

# The Impact of Electronic Word-Of-Mouth Marketing on the Purchasing Decisions of Laptops made by College Students in and around Virudhunagar district

Ivan Kenny Raj L<sup>1</sup> and Dr. A. Remila Jann<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Part time Research Scholar, Reg No: 22223161061008, Business Administration and Centre for Research, Scott Christian College (Autonomous), Nagercoil-629003.

Mail Id: [ivankennyraj@gmail.com](mailto:ivankennyraj@gmail.com)

Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli-627012, Tamilnadu, India.

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Business Administration and Centre for Research, Scott Christian College (Autonomous), Nagercoil-629003. Mail Id: [hemi.jann@gmail.com](mailto:hemi.jann@gmail.com)

Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Abishekapatti, Tirunelveli-627012, Tamilnadu, India

---

Received: 10.10.2024

Revised: 15.11.2024

Accepted: 05.12.2024

---

## ABSTRACT

*Today's marketplace is heavily influenced by the internet, which has changed the way consumers make decisions about their purchases: They won't rely solely on marketer-generated information only (ads or salespeople). Instead, they look up reviews on sites Amazon and Flipkart etc., for more information about a particular product. Now a days the customers are getting shifted to online purchase through E-commerce platform where the information flow is found to be more than the traditional methods. Researchers found that the WOM (Word of mouth) and eWOM (Electronic Word of Mouth) are the most important factor that influence the purchase behaviour or customer's brand preference. Even then the traditional way of getting information about product may be through WOM but the entire product information is only available in online platforms through eWOM. Online platforms will help people to share their product usage experience under a particular section called "Reviews" which serves as the most prominent way of getting appropriate information and the satisfaction level of the products from existing users. The objective of this study is to find out the influence of eWOM and the factors influencing e-WOM on purchasing behaviour. This study also aims to bring about the advantages of eWOM.*

**Key words: eWOM, Purchasing Behaviour, preference, E-Commerce, Satisfaction**

## 1.INTRODUCTION

Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM) is reshaping how customers discover, evaluate, and select products in today's digitally-driven marketplace. Unlike traditional word-of-mouth that relies on face-to-face interactions and personal trust, eWOM spreads rapidly through online

channels review sites, social media platforms, and messaging apps making product information easily accessible to a broad audience. Research shows nearly all consumers now consult online reviews before purchasing, with close to 82% trusting these digital recommendations as much or more than those from friends or family. Online reviews serve as the modern equivalent of personal testimonials, and visual content or detailed written feedback further enhances their credibility and impact. For brands, the presence of numerous, timely, and authentic reviews ideally showcasing user experiences and images can lower perceived risks, foster loyalty, and boost confidence in potential buyers. Negative reviews are scrutinized for signs of reliability, while positive eWOM heightens satisfaction and post-purchase affirmation. In addition, eWOM can dramatically extend the reach of product endorsements, as a single favourable review can influence hundreds of shoppers in minutes. Statistical evidence confirms that online reviews sway decisions for up to 93% of shoppers, and referral-driven buyers exhibit higher retention and engagement. Social media amplifies eWOM's effectiveness, with brand image and consumer engagement acting as mediating forces in shaping purchase intentions. As paid advertising becomes less trusted and more costly, eWOM empowers brands to convert customers into advocates, offering scalable and sustainable growth opportunities. Going forward, marketers are advised to prioritize strategies that encourage high-quality, credible user-generated content, optimize platforms for sharing and engagement, and quickly respond to feedback to maximize the benefits of eWOM.

## **2.LITERATURE REVIEW**

Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM) significantly shapes consumer purchase decisions, with key dimensions such as review valence, volume, credibility, recency, and reviewer expertise influencing consumer perceptions and behaviors. eWOM has emerged as a powerful determinant of consumer decision-making in the digital era, defined as “any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, or former customers about a product or company that is made available to a multitude of people and institutions via the Internet” (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004, p. 39). Unlike traditional word of mouth, eWOM benefits from the vast reach, persistence, and accessibility of digital communication platforms, enabling consumers to evaluate products based on diverse user experiences. Recent studies indicate that eWOM has surpassed traditional WOM in its ability to influence purchase intentions due to its interactive, transparent, and data-rich nature (Torres et al., 2021). Moreover, post-pandemic consumer behavior has accelerated the reliance on online reviews and social media recommendations, positioning eWOM as a crucial source of trust formation, brand evaluation, and purchase decision-making in virtual marketplaces (Handoyo, 2024; Journal ITBIND, 2023).

