Determinants of eWOM on hospitality CSR issues. In Facebook we trust?
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ABSTRACT
Social media has emerged as a powerful and successful tool to disseminate information relating to corporate social responsibility (CSR) in different industries, including the hospitality context. Similarly, the media plays a major role in the domain of CSR since news media materializes corporate goals regarding CSR issues. However, no prior studies have explored the main factors that influence electronic word of mouth (eWOM) on CSR issues covered by the media through social media. This research incorporates the characteristics of information (specific) and individuals’ informational predisposition (general) into an integrative model to examine the key predictors of intention to share and comment on negative CSR news covered by a specific media outlet on a particular social networking site (SNS): Facebook. To empirically test the proposed model, 208 Facebook users were surveyed in Spain. The results show that information value, Facebook trust and self-disclosure have a positive impact on eWOM intentions. It also confirmed that source credibility has a positive impact on information value. However, neither significant relationship was found between Facebook trust and privacy concerns, nor between this variable and intentions to share and comment. Finally, theoretical conclusions, managerial implications, and limitations are discussed.
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Introduction
An essential goal of companies when engaging in corporate social responsibility (CSR) related activities is to obtain a positive CSR reputation (Horng et al., 2018), defined as the public’s opinion of a company’s social performance (Mueller, 2014). CSR is described as a process whereby individuals identify stakeholder demands on their organizations and negotiate their level of responsibility towards the collective wellbeing of society, the environment, and the economy (Dahlsrud, 2008). The tourism industry, in general, and the hospitality sector in particular, are thus increasingly engaging in various social and environmental initiatives (González-Rodríguez et al., 2019). However, CSR implementation is not sufficient to fully exploit the benefits of CSR. Hospitality companies not only have to be socially responsible; they also need to ensure their stakeholder groups are adequately aware of their CSR initiatives (Luu, 2017). Consequently, CSR communication becomes a strategic tool through which to maximize hospitality companies’ benefits from their CSR activities (Tölkes, 2018). By efficiently managing CSR communications, these companies will be rewarded with strong and largely positive reactions from stakeholders and a
greater corporate reputation (Öberseder et al., 2013). Based on these ideas, in recent years the amount of CSR information provided by tourism and hospitality businesses through several company-controlled communication channels (e.g. CSR reports, press releases, and TV commercials) has grown rapidly (Ettinger et al., 2018; Guix et al., 2018).

Given the increasingly significant role of the media in shaping the public’s perception of CSR performance and the flourishing of eWOM in the tourism industry, this study attempts to explore how CSR information – a negative piece of news about environmental CSR aspects – covered by a media outlet is shared and commented on through a particular social networking site (SNS) in the hospitality setting.

Previous research has demonstrated that it is not only the self-presentation of companies (e.g. using their own communication channels) that is vital in building corporate reputation; the external communicators of CSR are also of significant importance. Within this group, the media plays a critical role because it is primarily news media that eventually helps companies’ CSR goals to materialize, the goal of which is to positively influence their reputation (Zhang & Swanson, 2006). The current literature indicates that members of the public form their opinion of a company primarily through the news media (Carroll & McCombs, 2003). More specifically, media has a specific ability to influence the salience of CSR issues and a company’s image among the public (Tang, 2012).

The comprehension of these dynamics is of great importance for hospitality managers since consumers are increasingly likely to not only reward responsible companies but also punish irresponsible ones (Du et al., 2010), especially in the tourism industry (Jung, Dieck, et al., 2018; Jung, Kim, et al., 2018; Volgger & Huang, 2019). Previous studies confirm that consumers are more sensitive to negative CSR information than to positive information (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). Specifically, consumers’ reactions to irresponsible behaviours can lead to complaints, boycotts, and even legal actions (Grappi et al., 2013). In today’s digital and hyper-connected society, social media offers additional and different forms for consumers to react to negative CSR information, especially in such information-intensive industries as tourism and hospitality (Gössling, 2017). Within the domain of online communication, social media has emerged as a powerful and successful tool through which to disclose CSR information (Cortado & Chalmeta, 2016). Aside from tourism and hospitality businesses, media outlets (e.g. newspapers and news magazines) have also established their own SNS pages (e.g. Facebook) to communicate with their relevant audiences (Soukup, 2018), so CSR information is easily available. In this regard, a growing number of people are using social media to exchange CSR information globally. Therefore, individuals can use this media to create content or freely express their opinions and experiences about CSR-related issues.

Social media is a group of Internet-based applications that allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Constantinides and Fountain (2008) propose the following taxonomy classifying social media into five categories: blogs, SNS, content communities, forums/bulletin boards, and content aggregators. Among these five categories, SNSs are the most popular nowadays given their ability to broadly propagate information to a large audience, which directly influences electronic word of mouth (eWOM) (Kim et al., 2014). According to a recent report, Facebook is the most popular social network with 2.2 billion active users and a usage penetration exceeding 80% (Omnicore, 2018). Every minute 510,000 comments are posted, 293,000 statuses are updated, and 136,000 photographs uploaded. These figures depict the great potential of this SNS to promote CSR and sustainability issues using eWOM.

