

Antecedents of Information Adoption of Sharing Mobile Social Commerce Experience: The Mediation Role of Trust

Research Paper

Fulya Acikgoz, University of Bristol Business School, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom, fulya.acikgoz@bristol.ac.uk

Abdelsalam Busalim, School of Enterprise Computing and Digital Transformation, Technological University Dublin, Dublin, Ireland, abdelsalam.busalim@tudublin.ie

Theo Lynn DCU Business School, Dublin City University, Glasnevin, Dublin, Ireland, theo.lynn@dcu.ie

Abstract

Despite the growing importance of mobile social commerce (Ms-commerce), little research has been conducted on the effects of informational-related factors on Ms-commerce and the role of trust in user willingness to share their experiences. Drawing on the Information Adoption Model, we examine the effect of information usefulness, quality, credibility, and need on information adoption and the effect of information adoption on trust and willingness to share Ms-commerce experience. Using data from 280 UK Ms-commerce users, we applied Partial-Least-Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) to test the model. The findings show that informational-related factors have a significant and positive impact on Ms-commerce information adoption. Moreover, the effect of information adoption on trust and willingness to share Ms-commerce experiences was found to be significant. More importantly, this study has also yielded support for the mediating role of trust on the relationship between information adoption and willingness to share Ms-commerce experiences.

Keywords: Mobile Social Commerce, Information Adoption, Trust, Information Adoption Model, Sharing Experience.

1 Introduction

Social commerce (s-commerce) is defined as e-commerce activities that are mediated by social media activities (Hajli et al., 2017). Facebook is at the forefront of the movement toward social commerce (Stelzner, 2021). S-commerce users can participate actively in sharing information about products and services, selling, or buying products in marketplaces or communities (Hew et al., 2017). S-commerce sales reached \$495 billion in 2021 and are expected to triple by 2025 (Accenture, 2022). Driven by the rise of technological devices in smartphones and smartphone applications, online shopping using a smartphone through mobile social commerce (ms-commerce) is increasingly commonplace, which consequently enhances the s-commerce experience (Meola, 2022). Ms-commerce is considered a sub-category of s-commerce that encompasses all transactions that take place through a mobile device (Barnhart, 2022; Stanley, 2022). Ms-commerce has recently emerged as a novel type of electronic commerce that enables individuals to access shopping websites on their mobile devices, rather than relying on a desktop computer. Ms-commerce can be defined as the act of sharing information about goods and services through social applications for marketing purposes, as well as conducting online

transactions using mobile devices (Sun and Xu, 2019). As a new way of shopping, ms-commerce offers a more convenient, easy, and accessible way for both customer-to-customer and business-to-customer interaction (Sun and Xu, 2019). WeChat is a good example of ms-commerce platform, wherein customers can access a comprehensive range of products and services within a single application (Degennaro, 2022). Brands and individual sellers share product information with users and sell products through WeChat stores (Sun and Xu, 2019; Yang, 2019). Similarly, customers use WeChat to search for information and spread eWOM regarding a product or service (Sun and Xu, 2019; Yang, 2019). As a result, ms-commerce is becoming one of the most influential information sources regarding customers' purchase decisions (Elwalda et al., 2021).

The marketing and information system literature has witnessed an increase in the amount of research exploring ms-commerce in recent years (Chen et al., 2021; Hew et al., 2016; Leong et al., 2021), with a particular focus on user behaviours such as impulse buying (Chen et al., 2021), usage intention (Hew et al., 2017), and the influence of peer users' conversion (Jin and Yoon, 2022). While providing considerable insight, little attention is paid to the role of trust in extant ms-commerce literature. Trust has historically been a crucial barrier to e-commerce adoption (Hillman and Neustaedter, 2017) and has been explored extensively in the context of s-commerce (Alalwan et al., 2019; Hajli and Khani, 2013; Shi and Chow, 2015; Yahia et al., 2018). Notwithstanding this, there is a paucity of research exploring the role of trust in the new context of ms-commerce (Hew et al., 2016; Leong et al., 2021). Due to the increasing volume of products and brands available via ms-commerce, ms-commerce users rely on information provided by other users and the platform despite having, in many cases, no prior relationship with these users (Hajli and Khani, 2013). Information adoption refers to the process of accepting, integrating, and utilizing new information or ideas into an individual's current knowledge or behavior (Sussman and Siegal, 2003). The notion of information adoption has two important elements: the central route and the peripheral route. The central route is when people give careful and thoughtful consideration to the arguments that are relevant to the issue at hand, while the peripheral route is achieved when people are influenced by simple cues rather than critically analyzing relevant information (Bhattacharjee and Sanford, 2006, Sussman and Siegal, 2003; Petty and Cacioppo, 1986). The information adoption process by users on ms-commerce platforms can be greatly influenced through either of the two routes based on their needs and desires that need to be satisfied. Additionally, as the ms-commerce user's main goal is to gain more product-related information before purchase, understanding the role of trust is vital in understanding users' information adoption and sharing behaviors (Shi and Chow, 2015).