## 2.1 Antecedents and Dimensions of eWOM

### Review Characteristics and Impact

- Ngo (2024), The volume (number of reviews) and valence (positive/negative reviews) of online reviews act as heuristic cues, where higher volumes suggest popularity and social approval, while positive sentiment in reviews directly increases product trust and purchase intent,
- Chen (2022) Lengthy reviews are found to be more helpful and perceived as credible, with their textual features such as readability, subjectivity, and informativeness affecting both review trustworthiness and purchasing intentions.
- Chen T (2022), Deepak Verma (2023) Consumer preference often leans towards reviews on popular sites (reviews in popular sites), considering them more reliable, especially if accompanied by product images (product image), which boost trust and decrease uncertainty in online shopping

### Reviewer Profile and Content

- Ngo (2024), Reviews by genuine consumers (experience review, normal people review) carry more weight in consumer decisions, as shoppers exhibit a preference for feedback from “real” users rather than from influencers or promotional content.
- Keda Qiu (2024), Ngo (2024) Recency and frequency of reviews additionally play a role, as newer reviews are perceived as more relevant, reflecting current product quality and availability (recency, availability, new product).

### Perceived Risk, Emotion, and Trust

- Fernandes (2022), Chen T (2022) Negative reviews strongly affect purchase decisions by increasing perceived risk, fear, and worry, often having a greater influence than positive reviews due to consumer tendencies to avoid potential loss or disappointment.
- Positive reviews, by contrast, foster emotional trust, reliability, and consumer confidence, with a beneficial effect on persuasion and purchase intention.
- Deepak Verma (2023) Trustworthiness of the review determined by reviewer transparency, detail, and site reputation serves as a crucial mediator between eWOM and consumer behavior.

### Cost, Popularity, and Rating

- Keda Qiu (2024), Chen T (2022) Cost considerations are often moderated by review content; compelling negative eWOM may deter even price-conscious buyers, while high ratings and positive customer reviews increase the perceived value and desirability of

products.

- Fernandes (2022) Popularity as reflected in rating counts and review volume can signal social consensus and encourage hesitant buyers to proceed (popularity, rating).

Numerous studies confirm that all review-related factors valence, volume, credibility, recency, and experience-based content positively influence purchase intention if managed effectively. Overall, the extant literature establishes eWOM as a crucial driver of consumer purchase decisions, operating through both cognitive (trust, perceived quality) and affective (emotional response, satisfaction) mechanisms. Message quality and source credibility consistently emerge as dominant predictors, while the effects of volume and valence vary by context. Future research should adopt multidimensional, cross-cultural, and longitudinal perspectives to deepen understanding of how eWOM shapes consumer decision-making in an evolving digital marketplace. Businesses are urged to foster authentic, cognitive, and emotionally engaging eWOM, not only focusing on sentiment but also on the credibility, accessibility, and relevance of review content for maximum impact on consumer decisions.

| Characteristics                                  | WOM                                       | eWOM                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Trustworthiness</b><br>Casare(2024)           | Positive influence over trust             | Negative Influence over trust                                          |
| <b>Privacy</b><br>Namsu Park Yoojung Kim (2020)  | The conversations are made private        | The conversations are more in public                                   |
| <b>Diffusion speed</b><br>Verma D (2023)         | Low rate of diffusion for the information | High rate of diffusion for the information                             |
| <b>Accessibility</b><br>Verma D (2023)           | Less accessible                           | Easily accessible                                                      |
| <b>Dilemmas in Decision making</b><br>Ngo (2024) | Less Dilemma                              | High Dilemma in decision making since more information is availability |
| <b>Availability</b><br>Adhi Prasetio (2022)      | Less availability due to poor awareness   | Availability of information is very good since its open access to all  |