However, in 2018 the Facebook–Cambridge Analytica data scandal, which involved nearly a million users’ personally identifiable information, reduced users’ willingness to share personal information given their loss of confidence in Facebook (Chin et al., 2018). This situation, together with several controversial decisions about not removing fake news from this platform (Facebook...
fake news, 2018), raises questions about information credibility and control in modern societies with crucial implications for eWOM.

We agree with the idea that the influence of eWOM depends on both the individual and the information (Knoll, 2016). Consequently, we consider both aspects whilst developing our research model. Specifically, this study suggests a comprehensive model including two broad categories: characteristics of information (specific) (e.g. source credibility and information value) and individuals’ informational predisposition (general) (e.g. Facebook trust, self-disclosure, and privacy concerns) as key predictors of individuals’ intention to share and comment on news regarding CSR issues on SNSs. This study contributes substantially to the tourism and hospitality literature since no previous research has investigated the driving forces behind individuals’ propensity to spread eWOM on CSR issues covered by media outlets on SNSs.

eWOM consists of a basic information transfer between those who send and receive the information. Tourism and hospitality practitioners and academics acknowledge that social media has transformed the ways in which people share information and engage in eWOM in these contexts (Han et al., 2018). In this regard, SNSs have brought a new aspect to eWOM on CSR information by enabling users to communicate with their existing networks before, during, and after travel (Jung, Dieck, et al., 2018; Jung, Kim, et al., 2018). People are now able to exchange opinions and experiences about different aspects, including CSR-related issues, with their friends and acquaintances on social media (Erkan & Evans, 2016). Such reduced anonymity has the potential to make eWOM information more trustworthy and reliable (Chu & Choi, 2011). However, the influence of the information might change from person to person, as the same content can evoke different notions among receivers (Cheung et al., 2008). In this study, therefore, we propose a model that not only considers the characteristics of information, but also individuals’ informational predisposition (Figure 1).

The next section provides an overview of eWOM on SNSs and proposes the conceptual model and the hypotheses to be tested. The authors will then describe the methodology, including measures of variables, data collection procedures, and sample characteristics. The results are subsequently presented, followed by a discussion of its theoretical and managerial implications. Finally, research limitations and future lines of research are outlined.

Literature review and research hypotheses

eWOM on SNSs

The increased importance of eWOM on social media has been acknowledged by numerous researchers (Kimmel & Kitchen, 2014). Conceptually, eWOM on SNSs can be examined through three aspects: opinion seeking, opinion giving, and opinion passing (Chu & Kim, 2011). Previous research has tended to consider opinion seeking and opinion giving as two important factors in both offline and online word of mouth. However, this study in the hotel context focuses on opinion-passing behaviour since it is considered an overlooked domain of eWOM on SNSs, thus requiring careful investigation (Chu & Choi, 2011). In addition, this dimension is crucial for hotels considering the importance of customer relationships in attracting and retaining guests through social media (Dieck et al., 2017).

Individuals with a high level of opinion-seeking behaviour will search for information and advice from others when making a decision regarding specific corporate aspects (e.g. hotels’ environmental policy) (Flynn et al., 1996). Opinion giving is the process by which individuals provide information and influence others’ attitudes and behaviours (Kim et al., 2014). Individuals with high levels of opinion-giving behaviour (e.g. opinion leaders) may exert a greater influence on others’ attitudes and behaviours (Feick & Price, 1987). On SNSs, consumers might play a role as opinion leaders in the CSR context by posting messages and opinions on their accounts.
regarding several social or environmental aspects or commenting on pages and images relating to these issues.

On the other hand, opinion passing is the process of pass-along behaviour (Huang et al., 2009). This behaviour consists of distributing a specific kind of content instead of posting personal images, telling anecdotes, or sharing one’s feelings (Kümpel et al., 2015), and facilitates the flow of information (Sun et al., 2006). According to Chu and Kim (2011), online-passing behaviour is more likely to occur in SNS contexts, where people avert their opinions and forward those of others with great ease. For example, in the hospitality context of this research, individuals may easily distribute information about hotel CSR issues simply by clicking the “share” button on Facebook.

**Facebook trust, privacy concerns, and self-disclosure**

Trust in the SNS (hereinafter referred to as Facebook trust) is a construct worth considering during the conceptualization of individuals’ decisions to give or pass opinions on CSR issues published by media outlets on SNSs in the context of hospitality. Trust is defined as “a willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confidence” (Moorman et al., 1992, p. 82). Previous studies in the tourism industry have proposed that trust in an SNS is a critical determinant of exchanging information and integrating knowledge, as it allows individuals to justify and evaluate their decision to provide and obtain more useful information (Grabner-Kräuter & Bitter, 2015; Munar & Jacobsen, 2013). Moreover, trust is an important influence on consumer beliefs, attitudes, and behavioural intentions in a social media context within hotels, as previous research suggests (Jung, Dieck, et al., 2018; Jung, Kim, et al., 2018).