Ms-commerce offers business the potential of greater consumer engagement and reach, ease of use, and convenience compared to other forms of e-commerce and s-commerce. Recently, researchers have shifted their attention towards ms-commerce due to its unique evolution in comparison to traditional s-commerce platforms. The significant distinctions between ms-commerce and s-commerce excluding the use of mobile devices or social media could render earlier findings on general social commerce or mobile commerce irrelevant in the ms-commerce context. Therefore, new research in the ms-commerce context is necessary. However, there is currently limited knowledge about ms-commerce, as noted by Hew et al. (2017), and therefore, several studies have called for further research on the fusion of ms-commerce (Hew et al., 2017; Hew, 2017; Sun and Xu, 2019). In addition, Saprikis and Avlogiaris (2021) have pointed out that the number of research studies investigating ms-commerce is still relatively low. Based on this, in order to foster consumer engagement with ms-commerce apps, it is important to understand what factors that influence users' information adoption in ms-commerce and the effect of information adoption on users' willingness to share their experiences using and

through ms-commerce. Moreover, we posit that trust plays a mediating role in the ms-commerce context. Consequently, we explore the following research questions:

RQ1. What are the factors influencing information adoption of ms-commerce users?

RQ2. Does trust have a mediating role in the relationship between information adoption and users' willingness to share experiences on ms-commerce apps?

To examine these questions, this study proposes a research model based on the Information Adoption Model (IAM) and uses a survey-based method to test the model. A total of 350 responses were received from ms-commerce app users in the UK; 280 valid responses were used in the final analysis. The results show that information usefulness, information quality, information credibility, and information need were positive predictors of information adoption, and information adoption has a significant positive effect on users' willingness to share ms-commerce experiences. Furthermore, the results also confirm the mediating role of trust between information adoption and willingness to share ms-commerce experiences.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the literature on IAM and trust in e-commerce and s-commerce. Based on these theoretical foundations, we propose the research model and the associated hypotheses in Section 3. In Section 4 we outline the research methodology employed in this research followed by the results in Section 5 before concluding with a discussion of key findings and future avenues for research in Section 6.

2 Theoretical Background

2.1. Information Adoption Model (IAM)

IAM seeks to understand how users decide whether to use and share information, comments or ideas in computer-mediated communication contexts (Sussman and Siegal, 2003; Hussain et al., 2017). Theoretically, IAM draws on the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) (Petty et al., 1981) and the technology acceptance model (TAM) (Davis et al., 1989). IAM advocates that there are two ways that people can be affected in their information receive process; one is the central route while the other is the peripheral route, which relies on ELM (Cheung et al., 2008; Sussman and Siegal, 2003). IAM considers information quality as the central process and source credibility as the peripheral process (Cheung et al., 2008; Elwalda et al., 2021). Accordingly, proponents of IAM assert that perceived usefulness, argument quality, and source credibility have important role on people's information adoption (Cheung et al., 2008; Sussman and Siegal, 2003).

IAM has been employed in different research disciplines including travel and tourism (Fileri and McLeay, 2014; Fileri et al., 2015; Mainolfi et al., 2022; Tseng and Wang, 2016), social media (Erkan and Evans, 2016; Jiang et al., 2021), online shopping (Erkan and Evans, 2018; Peng et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2016), mobile messaging applications (Elwalda et al., 2021), new product development (Lee and Yang, 2015), and online health communities (Zhou, 2021). However, to our knowledge IAM has not been applied in the ms-commerce context.

2.2. Trust In Mobile Social Commerce

Trust is a prevalent and known component that impacts the user behavioral intentions toward online environment activities. It is also a complicated and multifaceted construct, which has been conceptualized in a several ways (Lu et al., 2016). As suggested by Cheng et al. (2019),

there are two types of trust: particularized trust and system trust. While particularized trust focuses on trust between individuals (Li and Wu, 2010), system trust is a person's perception of the institutional environment of s-commerce enabled by apps, which causes the user to feel secure (Benlian and Hess, 2011). Trust is a crucial factor in sustaining confidence-based consequences in s-commerce (Kim and Peterson, 2017). Moreover, it is well known that trust is an essential component of long-term relationships in s-commerce (Sharma et al., 2017).

Unsurprisingly, trust has been adapted and applied to e-commerce (Gefen, 2000; McKnight et al., 2002a) and more recently s-commerce (Hajli et al., 2017). Featherman and Hajli (2015) argue that trust in s-commerce is more significant than traditional e-commerce because of the greater communication complexity. In traditional e-commerce, there is a limited one-to-one communication between buyers and sellers, whereas in s-commerce there are multiple opportunities for communication and information sharing between multiple actors (Featherman and Hajli, 2015). Hence, understanding trust in s-commerce is gaining significant attention and importance (Leong et al., 2021). The existing literature on trust in s-commerce suggests that trust has a positive impact on attitudes towards purchasing (Farivar et al., 2017; Hajli, 2020; Yeon et al., 2019), information seeking (Hajli et al., 2017), social shopping intention (Li, 2019), and commitment (Nadeem et al., 2020). Furthermore, it would appear that different antecedents such as social presence (Nadeem et al., 2020), familiarity and closeness (Ng, 2013), and social support (Zhao et al., 2019) positively affect trust in s-commerce. Even though extensive research exists on trust's antecedents and outcomes, there is still a paucity of research on the mediating role of trust on s-commerce information sharing, in this case information on the user's s-commerce experience, a focus of this study.

3 Research Model and Hypothesis Development

3.1 Hypothesis Development

3.1.1 Antecedents of Information Adoption

Information adoption refers to understanding how people adopt, internalize and use explicit information (Cheung et al., 2008). Even though different factors affect information adoption, in this research, we cover four determinants related to the ms-commerce context and reflect IAM. The first, information usefulness, refers to people's belief that acceptance of novel information will improve his/her performance. Cheung et al. (2008) suggest that if users consider that comments within an online environment are useful, they are likely to have a higher adoption intention of the comments. This is borne out in extant information adoption studies in different contexts (Hussain et al., 2017; Erkan and Evans, 2016; Shen et al., 2013; Sussman and Siegal, 2003). Thus, we hypothesise:

H1: Information usefulness has a positive impact on ms-commerce information adoption.