**Table 1. Difference between WOM and eWOM**

### 3.RESEARCH GAP

Numerous studies have shown that eWOM might affect consumers' final decision making when making a purchase. This study aspires to identify the most important aspects of eWOM that drive consumers to make purchases. The level of customer satisfaction among those who make purchases via eWOM has not been quantified in previous studies. The primary criteria used to select eWOM are also investigated here. Researchers note a lack of conceptual models that account for these nuanced psychological processes, especially the impact of initial consumer attitudes prior to encountering eWOM. There is contradictory evidence about the effect of conflicting eWOM (e.g., inconsistent reviews and ratings) on outcomes like credibility,

helpfulness, and persuasiveness. Some studies find conflict reduces trust, while others show it can enhance persuasion under certain conditions. This research would try to fill the research gaps available in recent studies.

#### **4.OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of this research are to thoroughly analyze how electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) content influences customer satisfaction with their purchase decisions and to determine which specific factors within eWOM most impact the decision-making process for laptop buyers. This includes exploring the role of review credibility, usefulness, sentiment, and adoption in shaping post-purchase satisfaction, as well as examining how attributes such as review length, recency, depth, images, and trust indicators contribute to a customer's level of confidence after a purchase. The research further intends to investigate how brand image, product quality, technical specifications, pricing, peer recommendations, and after-sales service when communicated through eWOM channels affect the likelihood of purchase and satisfaction in the laptop market. Additionally, the study will assess the moderating effects of demographic and psychographic factors, such as age, gender, education, and technology readiness, on eWOM's influence, and it will evaluate the impact of positive, negative, and conflicting online opinions on perceived risk, trust, and overall satisfaction outcomes. By addressing these elements, the research aims to provide actionable insights for marketers seeking to optimize eWOM strategies for enhanced customer satisfaction and better purchase outcomes, particularly in technology-driven product categories like laptops.

#### **5. RESEARCH DESIGN**

In this study, a descriptive research approach was adopted to provide a systematic and detailed understanding of the impact of electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) on purchase decisions among college students. Both primary and secondary sources of data were utilized to ensure a comprehensive perspective. The primary data was gathered directly from college students, who participated as respondents and provided firsthand insights regarding their experiences and perceptions with eWOM and buying behavior. For secondary data collection, the study relied on respected journals, magazines, websites, and blogs to enrich the research context, offer supporting literature, and compare findings with existing knowledge in the domain. A total of 258 students participated in the research, forming the study's respondent base and ensuring that the sample size was adequate for drawing meaningful conclusions and patterns relevant to the topic. The sampling technique employed was convenience sampling, which was chosen for its practicality in accessing

students who were readily available and willing to participate. This methodology facilitated efficient data collection while enabling a focused exploration of how eWOM influences purchasing decisions in a population segment that is deeply engaged with digital platforms and online peer networks

### 5.1.Data Analysis

| <b>Total Respondents : 258</b> |                          |                     |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Age Category</b>            | <b>No of Respondents</b> | <b>Percentage %</b> |
| 18-20                          | 112                      | 43                  |
| 21-30                          | 141                      | 55                  |
| 31-40                          | 2                        | 1                   |
| 41+                            | 3                        | 1                   |
|                                |                          |                     |
| <b>Profession</b>              | <b>No of Respondents</b> | <b>Percentage %</b> |
| Government Employee            | 1                        | 0.4                 |
| Self Employed                  | 1                        | 0.4                 |
| Student                        | 255                      | 98.8                |
| Unemployed                     | 1                        | 0.4                 |
|                                |                          |                     |
| <b>Marital Status</b>          | <b>No of Respondents</b> | <b>Percentage %</b> |
| Married                        | 5                        | 2                   |
| Unmarried                      | 253                      | 98                  |
|                                |                          |                     |
| <b>Internet Familiarity</b>    | <b>No of Respondents</b> | <b>Percentage %</b> |
| Extremely Familiar             | 102                      | 40                  |
| Moderately Familiar            | 119                      | 46                  |
| Slightly Familiar              | 35                       | 14                  |