Self-disclosure is traditionally defined as “any message about the self that a person communicates to another” (Wheless & Grotz, 1976, p. 47). Although the concept originally focused on disclosure between two people, it is also useful in the context of sharing information with more than one person on social media (Lai & Yang, 2015). Social exchange theory provides the theoretical foundation of this notion, arguing that interpersonal relationships are based on a subjective evaluation of benefits and costs (Homans, 1958). This logic forms the basis for Privacy Calculus theory, which argues that some users feel that the returns of disclosure counterweigh the risk of their privacy being compromised (Dinev & Hart, 2006; Fortes & Rita, 2016; Krasnova et al., 2010). Privacy loss is seen as the price of acquiring their desired benefits. Privacy within SNSs is often not expected or is undefined; SNSs record all interactions and retain them for potential use in social data mining (Dwyer et al., 2007). Smith, Milberg, and Burke’s concern for information privacy (CFIP) identified four fundamental factors that influence concerns in response to organizations’ use or potential use of personal information: collection, unauthorized secondary use, improper access, and errors in personal information (Smith et al., 1996).

With regard to CFIP, trust in the SNS is believed to be used in the calculation of perceived cost (Dwyer et al., 2007). High levels of trust in an SNS would lead to a perception of low cost and vice versa. Trust in a specific SNS (e.g. Facebook) is a way to reduce uncertainty or concern about the cost of privacy and encourages users to participate in pages on these social platforms (Cheung et al., 2015). Specifically, previous studies confirm that trust is a precondition for self-disclosure because it reduces the perceived risks involved in revealing private information (Cheung & Lee, 2006; Gruzd & Hernández-García, 2018). Concerning these ideas, users pay considerable attention to service providers’ benevolence and integrity when they choose to disclose information (McKnight et al., 2002). When SNSs are perceived, to be honest and consistent in dealings with users, they will be less sensitive to the privacy risks involved in using SNSs (e.g. sharing or commenting on CSR news) and may potentially increase their self-disclosure intensity (Cheung et al., 2015). Additionally, since SNSs allow users to create and maintain relationships (e.g. friends, colleagues, or relatives) and easily share and exchange information, this established trust may extend to other contacts, thereby enhancing the overall sense of trust in the SNS. Such
improved trust may substantially affect individuals’ willingness to share and comment on CSR news. However, empirical evidence about the relationships and trust in an SNS, users’ self-disclosure, and their privacy concerns regarding eWOM of CSR issues covered by the media is non-existent in the tourism and hospitality context. Hence, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**H1:** Facebook trust positively influences self-disclosure on this SNS.

**H2:** Facebook trust positively influences (decreases) privacy concerns related to sharing and commenting on posts about CSR on this SNS.

**Source credibility of Facebook posts about CSR and information value**

The term source credibility is defined as the extent to which an information source is perceived to be believable, competent, and trustworthy by information recipients (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Source credibility enhances the believability and validity of a sender’s message as perceived by the receiver of that message. The role of credibility in informational influence has been found to significantly modify a recipient’s opinion in the direction advocated by the communicator when the material was attributed to a high-credibility source than when it was attributed to a low-credibility source. Previous research has identified that information provided by highly credible sources (e.g. newspapers) is perceived to be useful and reliable, and thereby facilitates knowledge transfer (Cheung et al., 2008; Ko et al., 2005). In this sense, source credibility is considered to be a fundamental predictor of individuals’ acceptance of a message not only during traditional word of mouth but also in an eWOM context within the tourism and hospitality settings (Dedeoglu, 2019; Filieri, 2016; Herrero et al., 2015; Sparks et al., 2013). Moreover, as previous research suggests, compared to comments from anonymous or unfamiliar sources via other eWOM formats, connections on SNSs are embedded in individuals’ networks and may, therefore, be perceived as more trustworthy, credible, and reliable than unknown sources (e.g. advertisers or companies) with established interests (Chu & Kim, 2011).

Information value refers to individuals’ perception that using new information will enhance their performance (Cheung et al., 2008). Previous research into the eWOM context has proved that users’ perceptions of the value (or quality) of the information available through eWOM sources influence their tourism behaviour (Dieck et al., 2017; Gruen et al., 2006; Herrero et al., 2015; Mathwick et al., 2008). This term is related to the relevance, timeliness, accuracy, and comprehensiveness of the information available to the consumer (Cheung et al., 2008). According to this approach, individuals will be particularly influenced by other users’ comments on SNSs (e.g. posts on a hotel CSR issue published by a newspaper on Facebook) if they consider the information to be useful and relevant to their decision-making process.

