., Caputi, P., 2003. Methodologies for the exploration of computer and technology transference. *Comput. Human. Behav.* 19 (5), 523–535.
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., De Chernatony, L., Hogan, M., 2014. Who “likes” you ... and why? A typology of facebook fans. *J. Advert. Res.* 54 (1), 92–109.
- Walters, R., 2016. *Defining the Business Value of a Facebook Like and a Twitter Follower, LinkedIn*. Available at: <<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/defining-business-value-facebook-like-twitter-follower-rik-walters>>. (accessed September 2017).
- Wu, Y., Wu, J., 2016. The impact of user review volume on consumers’ willingness-to-pay: a consumer uncertainty perspective. *J. Interact. Mark.* 33, 43–56.
- Xu, C., Ryan, S., Prybutok, V., Wen, C., 2012. It is not for fun: an examination of social network site usage. *Inf. Manag.* 49 (5), 210–217.
- Yeh, Y.H., Choi, S.M., 2011. Mini-lovers, maxi-mouths: an investigation of antecedents to eom intention among brand community members. *J. Mark. Commun.* 17 (3), 145–162.
- Zhang, L., Ma, B., Cartwright, D.K., 2013. The impact of online user reviews on cameras sales. *Eur. J. Mark.* 47 (7), 6 (-6).
- Zhu, F., Zhang, X., 2010. Impact of online consumer reviews on sales: the moderating role of product and consumer characteristic. *J. Mark.* 74 (2), 133–148.