**Table 2. Demographics**

**Inference:** A majority of respondents (98%) are under the age of 30, indicating a predominantly young sample group. Nearly all respondents (98.8%) are students, showing that the survey primarily targeted an academic population. Most respondents (86%) are either moderately or extremely familiar with the internet, suggesting a digitally literate group.

| <b>Question</b>                      | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> |
|--------------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Do you buy electronic goods online ? | 236        | 22        |
| <b>Percentage %</b>                  | <b>91</b>  | <b>9</b>  |

**Table 3.Purchase of Electronic Goods online**

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.08.422

**Inference:** According to the data presented in the pie chart that has been provided above, the vast majority of students make their purchases of electronic products only through the use of the E-commerce platform.

| Question                                                           | Yes | No |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|
| Are you comfortable with the ecommerce platforms for buying good ? | 243 | 15 |
| Percentage %                                                       | 94  | 6  |

Table 4.Comfortness with E-commerce Platform

**Inference :** This pie chart makes it abundantly evident that college students are more at ease using e-commerce platforms, and they also express satisfaction with the level of navigability offered by these platforms.

| Question                                                  | Always | Never | Sometime |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|----------|
| Do you look for online reviews while purchasing laptops ? | 215    | 39    | 4        |
| Percentage %                                              | 83     | 15    | 2        |

Table 5. Preference of Online Reviews

**Inference:** The above pie chart demonstrates that the vast majority of college students consult a variety of internet resources in order to get customer testimonials that will help them make an informed buying decision.

| Online Review Usage                                  | No of Respondents | Percentage % |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| It creates a dilemma                                 | 61                | 24           |
| It is not supportive in purchase decision            | 15                | 6            |
| It makes me clear and supports for purchase decision | 182               | 71           |

Table 6. Online Review Usage

**Inference:** A significant majority of respondents (71%) stated that online reviews help them make clear and confident purchase decisions. About one-fourth (24%) felt that reviews create a dilemma, while only a small fraction (6%) found them unhelpful. This pie chart makes it very evident that the internet evaluations left by other consumers are of great assistance to the students in making purchase decisions

|          | Average | Rank |
|----------|---------|------|
| Amazon   | 1.996   | 1    |
| Flipkart | 2.814   | 2    |

|                  |       |   |
|------------------|-------|---|
| <b>YouTube</b>   | 3.182 | 3 |
| <b>Facebook</b>  | 3.422 | 4 |
| <b>Instagram</b> | 3.585 | 5 |

Table 7. Rank for getting reviews from online platforms

**Inference:** According to the data presented in the table above, the majority of respondents place Amazon at the top of the list when it comes to collecting reviews, followed by Flipkart, then YouTube, and finally, Facebook. It has been determined that Instagram is the least desirable platform to obtain given that it has the lowest average scores. It was discovered that YouTube, Facebook, and Instagram are close priority since customers frequently utilize those online sites for the purpose of obtaining evaluations. But when compared to all the other digital platforms, the vast majority of respondents preferred Amazon first since it has a wide variety of items and customers can leave a variety of evaluations.

| <b>Overall Satisfaction</b> | <b>Count</b> | <b>Percentage%</b> |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| <b>Highly Satisfied</b>     | 99           | 39                 |
| <b>Satisfied</b>            | 80           | 31                 |
| <b>Neutral</b>              | 45           | 17                 |
| <b>Dissatisfied</b>         | 29           | 11                 |
| <b>Highly Dissatisfied</b>  | 4            | 2                  |

Table 8. Overall Satisfaction in eWOM for Purchasing Laptops online

**Inference:** A majority of respondents (70%) fall into the satisfied segment (Highly Satisfied + Satisfied = 39% + 31%), indicating generally positive sentiment. 17% are neutral, suggesting some customers neither strongly approve nor disapprove of their experience. Only 13% of respondents (Dissatisfied + Highly Dissatisfied = 11% + 2%) express negative sentiment, showing a low dissatisfaction level. The high proportion of satisfied participants suggests that overall service or product performance meets customer expectations. However, the 17% neutral group presents an opportunity for improvement to convert them into satisfied customers through enhanced engagement, quality, or service experience. Overall inference: Customer satisfaction is strong, with minimal dissatisfaction, but efforts could focus on addressing neutral responses to achieve even higher satisfaction levels.