As previously stated, several authors have observed that the information provided by highly credible sources is perceived to be more useful and reliable (Cheung et al., 2008; Herrero et al., 2015; Ko et al., 2005). However, existing empirical evidence about the relationship between source credibility and information value attributed to CSR news published in media outlets SNS’ pages is non-existent in the tourism and hospitality context. Based on the previous discussion, it is proposed that:

**H3:** Source credibility positively influences the information value of a post about CSR on Facebook.

**Privacy concerns, self-disclosure, and information value as determinants of eWOM on CSR**

Information value is considered to be the main predictor of information adoption and behavioural intentions not only in tourism but also in other service contexts (Lee & Koo, 2015), since
individuals tend to engage with information when they think it is useful (Erkan & Evans, 2016). In the specific field of hospitality eWOM, previous studies have established that the effects of eWOM on behaviour are determined by the value attributed by the user to the information (Jeong & Lambert, 2001; Lee et al., 2011; Serra & Salbi, 2014). In particular, on SNSs in the hospitality setting, people encounter a great amount of information and so may have a greater intention to react when they find useful information. As a result, the influence of online CSR information on consumer behaviour will depend on the degree to which the user considers the content posted to be useful and relevant to their decision-making process. However, no study has examined how the information value of a post about CSR issues published by a media outlet influences individuals’ intentions to share and comment on this information. Considering this argumentation, it is proposed that:

**H4:** Information value positively influences the intention to share and comment on posts about CSR on Facebook.

The means-end theory (Gutman, 1982) and the uses and gratifications theory (Anderson & Meyer, 1975) both provide a theoretical foundation on which to explore the relationship between self-disclosure and intentions to share and comment on CSR news. Individuals disclose personal information to achieve personal and social goals (e.g. increase feelings of closeness and self-esteem or fulfil a need for popularity) (Omarzu, 2000). It has been demonstrated that self-disclosure fulfils fundamental needs for social connectedness and belonging and is intrinsically rewarding (Lai & Yang, 2015). Furthermore, individuals can use SNSs to express their personality and social or personal identity (Currás-Pérez et al., 2014).

The means-end theory explains how the behaviour (the means, e.g. sharing a Facebook post about a hotel's irresponsible environmental behaviour) facilitates the achievement of the desired state (the end, e.g. self-esteem). On the other hand, the uses and gratifications theory supports the notion that people seek gratification using different media and technologies based on their needs and motivations (Lin, 1996). The extant literature confirms that individuals participate in and expose themselves to virtual communities to obtain gratification and satisfy their social and psychological needs (Currás-Pérez et al., 2014). Considering these arguments, it is reasonable to suggest that users’ self-disclosure will have a positive impact on the intention to share and comment on news in a hospitality SNS context. If CSR issues are particularly important for an individual, their willingness to share and comment on this kind of post on Facebook will be higher in order to reinforce their personal or social benefits. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H5:** Self-disclosure positively influences the intention to share and comment on posts about CSR on Facebook.

The effect of privacy concerns on consumer behaviour from the marketing literature reveals that concerns for privacy negatively influence behavioural intentions to transact (Liao et al., 2011). In the context of e-commerce, individuals’ willingness to participate in an online transaction is shown to be negatively related to their perception of privacy risks (Fortes & Rita, 2016; Herrero et al., 2018; Xu & Gupta, 2009). In this regard, the intention to not provide information when individuals have privacy concerns is consistent with privacy calculus theory in that individuals are motivated to minimize negative outcomes (Dinev & Hart, 2006). Consequently, previous studies have found that perceptions of risk concerning online retailers and their business practices are related to privacy concerns and a lack of willingness to provide personal information online (Bandyopadhyay, 2009). Privacy issues may include the unauthorized sharing of personal information, spam from the online retailer, and the disclosure of patterns of online shopping behaviour (Miyazaki & Fernández, 2001).

Extending these ideas to the hospitality context of this research, users’ privacy concerns act as a potential risk, which can negatively influence their intention to share information (Herrero
et al., 2015). Focusing on online CSR information on SNSs in the hotel setting, some individuals may feel that sharing and commenting on a post about CSR aspects on Facebook may imply a threat to their privacy, lead to unexpected problems, expose them to unwanted responses, or cause unexpected reactions from their contacts. Since empirical evidence about the relationship between privacy concerns and intentions to comment on and share online CSR information covered by the media on SNSs is non-existent in the tourism and hospitality context, we, therefore, propose the following hypothesis:

H₆: Privacy concerns negatively influence the intention to share and comment on posts about CSR on Facebook.

Methodology

Data collection and sample

A sample of Spanish Facebook users was surveyed using a structured questionnaire. Respondents were approached randomly in different neighbourhoods of the city to maximize socio-demographic representativeness. Personal surveys were carried out in respondents’ homes to ensure their comfort and to make sure that they took the time needed to answer the questions calmly and thoughtfully. University students collaborated in collecting and gathering data. Data collection took place between April and June 2018. This research focused on a real context; specifically, the hospitality sector was chosen since the tourism industry is strongly affected by eWOM and, within this industry, hotels are likely the most affected (Serra & Salbi, 2014). Participants were shown a stimulus in the form of a fictitious post by an online newspaper (El Diario Montañés) relating to a negative piece of news about the environmental CSR aspects of a real Spanish hotel chain (NH Hotels), and then responded to the questionnaire. Specifically, the authors elaborated on a fictitious (hypothetical) but realistic piece of news concerning an event in the city of Santander, with possible negative consequences for the environment. The authors focused on a negative piece of news since previous studies confirm that consumers are more sensitive to react to negative CSR information than to positive information (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004). The post informed participants about the chain opening a new hotel in the city, with a possible environmental impact. According to the piece of news, ecologists’ associations had sounded the alarm (Appendix 1). As previously mentioned, we analysed the antecedents of eWOM intentions in a real context, so both the online media and the hotel brand were well-known by users. The authors considered ‘El Diario Montañés’ for this study, the leading newspaper for 73.5% of press readers in Cantabria – the region in which the study was developed – with almost 90,000 followers on Facebook. NH Hotels is a Spanish hotel chain with strong CSR engagement, especially in the environmental domain of CSR. Energy, water, recycling, and climate change are its main performance areas, and the company regularly conveys information about its initiatives in these topics through annual CSR reports and its corporate website. At the end of the survey, we expressed our appreciation for the respondents’ participation and indicated that the content of the post was fictitious (hypothetical) and specifically created for research purposes in order to avoid any harm to the company’s reputation.