The second determinant, information quality, refers to the persuasive strength of arguments embedded in an informational message (Bhattacharjee and Sanford, 2006). If one perceived information as being of high quality, one is more likely to adopt it (Erkan and Evans, 2016). Even though Filieri and McLeay (2014) examine information quality under different

dimensions, they found a positive effect of information quality on information adoption for online reviews in a travel context. They also noted that consumer evaluations of products and services are strongly influenced by information quality (Filiari and McLeay, 2014). Similarly, the literature demonstrated that information quality positively affects purchase intention (Erkan and Evans, 2018; Park et al., 2007). While researchers often examine the effect of information quality on information usefulness (Peng et al., 2016; Zhou, 2011), we posit:

H2: Information quality has a positive impact on ms-commerce information adoption.

Information credibility, the third proposed antecedent, refers to the reliability of the source of information (Elwalda et al., 2021). Higher source credibility is thought to result in greater information adoption in online communities (Zhang and Watts, 2008). For example, Hajli (2018) found that credibility in the social media word of mouth (WOM) positively affects information adoption and ultimately social media WOM adoption. Accordingly, we posit:

H3: Information credibility has a positive impact on ms-commerce information adoption.

Lastly, information need, is derived from "advice or opinion seeking" (Erkan and Evans, 2016). During the process of information-seeking, it is often difficult to determine what is needed to satisfy the information need (Wang and Shah, 2017). Erkan and Evans (2016) proposed that those who need information on social media are more likely to find it useful, affecting their information adoption. Furthermore, Gökerik et al. (2018) argued that when people satisfy their information needs, it is likely that they will adopt the information they found. Based on this, we posit:

H4: Information need has a positive impact on ms-commerce information adoption.

3.1.2 Outcomes of Information Adoption

Information adoption may have a variety of outcomes including sharing experiences via electronic WOM (eWOM), use continuance or termination, and greater or lesser trust in the source or target of the information. IAM assumes that users who think that information is beneficial are more likely to internalize and adopt information. For example, Shafieizadeh and Tao (2020) and Nicolaou et al. (2013) highlighted that consumers' trust in a company is improved if they believe that information provided about a product is authentic and relevant. Elwalda et al.'s study (2021) suggests that users might automatically adopt information when the information provided is accurate and applicable. Considering both claims, we posit:

H5: Information adoption has a positive impact on trust toward ms-commerce platforms.

The existing literature suggests that information adoption has a positive effect on different outcomes such as purchase intention (Erkan and Evans, 2016; Hendijani Fard and Marvi, 2019), herding intentions (Rejikumar et al., 2022), visit intention (Arora and Lata, 2020), and brand image (Gokerik et al., 2018). Thus, we posit:

H6: Information adoption has a positive impact on willingness to share ms-commerce experiences.

3.1.3 Trust-Willingness to Share Ms-commerce Experience

Trust is a popular focus in s-commerce research (Alalwan et al., 2019; Yahia et al., 2018), however there remains a need to explore it in an ms-commerce context given the perception that it is a requirement for increased adoption and use (Sarkar et al., 2020). Previous studies have shown that trust has a positive effect on the usage continuance decisions (Nilashi et al., 2022), satisfaction (Akter et al., 2013; Marinkovic and Kalinic, 2017), and attitude (Arpaci, 2016) in ms-commerce platforms. Hence, we hypothesize that:

H7: Trust has a positive impact on willingness to share ms-commerce experiences.

3.1.4. Mediating Role of Trust

Elwalda et al. (forthcoming) stated that trust may decrease users' uncertainty when interacting with buyers since it diminishes social difficulties. Extant research suggests that trust is critical predicting user adoption of behavior in social and mobile commerce and positively associated with behavioral intentions (Ghazali et al., 2018; Sarkar et al., 2020). Trust also may influence user knowledge sharing behaviour and decision-making (McKnight et al., 2002b). Therefore, we posit that:

H8: Trust mediates the relationship between information adoption and willingness to share ms-commerce experiences.

3.2 Research Model

The proposed research model below illustrates our hypotheses assumes that information usefulness, information quality, information need, and information credibility are antecedents ms-commerce information adoption which, in turn, is an antecedent of willingness to share ms-commerce experiences, and that ms-commerce information adoption is mediated by trust.




Figure 1. Research model.

4 Research Methodology

4.1. Measures, Participants, and Settings

The proposed model in this paper consists of eight constructs including information usefulness (IU), information quality (IQ), information credibility (IC), information need, (IN), information adoption (IA), trust (TR), and willingness to share mobile commerce experience (WSE). All survey items were adopted from previous studies and were adapted for the ms-commerce context. IU was assessed using three items adopted from (Sussman and Siegal, 2003). IQ was assessed by four items adopted from (Sussman and Siegal, 2003). IC was assessed by three items adopted from (Sussman and Siegal, 2003). IN was assessed by four items adopted from (Chu and Kim, 2011; Erkan and Evans, 2016). IA was assessed by four items adopted from Sussman and Siegal (2003). TR was assessed by three items adopted from Lee and Turban (2011), and WSE was assessed using four items were adapted from Liang (2011).