## 5.2. Analysis of Variance (Chi Square)

|  | <b>Familiarity</b>       |                            |                           | <b>Total</b> |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
|  | <b>Slightly Familiar</b> | <b>Moderately Familiar</b> | <b>Extremely Familiar</b> |              |

|                                                |               |    |     |               |     |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------|----|-----|---------------|-----|
| <b>Gender</b>                                  | <b>Male</b>   | 29 | 65  | 84            | 178 |
|                                                | <b>Female</b> | 7  | 55  | 18            | 80  |
| <b>Total</b>                                   |               | 36 | 120 | 102           | 258 |
| <b>Pearson Chi-Square value</b>                |               |    |     | 23.090        |     |
| <b>d.f</b>                                     |               |    |     | 2             |     |
| <b>p value</b>                                 |               |    |     | <0.05         |     |
| <b>Hypothesis</b>                              |               |    |     | Null Rejected |     |
| <b>Cramer's V coefficient</b>                  |               |    |     | 0.299         |     |
| <b>Level of relationship between variables</b> |               |    |     | Weak          |     |

Table 9. Gender vs Familiarity Crosstabulation

**Inference:** The chi-square value of 23.090 with 2 degrees of freedom and a p-value less than 0.05 indicates a statistically significant association between gender and familiarity level. The null hypothesis of no association is rejected, suggesting gender influences familiarity levels. The Cramer's V coefficient of 0.299 indicates a weak relationship between gender and familiarity. Data interpretation shows that males tend to have higher levels of familiarity (84 extremely familiar) compared to females (18 extremely familiar), while females are more concentrated in the moderately familiar category. Overall inference: There is a statistically significant but weak relationship between gender and familiarity, with males generally exhibiting higher familiarity levels than females.

|                                                |               | <b>Online_Purchase</b> |           | <b>Total</b>          |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
|                                                |               | <b>Yes</b>             | <b>No</b> |                       |
| <b>Gender</b>                                  | <b>Male</b>   | 173                    | 5         | 178                   |
|                                                | <b>Female</b> | 63                     | 17        | 80                    |
| <b>Total</b>                                   |               | 236                    | 22        | 258                   |
| <b>Pearson Chi-Square value</b>                |               |                        |           | 24.064                |
| <b>d.f</b>                                     |               |                        |           | 1                     |
| <b>p value</b>                                 |               |                        |           | <0.05                 |
| <b>Hypothesis</b>                              |               |                        |           | Null Rejected         |
| <b>Contingency coefficient</b>                 |               |                        |           | 0.36                  |
| <b>Level of relationship between variables</b> |               |                        |           | Moderate Relationship |

Table 10. Gender vs Online Purchase comfort

**Inference:** The chi-square value of 24.064 with 1 degree of freedom and a p-value less than 0.05 shows a statistically significant association between gender and online purchase behavior. The null hypothesis stating there is no relationship between gender and online purchasing is rejected. The contingency coefficient of 0.36 indicates a moderate relationship between the two variables. Males (173 out of 178) have a higher tendency to purchase online compared to females (63 out of 80), suggesting gender differences in online shopping behavior. Overall inference: Gender significantly

influences online purchasing behavior, with a moderate relationship indicating that males are more active online buyers than females.

|                                         |        | Sharing_Review       |                                                      |                                           | Total |
|-----------------------------------------|--------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|
|                                         |        | It creates a dilemma | It makes me clear and supports for purchase decision | It is not supportive in purchase decision |       |
| Gender                                  | Male   | 41                   | 129                                                  | 8                                         | 178   |
|                                         | Female | 20                   | 53                                                   | 7                                         | 80    |
| Total                                   |        |                      |                                                      |                                           |       |
| Pearson Chi-Square value                |        |                      |                                                      | 2.112                                     |       |
| d.f                                     |        |                      |                                                      | 2                                         |       |
| p value                                 |        |                      |                                                      | 0.348 > 0.05                              |       |
| Hypothesis                              |        |                      |                                                      | Null Accepted                             |       |
| Cramer's V coefficient                  |        |                      |                                                      | 0.090                                     |       |
| Level of relationship between variables |        |                      |                                                      | No Relationship                           |       |