The authors used a non-probabilistic sampling procedure to design the sample. The survey participants comprised Facebook users; in order to guarantee a more accurate representation of the data, we consulted the Annual Study of Social Networks 2017, expanded upon by Interactive Advertising Bureau (IAB) Spain (Interactive Advertising Bureau, 2017), to ascertain the demographic profile of users. Categorized by gender and age, the percentages of Facebook users allowed us to define quotas, and the respondents were randomly selected respecting such quotas. Following data collection and processing, the final sample included 208 valid surveys.
One pre-test was conducted utilizing convenience sampling (university students). Because this study focused on Facebook users, 20 university students (meeting the established quotas in terms of gender and age) were invited to assist in determining the realism of the stimulus and express comments on the content of the questionnaire.

Measures

This study uses seven-point Likert scales from 1 to 7 (ranked from strong disagreement to strong agreement) to measure the items of the constructs. Intentions towards sharing and commenting on the news were measured following Herrero et al. (2017). Three items based on Herrero et al. (2015) were used to measure information value. To assess self-disclosure, two items based on the study by Krassnova et al. (2010) were used. Four items based on Herrero et al. (2017) were also used to measure privacy concerns. Finally, four items were employed to measure source credibility and Facebook trust following Newell and Goldsmith (2001). Appendix 2 shows the scales used for each factor and Appendix 3 of the descriptive statistics.

Results

The research model is empirically tested following a covariance-based structural equations model (CB-SEM) approach (software EQS version 6.1, Multivariate Software, Inc. 15720 Ventura Blvd., Suite 306 Encino, California USA 91436-2989). This implies two-steps: first, estimating the measurement model to test the psychometric properties of the measurement scales (confirmatory factor analysis – CFA) and second, estimating the structural model representing the direct relationships proposed in the research hypotheses. In both cases, we use the robust maximum-likelihood estimation procedure, as it minimizes the potential problems associated with non-normality of the data. In particular, this method provides the "robust chi-square statistic" and ‘robust standard errors’ outputs, which have been corrected for non-normality (Byrne, 1994) and which, consequently, guarantee the validity of the model estimation.

Estimation of the measurement model

A first estimation of the measurement model showed the need to remove one item of the scale of self-disclosure (SDIS1) due to convergent validity problems (lambda coefficient smaller than 0.5). Once this adjustment was introduced in the measurement model, the results obtained (Table 1) confirm that the factorial structure proposed fits the empirical data, as the goodness-of-fit indices are within the recommended values. In particular, the Bentler–Bonett normed fit index (BBNFI), Bentler–Bonett non-normed fit index (BBNNFI), incremental fit index (IFI), and comparative fit index (CFI) all exceed the minimum value of 0.9. Furthermore, the root means square error of approximation (RMSEA) is particularly close to the recommended limit of 0.08, and normed $\chi^2$ takes a value under the recommended value of 3.0 (Hair et al., 2010). The reliability of the measurement instruments is confirmed (Table 1), as the values obtained for Cronbach’s alpha and the compound reliability coefficient are above the required value of 0.7 and the AVE coefficient is higher than 0.5 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Hair et al., 2010). Additionally, all items are significant to a confidence level of 95% and their standardized lambda coefficients are higher than 0.5 (Steenkamp & Van Trijp, 1991), thus supporting the convergent validity of the scales.