Moreover, to meet ethical requirements, the respondents were informed of the purpose of the research, that their identity would be kept anonymous, and informed of the option to withdraw their participation at any time (Collis and Hussey, 2014). A total of 280 valid responses were used for data analysis. We used a non-probability, purposive sampling method to collect the data. Purposive sampling is used to determine samples based on certain criteria of similar characteristics (Uma Sekaran and Bougie, 2013). Thus, we collected the data only from users who had experience with ms-commerce platforms. An online survey was developed and sent to the participants. A total of 350 UK users were involved in this study. The reason for choosing this sample is that UK young consumers (aged between 27-37 years old) are more likely to use digital payments and mobile commerce platforms (Gjorgievska, 2021). Moreover, according to Tighe (2022), approximately 90 billion US dollars have been invested in ms-commerce in the UK, and it is projected that this figure will rise to 140 billion US dollars by 2024. Binns (2023) forecasts that mobile consumer spending in the UK will increase by 181% by 2025. Additionally, Djordjevic (2022) notes that the UK is among the three largest ms-commerce markets in the world. After removing the ineligible response including suspicious patterns (e.g., straight-lining answers) and outliers, a total of 280 valid responses were remained and used for analysis. We used power analysis (Faul et al., 2009) and followed the settings ($\alpha=0.05$ $\beta=0.80$ for error type one and two, an effect size =0.15, and no. of predictors = 6 as proposed in the model) as recommended by Dattalo (2008), to ensure the adequacy of the collected sample size. The results showed that the minimum sample size required for this study is 146, thus, the sample size of 280 respondents used in this study is adequate. Out of the 280 respondents, 75.4% were female (n=221) and 24.6% were male (n= 69). The majority of respondents were young consumers aged between 18 and 22 (n= 213, 76.1%), and the remainder were aged between 23-27 (n= 44, 15.7 %), 28-32 (n= 11, 3.9 %), and 33 or above (n= 12, 4.2%). Most of the respondents held bachelor's degrees (n=224, 80%), and the remainder held master's degree (n=49, 17.5%) or Ph.D. qualifications (n= 7, 2.5%).

4.2. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using SPSS version 28.0 and SmartPLS 4 (Ringle et al., 2015). PLS-SEM is a suitable technique for prediction-based research with a small sample size and resolves

problematic model identification problems (Hair et al., 2019). Moreover, PLS-SEM has the ability to maximize the variance explained and can handle non-normally distributed data (Hair et al. 2019).

5 Results

5.1. Measurement Model Assessment

Before evaluating the measurement model, we assessed the common method bias (CMB) to check whether CMB affects the validity of our findings. Because the data was gathered as a self-reported survey and all constructs were presented only in the survey, it is recommended to test the CMB (Kock, 2015). We used collinearity variance inflation factors (VIFs) to investigate the CMB. The result shows that all VIF values were below 3.3 (Kock, 2015), indicating that multicollinearity is not a problem in this study. Moreover, to check the endogeneity issue, we followed Sarstedt et al. (2020) and used the Gaussian copula approach. The results of Gaussian copulas show that none of the copulas between the proposed relationships is significant (p -value > 0.05) (Sarstedt et al., 2020), indicating that endogeneity is not an issue in the model of the study.

Table 1 shows the results of the internal reliability and the convergent validity of the constructs and their associated items. The results show that the Cronbach's Alpha of all constructs ranged from 0.77 to 0.89 and the Composite Reliability (CR) ranged from 0.85 to 0.93, thus demonstrating a satisfactory level of reliability (Hair et al., 2022). We estimated the convergent validity by examining the outer loading and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). As shown in Table 1, all the outer loadings of the constructs were higher than 0.7 except for four items (one item with IC, two items with WSE, and one item with IU) which are less than the minimum threshold of 0.7. Therefore, following PLS-SEM best practice, these items were deleted (Hair et al., 2022). Furthermore, the AVE values of all items ranged from 0.59 to 0.79, which indicate good convergent validity (Hair et al., 2019; Hair et al., 2022).

	Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	CR
IA1	0.782	0.844	0.896
IA2	0.869		
IA3	0.861		
IA4	0.788		
IN1	0.776	0.777	0.856
IN2	0.722		
IN3	0.808		
IN4	0.787		
IU1	0.895	0.891	0.933
IU2	0.888		
IU3	0.935		
IQ1	0.837	0.834	0.889
IQ2	0.832		
IQ3	0.834		
IQ4	0.763		
IC1	0.871	0.805	0.884
IC2	0.871		
IC3	0.797		
WSE1	0.865	0.880	0.885
WSE2	0.912		
WSE3	0.867		
WSE4	0.785		
TR1	0.817	0.876	0.920
TR2	0.929		
TR3	0.922		

Table 1. Reliability and Validity of Measurement Model.

1. Additionally, to assess the discriminant validity, we used Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) criteria (Henseler et al., 2015). HTMT is a new alternative measure for discriminant validity, which refers to “the average of the correlation indicators across constructs measuring different phenomena, relative to the average of the correlations of indicators within the same construct” (Henseler et al., 2015, p.121). The HTMT values for all variables should be less than 0.90 (Benitez et al., 2020; Henseler et al., 2015). Table 2 shows that all HTMT values are below 0.90, thus indicating adequate discriminant validity.

	AVE	IA	IC	IQ	IU	IN	TR	WSE
IA	0.682							
IC	0.717	0.589						
IQ	0.667	0.596	0.856					
IU	0.822	0.626	0.682	0.702				
IN	0.599	0.736	0.681	0.682	0.783			
TR	0.793	0.276	0.241	0.200	0.311	0.262		
WSE	0.737	0.515	0.476	0.509	0.496	0.496	0.245	

Table 2. Discriminant Validity- HTMT.