Table 11. Gender vs Feeling towards Online reviews Crosstabulation

**Inference:** The Chi-square test was conducted to examine the association between gender and respondents' opinions on sharing online reviews. The results of the analysis revealed a Pearson Chi-square value of 2.112 with 2 degrees of freedom and a corresponding p-value of 0.348, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that there is no statistically significant relationship between gender and the perception of sharing online reviews. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted, confirming that gender does not influence respondents' opinions in this context. The Cramer's V value of 0.090 further supports this conclusion, suggesting that the strength of association between the two variables is very weak. Therefore, it can be inferred that both male and female respondents share similar views regarding whether online reviews create a dilemma, provide support for purchase decisions, or are not supportive in influencing purchase behaviour.

|        |        | Reviews |       |          | Total |
|--------|--------|---------|-------|----------|-------|
|        |        | Always  | Never | Sometime |       |
| Gender | Male   | 151     | 2     | 25       | 178   |
|        | Female | 64      | 2     | 14       | 80    |
| Total  |        | 215     | 4     | 39       | 258   |

|                                                |                 |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Pearson Chi-Square value</b>                | 1.265           |
| <b>d.f</b>                                     | 2               |
| <b>p value</b>                                 | 0.531>.05       |
| <b>Hypothesis</b>                              | Null Accepted   |
| <b>Cramer's V coefficient</b>                  | 0.070           |
| <b>Level of relationship between variables</b> | No Relationship |

Table 12. Gender vs Sharing reviews online Crosstabulation

It is clear from this that people of both genders have experience using the internet, and there is no evidence to suggest that this is due to any sort of bias based on gender. The Pearson Chi-Square value is 1.265 with 2 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.531. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis (that there is no association between gender and review behavior) is accepted, indicating insufficient evidence to suggest a relationship. Cramer's V coefficient is 0.070, which shows a very weak association, further supporting the conclusion of no relationship.

## 5.2. Analysis of Variance (Regression)

| M                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | R                 | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |          |     |     |               | Durbin-Watson |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|---------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                   |                |                         |                            | R Square Change   | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |               |
| 1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | .504 <sup>a</sup> | .254           | .184                    | .6546                      | .254              | 3.618    | 22  | 234 | .000          | 1.937         |
| <b>a. Predictors:</b> (Constant), Preference of Online review, Lengthy Review, Negative reviews, Reviews Popular sites, Product Image, Online Review by consumer, New Product, Availability, Fear, Cost, popularity, Rating, Number of reviews, Trustworthiness, Positive Reviews, Reliability, Worry, Recent Frequencies, Consumer Reviews, Experienter view, Normal People Review |                   |                |                         |                            |                   |          |     |     |               |               |
| <b>b. Dependent Variable:</b> Satisfaction levels                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                   |                |                         |                            |                   |          |     |     |               |               |

| Model |                  | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardize Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|-------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------|------|
|       |                  | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                     |       |      |
|       | (Constant)       | 1.507                       | .382       |                          | 3.945 | .000 |
|       | Rating           | .145                        | .069       | .164                     | 2.095 | .037 |
|       | Positive Reviews | .176                        | .083       | .164                     | 2.116 | .035 |

Table 12. Factors of eWOM vs Overall Satisfaction (Regression)

## Inference

From the previous table the following regression equation can be framed;

$$Y = 0.145 X_1 + 0.176 X_2 + 1.507$$

$X_1$  = Rating of the review

$X_2$  = Positive Reviews

$Y$  = Overall Satisfaction in eWOM during purchasing

**(Other Factors are neglected while they have no significance in overall satisfaction in eWOM during purchasing)**

Observing from the above table the model is fit and its due to the overall significance value is lesser than 0.05. But from the  $R^2$  value of the table it is found that only 25 % of the variable took in consideration has significance with overall satisfaction out of which only two variable  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are found to have major significance value.