The discriminant validity of the scales was tested following the procedure proposed by Fornell and Larcker (1981), which is based on the comparison of the variance extracted for each pair of constructs (AVE coefficient) with the squared correlation estimate between these two constructs (Table 1). In all cases, the variances extracted for each construct are greater than the
| Factor                  | Variable | Stand. coeff. | $R^2$ | Cronbach’s alpha | Composite reliability | AVE | Goodness of fit indices         |
|------------------------|----------|---------------|-------|------------------|-----------------------|-----|------------------------------|
| Intention share & comm | INT1     | 0.96          | 0.93  | 0.97             | 0.97                  | 0.90| Normed $\chi^2=2.76$ BBNFI = 0.90 |
|                        | INT2     | 0.97          | 0.95  |                  |                       |     | BBNFI = 0.92 CFI = 0.94 IFI = 0.94 RMSEA = 0.09 |
|                        | INT3     | 0.92          | 0.84  |                  |                       |     |                              |
| Self-disclosure        | SDIS2    | 0.85          | 0.72  | 0.86             | 0.87                  | 0.77|                              |
|                        | SDIS3    | 0.90          | 0.80  |                  |                       |     |                              |
| Privacy concern        | PRIC1    | 0.68          | 0.46  | 0.92             | 0.92                  | 0.74|                              |
|                        | PRIC2    | 0.87          | 0.76  |                  |                       |     |                              |
|                        | PRIC3    | 0.92          | 0.84  |                  |                       |     |                              |
|                        | PRIC4    | 0.94          | 0.88  |                  |                       |     |                              |
| Facebook trust         | FTRU1    | 0.96          | 0.92  | 0.93             | 0.93                  | 0.77|                              |
|                        | FTRU2    | 0.91          | 0.83  |                  |                       |     |                              |
|                        | FTRU3    | 0.72          | 0.52  |                  |                       |     |                              |
|                        | FTRU4    | 0.90          | 0.80  |                  |                       |     |                              |
| Information value      | INFV1    | 0.96          | 0.92  | 0.94             | 0.94                  | 0.85|                              |
|                        | INFV2    | 0.90          | 0.81  |                  |                       |     |                              |
|                        | INFV3    | 0.90          | 0.81  |                  |                       |     |                              |
| Source credibility     | SCRE1    | 0.92          | 0.84  | 0.97             | 0.97                  | 0.90|                              |
|                        | SCRE2    | 0.97          | 0.94  |                  |                       |     |                              |
|                        | SCRE3    | 0.93          | 0.87  |                  |                       |     |                              |
|                        | SCRE4    | 0.97          | 0.94  |                  |                       |     |                              |

Intention share & comm | Self-disclosure | Privacy concern | Facebook trust | Information value | Source credibility |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 0.90\(^a\)            |                 |                 |                |                   |                   |
| Self-disclosure       | 0.37            |                 |                |                   |                   |
| Privacy concern       | 0.02            | 0.01            | 0.74\(^a\)    |                   |                   |
| Facebook trust        | 0.18            | 0.14            | 0.02           | 0.77\(^a\)        |                   |
| Information value     | 0.25            | 0.03            | 0.00           | 0.09              | 0.85\(^a\)        |
| Source credibility    | 0.06            | 0.04            | 0.00           | 0.22              | 0.26              | 0.90\(^a\) |

\(^a\)AVE coefficient for the construct. Off diagonal elements are the squared correlations among constructs.
squared correlation between them, which supports the discriminant validity of the measurement scales.

**Estimation of hypothesized structural model**

A first estimation of the structural model shows that the “privacy concern” variable does not have any significant effect on the intention to share and comment on posts about CSR on Facebook (hypothesis H6). Additionally, Facebook trust does not exert a significant influence on privacy concerns (hypothesis H2), so this variable does not have any relevant effect in the research model proposed. However, the LM Test suggests the existence of a significant relationship between Facebook trust and the intention to share and comment on posts about CSR, which was not initially hypothesized. This relationship makes logical and theoretical sense, as the previous literature discovered a direct link between trust and behavioural intentions in different settings (Mouzas et al., 2007; Wilkins et al., 2009). Consequently, and following the model development procedure suggested by Hair et al. (2010), we reformulated the research model eliminating the relationships involving privacy concerns and including a direct effect between Facebook trust and intention to share and comment on posts about CSR.

Figure 2 summarizes the results for the estimation of the proposed research model, including the goodness-of-fit indices of the structural model, $R^2$ statistics for each dependent variable, and the standardized coefficients and significance level ($p$-value) for each relationship. The goodness-of-fit indices support the correct definition of the structural model (Normed $\chi^2 = 2.86$; BBNFI = 0.90; BBNFI = 0.92; CFI = 0.93; IFI = 0.93; RMSEA = 0.09), thus explaining a relevant percentage of the variance of the dependent variable ($R^2$ over 0.50 for intention to share and comment on Facebook posts about CSR).

According to the empirical evidence obtained, the intention to share and comment on Facebook posts about CSR is positively influenced by the individual’s disposition to self-disclosure (hypothesis H5 is supported), the perceived value of the information contained in the post (hypothesis H4 is supported), and his/her Facebook trust (not initially hypothesized). Moreover, Facebook trust has a direct influence on self-disclosure (hypothesis H1 is supported). Thus, the more the individual trusts Facebook, the higher his/her willingness to self-disclose information on this SNS. Finally, according to the results obtained, the information value of a post about CSR on Facebook is determined by the source credibility, as perceived by the individual (hypothesis H3 is supported). Therefore, the more the subject trusts the media publishing the post, the higher the value attributed to the information and, in the end, the intention to share and comment on the Facebook post in question.
Discussion and conclusions

Theoretical implications

From a theoretical perspective, our findings represent a significant step forward in hospitality research on the influential factors affecting eWOM on CSR information covered by the media in the hotel context, since this topic has been scarcely researched to date. First, this study demonstrates that the media is highly important in the dissemination of CSR information. Our results suggest that individuals are willing to share and comment on negative CSR news published by media outlets on their SNSs, which may influence other users’ opinions not only towards CSR aspects but also towards the companies themselves (Carroll & McCombs, 2003; Tang, 2012).