5.2. Structural Model Assessment

We used PLS-SEM to generate the estimate for testing the hypotheses. WE applied a bootstrapping test with a 10000 subsample and one tailed test (Hair et al., 2022). The hypotheses results are shown in Table 3. The results revealed that according to the path coefficient, information usefulness ($\beta= 0.166$, $T=2.149$), information quality ($\beta=0.129$, $T=1.875$), information credibility ($\beta= 0.102$, $T=1.429$), and information need ($\beta=0.364$, $T=4.665$) have a significant positive effect on ms-commerce information adoption, supporting H1, H2, H3, and H4. Furthermore, as hypothesized information adoption had a significant effect on trust ($\beta=0.26$, $T=3.87$), which supports H5. Information adoption also had a significant positive effect on users' willingness to share their ms-commerce experience ($\beta=0.414$, $T=6.195$), support H6. Finally, trust was found have a direct significant effect on users' willingness to share their ms-commerce experience ($\beta=0.117$, $T=2.003$), supporting H7.

5.3. Mediating Effect of Trust

In order to test the meditating effect of trust, we followed the most recent approach by Zhao et al. (2010) and recommended by Hair et al. (2022). The results show that the direct effect of information adoption on willingness to share ms-commerce experience is significant (H6, $\beta=0.414$, $T=6.195$), and the indirect effect of information adoption on willingness to share ms-commerce experience through trust is also significant (H8, $\beta=0.03$, $T=1.507$). This indicates a complementary meditation, thus supporting H8. Furthermore, the result of the Sobel Test also supports the mediation of trust between information adoption and willingness to share ms-commerce experience (Sobel test statistic=33.439, $p=0.000$) (Preacher and Leonardelli, 2001).

	Path Coefficient (β)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values	Sig
H1: Information usefulness-> Information adoption	0.166	0.163	0.077	2.149	0.016	**
H2: Information quality -> Information adoption	0.129	0.132	0.069	1.875	0.030	**
H3: Information credibility-> Information adoption	0.102	0.102	0.071	1.429	0.077	*
H4: Information need-> Information adoption	0.364	0.367	0.078	4.665	0.000	***
H5: Information adoption -> Trust	0.260	0.268	0.067	3.87	0.000	***
H6: Information adoption -> Willingness to share experience	0.414	0.414	0.067	6.195	0.000	***
H7: Trust -> Willingness to share experience	0.117	0.121	0.058	2.003	0.023	**
Specific Indirect Effect						
H8: Information adoption -> Trust -> Willingness to share experience	0.03	0.033	0.02	1.507	0.066	*

Table 3. Path Coefficients.

PLS results of the research model (* denotes $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, and *** $p < 0.01$, one-tailed).

6 Discussion and Conclusion

Given the increasing importance of ms-commerce experiences in mobile commerce, we examined the relationship between trust and willingness to share ms-commerce experience from an informational perspective. To achieve this, this study focused on information-related determinants that impact the willingness to share mobile commerce experiences through information adoption and trust, drawing upon the Information Adoption Model (IAM) (Sussman and Siegal, 2003).

First, in this study, information usefulness positively affects information adoption in ms-commerce apps. As Sussman and Siegal (2003) stated, information usefulness is a pivotal determinant of information adoption. This illustrates that users who believe that information is useful are more motivated to adopt information on ms-commerce apps. Even though our research context is different, our findings are consistent with the previous studies in the existing literature (e.g., Cheung et al., 2008; Elwalda et al., 2021; Erkan and Evans, 2016). Further, we examined the relationship between other characteristics of information (information quality, information credibility, and information need) and information adoption, which are under researched in the s-commerce literature. Some studies suggest that information credibility is

critical for electronic word-of-mouth (e-WOM) adoption (e.g., Ismagilova et al., 2020) or information adoption itself (Jiang et al., 2021; McKnight and Kacmar, 2006). Additionally, studies found a direct effect of argument quality on e-WOM adoption (e.g., Hussain et al., 2017; Sardar et al., 2021; Xu and Yao, 2015). Our finding is consistent with this research. Finally, the need of information's is considered and its impact on information adoption is supported in this study. This relationship has not been widely investigated in the existing literature despite its importance (e.g., Gokerik et al., 2018).

Our findings also demonstrate that information adoption directly affects trust toward ms-commerce platforms and willingness to share ms-commerce experiences. Even though there are a small number of studies that examine the e-WOM adoption and trust relationship (e.g., Alfina et al., 2014), the direction of the relationship is still debatable in several contexts. In other words, there is no consensus on whether information adoption affects trust or trust affects information adoption, or not. Our research suggests that users can build trust towards ms-commerce platforms if they adopt the information from the ms-commerce apps.

Erkan and Evans (2016) called for research on using the different variables in IAM. As such, we investigated the relationship between information adoption and willingness to share ms-commerce experience, which is based on actual behavior. When users adopt information stemming from m-commerce platforms, they intend to share their experiences with their relatives, family members, or friends. Our results suggest this also occurs when the user has trust in ms-commerce apps. Moreover, our findings show that trust improves the relationship between information adoption and willingness to share experiences.

Our findings make several theoretical contributions. Firstly, this research emphasizes the direct effect of information characteristics on information adoption in the ms-commerce context. Tang (2019) emphasized hedonic, utilitarian, and social determinants are the essential antecedents to continued usage of mobile apps in the ms-commerce context. In a similar vein, Hu et al. (2022) examined the effect of utilitarian factors on some behavioral intentions such as satisfaction, eWOM, and repurchase intention. However, these studies have disregarded informational-related factors that might likely be substantial determinants of the ms-commerce context. This research thereby fills this gap and brings a new perspective by adding informational factors to the existing literature. Furthermore, drawing on IAM, this study not only provides an integrated model of information related factors affecting information adoption, but also confirms the important role of trust as a mediator of the relationship between information adoption and willingness to share ms-commerce experiences. Since it has been stated that the role of trust needs to be understood in the ms-commerce context (Sarkar et al., 2020), our findings based on trust contribute to the existing ms-commerce literature. Finally, As Liu et al. (2019) stated that in recent years, sharing travel experiences on SNSs has become a popular and important (Liu et al., 2019). Similarly, willingness to share ms-commerce experiences may gain more importance to predicts users' actual behaviors in ms-commerce. This is the first study to probe the role of willingness to share experience in the ms-commerce context and to show the underlying mechanisms between the information acceptance model and trust.