## 6. CONCLUSION

There is a great opportunity for new research to emerge in the field of digital transformation as the world moves in that direction. It was in this setting that this study was conducted. Since consumers' purchasing habits have shifted online, businesses have been transitioning to digital platforms, where they may generate more profits. The results of this study might help businesses meet eWOM customers' needs. Future work might also compare WOM with eWOM using the methods used here. The findings of this research are the vast majority of respondents (80%) said that they were satisfied with the information they discovered in internet reviews and that these reviews influenced their purchasing decisions. According to the results, each of the analyzed variables significantly affects eWOM buyers' satisfaction. But things like high ratings and reviews are the main reasons why people are satisfied with their purchases.

## 7. REFERENCES

1. Handoyo, S. (2024). Purchasing in the digital age: A meta-analytical perspective on trust, risk, security, and e-WOM in e-commerce. *Heliyon*, 10(8), e29714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29714>
2. Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(1), 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.10073>

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.08.422

3. Journal ITBIND. (2023). The role of e-WOM during and after the COVID-19 pandemic in shaping purchase decisions. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 9(2), 33–46. <https://journal.itbind.ac.id/index.php/jmbi/article/download/173/134/260>
4. Torres, P., Augusto, M., & Matias, A. (2021). Determinants of eWOM credibility and usefulness in consumer decision making. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 16(4), 1241–1260. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer16040043>
5. Chen, Tao & Samaranayake, Premaratne & Cen, XiongYing & Qi, Meng & Lan, Yi-Chen. (2022). The Impact of Online Reviews on Consumers' Purchasing Decisions: Evidence From an Eye-Tracking Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 13. 865702. 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.865702.
6. Chen T, Samaranayake P, Cen X, Qi M, Lan YC. The Impact of Online Reviews on Consumers' Purchasing Decisions: Evidence From an Eye-Tracking Study. *Front Psychol*. 2022 Jun 8;13:865702. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.865702. PMID: 35756238; PMCID: PMC9216200.
7. Deepak Verma, Prem Prakash Dewani, Abhishek Behl, Yogesh K. Dwivedi, Understanding the impact of eWOM communication through the lens of information adoption model: A meta-analytic structural equation modeling perspective, *Computers in Human Behavior*, Volume 143, 2023, 107710, ISSN 0747-5632, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107710>. (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563223000614>)
8. Ngo, Thi Thuy An & Bui, Chi & Chau, Huynh & Tran, Nguyen. (2024). Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) on social networking sites (SNS): Roles of information credibility in shaping online purchase intention. *Heliyon*. 10. e32168. 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e32168.
9. Keda Qiu, Liyi Zhang, How online reviews affect purchase intention: A meta-analysis across contextual and cultural factors, *Data and Information Management*, Volume 8, Issue 2, 2024, 100058, ISSN 2543-9251, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dim.2023.100058>. (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2543925123000323>)
10. Fernandes, Semila & Rajesh, Panda & Venkatesh, V.G. & Swar, Biranchi & Shi, Yangyan. (2022). Measuring the impact of online reviews on consumer purchase decisions – A scale development study. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. 68. 103066. 10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103066.
11. Casare, Andréia & Guimarães da Silva, Celmar & Moraes, Regina. (2024). User perception as a factor for improving Trustworthiness in e-commerce systems. *Journal on Interactive Systems*. 15. 194-219. 10.5753/jis.2024.3748.

10.48047/jocaaa.2024.33.08.422

12. Belanger, France & Crossler, Robert. (2011). Privacy in the Digital Age: A Review of Information Privacy Research in Information Systems. MIS Quarterly. 35. 1017-1041. 10.2307/41409971.
13. Namsu Park Yoojung Kim (2020) International Journal of Communication 14(2020), 176–199, 1932–8036/20200005
14. Verma D.; Dewani P.P.; Behl A.; Dwivedi Y.K.(2023), Computers in Human Behavior, Understanding the impact of eWOM communication through the lens of information adoption model: A meta-analytic structural equation modeling perspective, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107710>
15. Adhi Prasetyo, Puspita Kencana Sari (2022), Promoting Information Security Awareness Using Electronic Word-Of Mouth Through Social Network Sites, Journal of Management Information and Decision Sciences Volume 25, Issue 1, 2022