Second, the authors advance the literature on eWOM and CSR by providing an integrative framework through which to study the main factors that influence individuals’ propensity to spread eWOM on CSR issues on a specific SNS. Although the number of studies in eWOM research is increasing, this phenomenon has rarely been studied in relation to CSR in an online communication context and less so considering the role of the media. This research provides a comprehensive model to incorporate characteristics of information (specific) (source credibility and information value) and individuals’ informational predisposition (Facebook trust, self-disclosure, and privacy concerns) as key predictors of individuals’ intention to share and comment on the news on CSR issues on Facebook. In this sense, this study analyses not only users’ opinion-giving but also their opinion-passing behaviour since this last domain of eWOM has received much less attention to date.

Third, no previous study has explored the factors influencing eWOM in relation to CSR issues on SNSs in the hotel sector. Our study enriches the tourism and hospitality literature by integrating, in the same proposal, the idea that the influence of eWOM depends on both the individual and the information. This study expands this line of research since the marketing and general communication literature is inclined to explore separate relationships between the proposed variables, thus there is very limited empirical evidence available concerning communicative issues in relation to CSR, and even less in the tourism context. Our results demonstrate that information value, self-disclosure, and Facebook trust have a positive impact on eWOM intentions to share and comment on CSR news. Similarly, this study demonstrates that eWOM intentions are affected by the value of the content available, which also supports the extant research (Lee & Koo, 2015; Serra & Salbi, 2014). Moreover, these results emphasize the role of trust in facilitate online
communication. In the specific SNS context of this study, trust was found to be critical in the opinion-giving and opinion-passing behaviours of Facebook users regarding CSR aspects. This study demonstrates that trust is a precondition not only for self-disclosure but also to increase the intention to comment on and share CSR posts because it reduces (or even completely eliminates) the perceived risks involved in this interpersonal exchange situation, as previous studies have suggested (Cheung et al., 2015; Gruzd & Hernández-García, 2018).

This study also demonstrates that source credibility has a positive impact on information value, which is consistent with previous studies (Herrero et al., 2015). Therefore, users will be more influenced by CSR information published on Facebook when they consider that such content (e.g. comments, videos, and pictures) is credible and valuable. To conclude, this study contributes to the ongoing debate about the privacy paradox in the context of SNSs, since no significant relationship was found between Facebook trust and privacy concerns, and between this variable and intentions to share and comment. Indeed, privacy concerns do not exert influence in the proposed research model. Several possible factors which may contribute to these results are that individuals are not proficient at putting an absolute value on their privacy, nor are they skilled in evaluating in real terms the potential harm that could come to them if that privacy is violated. In other words, users have difficulty reasoning in relation to privacy and security policies (Reeder et al., 2008). Even if users care about their privacy, previous studies demonstrate that they often do not have the expertise needed to protect their privacy (Lipford et al., 2008).

Practical implications

The empirical evidence obtained in this research also has important practical implications. First, this study provides hospitality professionals with a frame of reference to understand the influence of certain information characteristics and individuals’ informational predisposition on intentions to share and comment on CSR news published by media outlets on SNSs. In this regard, companies should understand the need to enhance their relations with the media since negative news may adversely influence public opinion towards companies. Consequently, companies should identify CSR issues of current interest published by media outlets on their SNSs and examine how the news media represents companies’ CSR initiatives. In order to develop strategies to avoid potential damage to companies’ CSR performance, public relations initiatives may be an adequate tool to develop relationships between firms and news media. With regard to this, those organizations truly interested in promoting sustainability and CSR issues should nurture their relationship with the media and regularly produce press releases to highlight the relevance of their CSR and obtain publicity and create a favourable image with the public. Similarly, companies may use additional public relations tools, such as business events, sponsorships or partnerships, or even trade fairs, workshops, and press trips for journalists to promote CSR and sustainability issues. Similarly, firms can monitor and analyse conversations about CSR issues in social media to understand how consumers view a firm or its CSR actions. Thus, companies can assess consumers’ expectations and integrate their considerations in future CSR strategies. With regard to this, before using public relations tools, companies must ensure that they present and communicate CSR issues honestly to avoid scepticism.

From the perspective of media groups, these institutions should be aware of the potential of social media to communicate CSR issues to users. Our results are valuable during the development of strategies to increase not only the use of their social platforms (e.g. to publish content about CSR issues) but also their visibility among users. Therefore, journalists may encourage individuals to share and comment on news published on SNSs (e.g. Facebook posts) about CSR-related topics by increasing the level of information value provided in such posts. Media outlets (e.g. newspapers) should subsequently publish relevant, accurate, and comprehensive CSR-
related news to increase the likelihood of eWOM intentions, thus increasing their level of visibility in the social media context as well as users’ awareness about this information.