Additionally, our findings provide some managerial insights into ms-commerce managers and policymakers. First, ms-commerce apps should seriously consider the information characteristics factors that affect information adoption. While ms-commerce users search for information on the apps, they are concern about how credible, usable, and necessary the

information is. Those features make the user adopt and embrace the information while using ms-commerce apps. Therefore, ms-commerce app providers should ensure that the information provided is very helpful and trustworthy so that the user can continue using the same ms-commerce apps. Also, ms-commerce providers should emphasize building a trusting relationship between the users and ms-commerce apps. They ought to know that the effect of information adoption on trust is pivotal for ms-commerce app users. At the same time, users' information adoption and user's trust in ms-commerce apps stimulate users' willingness to share their ms-commerce experience with families and relatives. Hence, if ms-commerce app providers provide some policies, which highlight information and trust-related issues, users are keen on sharing their ms-commerce app experience. Consequently, this may increase users' positive word of mouth, awareness, and familiarity with ms-commerce apps.

6.1. Future Research and Limitations

This study has limitations that can inform future avenues for research. We only examined the willingness to share the experience as the actual behavior in our model. However, other actual behaviors might also be explained based on IAM in the ms-commerce context e.g., usage continuance or termination. While we focused only on the informational perspective and the ms-commerce context, our model can extend to other perspectives (e.g., social perspective). In our model, we only focused on the mediation role of trust, but future studies also can integrate other mediators such as privacy concerns. Furthermore, there is significant room for a more nuanced conceptualization of the antecedents of trust that reflects a wider conceptualization of the antecedents of both interpersonal trust and trust in technology. In this study, we used a survey-based method to collect quantitative data and test the research model. However, future research could use other approaches. For example, future studies can focus on experimental design to understand the causality, which also might be beneficial for the generalizability of the results. Moreover, using interviews and focus groups approach with the users to reveal the different types of antecedents and conduct the longitudinal study to understand the changes over time. Moreover, as the majority of the sample in this study is female, as they represent a significant segment of ms-commerce-based users, future research could consider studying the role of gender and examine the differences between male/female behavior in ms-commerce.

References

- Accenture (2022). *The Future of Shopping and Social Commerce*. URL: https://www.accenture.com/us-en/insights/software-platforms/why-shopping-set-social-revolution?c=acn_glb_socialcommercebusinesswire_12755585&n=mrl_0122
- Alalwan, A. A., Algharabat, R. S., Baabdullah, A. M., Rana, N. P., Raman, R., Dwivedi, R., and Aljafari, A. (2019). "Examining the impact of social commerce dimensions on customers' value cocreation: The mediating effect of social trust", *Journal of Consumer Behaviour* 18 (6), 431-446.
- Akter, S., Ray, P., and D'Ambra, J. (2013). "Continuance of mHealth services at the bottom of the pyramid: the roles of service quality and trust," *Electronic Markets* 23 (1), 29-47.
- Arpaci, I. (2016). "Understanding and predicting students' intention to use mobile cloud storage services," *Computers in Human Behavior* 58, 150-157.
- Arora, N. and Lata, S. (2020). "YouTube channels influence on destination visit intentions: An empirical analysis on the base of information adoption model," *Journal of Indian Business Research* 12 (1), 23-42.
- Barnhart, B. (2022). *Social media demographics to inform your brand's strategy in 2022*. URL:

- <https://sproutsocial.com/insights/new-social-media-demographics/>
- Bhattacharjee, A. and Sanford, C. (2006). "Influence processes for information technology acceptance: An elaboration likelihood model," *MIS Quarterly* 805-825.
- Benlian, A. and Hess, T. (2011). "The signaling role of IT features in influencing trust and participation in online communities," *International Journal of Electronic Commerce* 15 (4), 7-56.
- Benitez, J., Henseler, J., Castillo, A., and Schubert, F. (2020). "How to perform and report an impactful analysis using partial least squares: Guidelines for confirmatory and explanatory IS research," *Information and Management* 57 (2), 103168.
- Binns, R. (2023). *Mobile Commerce Trends & Statistics 2023*. URL: <https://www.expertmarket.com/uk/merchant-accounts/mobile-commerce-trends-statistics>
- Chen, S., Min, Q., and Xu, X. (2021). "Investigating the role of social identification on impulse buying in mobile social commerce: a cross-cultural comparison", *Industrial Management and Data Systems* 121 (12), 2571-2594.
- Cheng, X., Gu, Y., and Shen, J. (2019). "An integrated view of particularized trust in social commerce: An empirical investigation," *International Journal of Information Management* 45, 1-12.
- Cheung, C. M. K., Lee, M. K. O., and Rabjohn, N. (2008). "The impact of electronic word-of-mouth: The adoption of online opinions in online customer communities," *Internet Research* 18 (3), 229-247.
- Chu, S. C. and Kim, Y. (2011). "Determinants of consumer engagement in electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) in social networking sites," *International Journal of Advertising* 30 (1), 47-75.
- Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., and Warshaw, P. R. (1989). "User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models," *Management Science* 35, 982-1003.
- Degennaro, T. (2022). *The Top 3 Social Commerce Platforms in China*. URL: <https://nealschaffer.com/social-commerce-platforms-shopping-apps-china/>
- Djordjevic, M. (2022). *29 Most Notable Mobile Commerce Statistics in 2023*. URL: <https://fashiondiscounts.uk/mobile-commerce-statistics/>
- Erkan, I. and Evans, C. (2016). "The influence of eWOM in social media on consumers' purchase intentions: An extended approach to information adoption," *Computers in Human Behavior* 61, 47-55.
- Erkan, I. and Evans, C. (2018). "Social media or shopping websites? The influence of eWOM on consumers' online purchase intentions," *Journal of Marketing Communications* 24 (6), 617-632.
- Elwalda, A., Erkan, I., Acikgoz, F., and Rahman, M. (forthcoming). "A reconceptualisation of the mobile continuance intention: Social drivers' perspective," *International Journal of Technology Marketing*.
- Elwalda, A., Erkan, I., Rahman, M., and Zeren, D. (2021). "Understanding mobile users' information adoption behaviour: an extension of the information adoption model," *Journal of Enterprise Information Management* 35(6), 1789-1811.
- Gefen, D. (2000). "E-commerce: the role of familiarity and trust," *Omega* 28 (6), 725-737.
- Gjorgievska, L. (2021). *38 Mobile Commerce UK Stats and Facts to Know in 2021*. URL: <https://dontdisappoint.me.uk/resources/finance/mobile-commerce-statistics-uk>
- Gökerik, M., Gürbüz, A., Erkan, I., Mogaji, E., and Sap, S. (2018). "Surprise me with your ads! The impacts of guerrilla marketing in social media on brand image," *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 30 (5), 1222-1238.
- Farivar, S., Turel, O., and Yuan, Y. (2017). "A trust-risk perspective on social commerce use: an examination of the biasing role of habit," *Internet Research* 27 (3), 586-607.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., and Lang, A. G. (2009). "Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses," *Behavior Research Methods* 41 (4), 1149-1160.
- Featherman, M. and Hajli, N. (2015). "Self-service technologies and e- services risks in social commerce era," *Journal of Business Ethics* 1-19.
- Filieri, R., Alguezaui, S., and McLeay, F. (2015). "Why do travelers trust TripAdvisor? Antecedents

- of trust towards consumer-generated media and its influence on recommendation adoption and word of mouth,” *Tourism Management* 51, 174-185.
- Filieri, R. and McLeay, F. (2014). “E-WOM and accommodation: An analysis of the factors that influence travelers’ adoption of information from online reviews,” *Journal of Travel Research* 53 (1), 44-57.
- Ghazali, E. M., Mutum, D. S., Chong, J. H., and Nguyen, B. (2018). “Do consumers want mobile commerce? A closer look at M-shopping and technology adoption in Malaysia,” *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 30 (4), 1064-1086.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., and Sarstedt, M. (2022). “*A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*,” (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., and Ringle, C. M. (2019). “When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM,” *European Business Review* 31(1), 2-24.
- Hajli, N. (2015). “Social commerce constructs and consumer's intention to buy,” *International Journal of Information Management* 35 (2), 183-191.
- Hajli, N. (2018). “Ethical environment in the online communities by information credibility: a social media perspective,” *Journal of Business Ethics* 149 (4), 799-810.
- Hajli, N. (2020). “The impact of positive valence and negative valence on social commerce purchase intention,” *Information Technology & People* 33 (2), 774-791.
- Hajli, N. and Khani, F. (2013). “Establishing trust in social commerce through social word of mouth,” *Proceeding of 7th International Conference on Ecommerce in Developing Countries with Focus in E-Security* 11, 39-53.
- Hajli, N., Sims, J., Zadeh, A. H., and Richard, M. O. (2017). “A social commerce investigation of the role of trust in a social networking site on purchase intentions.” *Journal of Business Research* 71, 133-141.
- Hendijani Fard, M. and Marvi, R. (2020). “Viral marketing and purchase intentions of mobile applications users,” *International Journal of Emerging Markets* 15 (2), 287-301.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., and Sarstedt, M. (2015). “A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 43 (1), 115–135.
- Hew, J. J., Lee, V. H., Ooi, K. B., and Lin, B. (2016). “Mobile social commerce: The booster for brand loyalty?,” *Computers in Human Behavior* 59, 142-154.
- Hew, J.-J., Leong, L.-Y., Tan, G. W.-H., Ooi, K. B., and Lee, V. H. (2017). “The age of mobile social commerce: An Artificial Neural Network analysis on its resistances,” *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 144, 311-324.
- Hillman, S. and Neustaedter, C. (2017). “Trust and mobile commerce in North America,” *Computers in Human Behavior* 70, 10-21.
- Hu, L., Filieri, R., Acikgoz, F., Zollo, L., and Rialti, R. (2022). “The Effect of Utilitarian and Hedonic Motivations on Mobile Shopping Outcomes. A Cross-Cultural Analysis,” *International Journal of Consumer Studies* 1-16.
- Hussain, S., Ahmed, W., Jafar, R. M. S., Rabnawaz, A., and Jianzhou, Y. (2017). “eWOM source credibility, perceived risk and food product customer's information adoption,” *Computers in Human Behavior* 66, 96-102.
- Ismagilova, E., Slade, E., Rana, N. P., and Dwivedi, Y. K. (2020). “The effect of characteristics of source credibility on consumer behaviour: A meta-analysis,” *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 53, 101736.
- Jiang, G., Liu, F., Liu, W., Liu, S., Chen, Y., and Xu, D. (2021). “Effects of information quality on information adoption on social media review platforms: moderating role of perceived risk,” *Data Science and Management* 1 (1), 13-22.
- Jin, S. V. and Youn, S. (2022). “They bought it, therefore I will buy it’: The effects of peer users’ conversion as sales performance and entrepreneurial sellers’ number of followers as relationship performance in mobile social commerce,” *Computers in Human Behavior* 131, 107212.
- Kim, Y. and Peterson, R. A. (2017). “A Meta-analysis of Online Trust Relationships in E-commerce,” *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 38, 44-54.