From the perspective of SNS companies, since they monitor the information they collect, they must be aware of how users search the information and how they use this data (e.g. opinion-passing behaviour). By doing this, it is not only them but also media institutions (e.g. through community managers) that will target people more effectively (e.g. individuals with high versus low self-disclosure), thus providing more relevant and useful information and enhancing the way that SNSs’ recommendation systems provide information to their users (e.g. concrete information about environmental or social issues of interest for specific users). In addition, SNS companies should increase the level of credibility on their platforms (e.g. inviting experts or regular users as endorsers to share their experiences). To conclude, as our results suggest, concerns about privacy do not necessarily dampen users’ activity in sharing and commenting on CSR posts. Nevertheless, companies should maintain the highest levels of privacy protection and ethical consideration as well as design tools that will help users adjust their privacy settings since these concerns may have a negative impact on other individual behavioural factors not considered in the proposed model.

**Limitations and future lines of research**

One limitation of this study is its consideration of a specific SNS such as Facebook. Further research could explore eWOM on CSR issues in other SNSs (e.g. Twitter or Instagram). Similarly, a comparison among other social media (e.g. blogs) could produce valuable theoretical and managerial insights. In addition, it would be interesting to analyse additional online media outlets (e.g. magazines, journals, or broadcasts) and even specific business newspapers using SNSs that cover CSR information to generalize the results presented here. Additionally, since the focus of this research is placed on the role of the media in the dissemination of CSR information, a future line of research may focus on analysing the CSR information published by tourism companies themselves on SNS. In this sense, since the authors use a well-known hotel company and a negative news item related to environmental aspects, it would also be interesting to present other hospitality companies (inns, guesthouses, B&Bs, motels, and campsites) and even different types of tourism businesses (e.g. accommodation, restoration, and transportation) with varying reputations and other CSR approaches (e.g. economic, social, and cultural) to extend the scope of the findings. It would also be interesting to compare negative news with positive information to analyse whether the audience reacts to a greater or lesser extent to the information depending on the tone of the news. Similarly, this research has dealt with the relationship between the variables of interest without considering other antecedents and consequences. Thus, there still exists a need to explore other mediating variables such as individuals’ interest in the topic of the CSR news (e.g. environment).

From a methodological perspective, the use of a hypothetical scenario and self-reporting surveys can also be considered as limitations of this study. Although the scenario-based survey has often been used in previous studies in the hospitality context (Im & Qu, 2017), it would be interesting for future research to explore the research goal of this study in a real-life setting (e.g. lab experiment or field study). To conclude, this research is focused on intentions rather than actual behaviour. Even though intentions are a determinant of people’s actual behaviour (Ajzen, 1991), measuring actual behaviour is recommended in future research.
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Appendix 1.

Stimulus.
Appendix 2.

Measurement scales.

| Identifier | Item                                                                 |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| INT1       | I intend to use SNSs to share and comment on this piece of news.       |
| INT2       | I will probably use SNSs to share and comment on this piece of news.   |
| INT3       | I decided to use SNSs to share and comment on this piece of news.      |
| INFV1      | I consider that this piece of news is providing useful information.     |
| INFV2      | I consider that this piece of news is providing valuable information.   |
| INFV3      | I consider that this piece of news is providing important information. |
| SDIS1      | I find time to keep my Facebook profile up-to-date.                    |
| SDIS2      | I keep my friends updated about what is going on in my life through Facebook. |
| SDIS3      | When I have something to say, I like to share it on Facebook.          |
| PRIC1      | Sharing this type of news implies a threat to my privacy.              |
| PRIC2      | Sharing this type of news can lead to unexpected problems.             |
| PRIC3      | Sharing this type of news exposes me to unwanted responses.            |
| PRIC4      | Sharing this type of news may cause unexpected reactions.              |
| SCRE1      | El Diario Montañés is a media which is trustworthy.                    |
| SCRE2      | El Diario Montañés is a media which is honest.                        |
| SCRE3      | El Diario Montañés is a media which makes truthful claims.             |
| SCRE4      | El Diario Montañés is a media which is reliable.                      |
| FTRU1      | Facebook is an SNS which is trustworthy.                              |
| FTRU2      | Facebook is an SNS which is honest.                                   |
| FTRU3      | Facebook is an SNS in which truthful claims are made.                 |
| FTRU4      | Facebook is an SNS which is reliable.                                 |

Appendix 3.

Descriptive statistics.

| Identifier/item | Mean   | Std. deviation |
|-----------------|--------|----------------|
| SDIS2           | 2.91   | 1.962          |
| SDIS3           | 2.80   | 1.825          |
| INFV1           | 4.11   | 1.849          |
| INFV2           | 3.84   | 1.850          |
| INFV3           | 4.05   | 1.846          |
| SCRE1           | 4.54   | 1.673          |
| SCRE2           | 4.33   | 1.532          |
| SCRE3           | 4.29   | 1.402          |
| SCRE4           | 4.41   | 1.462          |
| INT1_           | 2.69   | 1.775          |
| INT2_           | 2.74   | 1.791          |
| INT3_           | 2.39   | 1.653          |
| PRIC1_          | 2.85   | 1.779          |
| PRIC2_          | 3.24   | 1.820          |
| PRIC3_          | 3.57   | 1.935          |
| PRIC4_          | 3.83   | 1.997          |
| FTRU1_          | 3.48   | 1.753          |
| FTRU2_          | 3.28   | 1.636          |
| FTRU3_          | 3.02   | 1.510          |
| FTRU4_          | 3.25   | 1.684          |