- Kock, N. (2015). "Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach," *International Journal of e-Collaboration (ijec)* 11 (4), 1-10.
- Lee, M. K. and Turban, E. (2001). "A trust model for consumer internet shopping," *International Journal of Electronic Commerce* 6 (1), 75-91.
- Lee, K. Y. and Yang, S. B. (2015). "The role of online product reviews on information adoption of new product development professionals," *Internet Research* 25 (3), 435-452.
- Leong, L. Y., Hew, T. S., Ooi, K. B., Chong, A. Y. L., and Lee, V. H. (2021). "Understanding trust in ms-commerce: The roles of reported experience, linguistic style, profile photo, emotional, and cognitive trust," *Information and Management* 58 (2), 103416.
- Li, C. Y. (2019). "How social commerce constructs influence customers' social shopping intention? An empirical study of a social commerce website," *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 144, 282-294.
- Li, S. and Wu, J. (2010). "Why some countries thrive despite corruption: The role of trust in the corruption–efficiency relationship," *Review of International Political Economy* 17 (1), 129-154.
- Liu, H., Wu, L., and Li, X. (2019). "Social media envy: How experience sharing on social networking sites drives millennials' aspirational tourism consumption," *Journal of Travel Research* 58 (3), 355-369.
- Mainolfi, G., Lo Presti, L. Marino, V. and Filieri, R. (2022). "YOU POST, I TRAVEL." Bloggers' credibility, digital engagement, and travelers' behavioral intention: The mediating role of hedonic and utilitarian motivations," *Psychology & Marketing* 39 (5), 1022-1034.
- Marinkovic, V. and Kalinic, Z. (2017). "Antecedents of customer satisfaction in mobile commerce: Exploring the moderating effect of customization," *Online Information Review* 41 (2), 138-154.
- McKnight, D. H., Choudhury, V., and Kacmar, C. (2002a). "Developing and validating trust measures for e-commerce: An integrative typology," *Information Systems Research* 13 (3), 334-359.
- McKnight, D. H., Choudhury, V., and Kacmar, C. (2002b). "The impact of initial consumer trust on intentions to transact with a web site: a trust building model," *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 11 (3-4), 297-323.
- McKnight, H. and Kacmar, C. (2006, January). "Factors of information credibility for an internet advice site," In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* 6, 113b-113b. IEEE.
- Meola, A. (2022). *Rise of M-Commerce: mobile ecommerce shopping stats & trends in 2020 business insider*. Retrieved October 14, 2022, from <https://www.businessinsider.com/mobile-commerce-shopping-trends-stats?op=1>.
- Nadeem, W., Khani, A. H., Schultz, C. D., Adam, N. A., Attar, R. W., and Hajli, N. (2020). "How social presence drives commitment and loyalty with online brand communities? the role of social commerce trust," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 55, 102136.
- Ng, C. S. P. (2013). "Intention to purchase on social commerce websites across cultures: A cross-regional study," *Information & Management* 50 (8), 609-620.
- Nicolaou, A. I., Ibrahim, M., and Van Heck, E. (2013). "Information quality, trust, and risk perceptions in electronic data exchanges," *Decision Support Systems* 54 (2), 986-996.
- Nilashi, M., Abumalloh, R. A., Alrizq, M., Alghamdi, A., Samad, S., Almulihi, A., ... and Mohd, S. (2022). "What is the impact of eWOM in social network sites on travel decision-making during the COVID-19 outbreak? A two-stage methodology," *Telematics and Informatics* 69, 101795.
- Peng, X., Zhao, Y. C., and Zhu, Q. (2016). "Investigating user switching intention for mobile instant messaging application: Taking WeChat as an example," *Computers in Human Behavior* 64, 206-216.
- Petty, R. E. and Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion*, Springer, New York.
- Petty, R. E., Cacioppo, J. T., and Goldman, R. (1981). "Personal involvement as a determinant of argument-based persuasion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 41 (5), 847.
- Preacher, K. J. and Leonardelli, G. J. (2001). *Calculation for the Sobel test*. URL: <https://quantpsy.org/sobel/sobel>
- Rejikumar, G., Asokan-Ajitha, A., Dinesh, S. and Jose, A. (2022). "The role of cognitive complexity

- and risk aversion in online herd behavior,” *Electronic Commerce Research* 22 (2), 585-621.
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S. and Becker, J. M. (2015). *SmartPLS 3. Bönningstedt: SmartPLS*. Retrieved from <https://www.smartpls.com/>
- Saprikis, V. and Avlogiaris, G. (2021). “Modeling users’ acceptance of mobile social commerce: the case of ‘Instagram checkout,” *Electronic Commerce Research* 1-30.
- Sardar, A., Manzoor, A., Shaikh, K. A., and Ali, L. (2021). “An empirical examination of the impact of eWom information on young consumers’ online purchase intention: Mediating role of eWom information adoption,” *SAGE Open* 11 (4).
- Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Cheah, J. H., Ting, H., Moisescu, O. I., and Radomir, L. (2020). “Structural model robustness checks in PLS-SEM,” *Tourism Economics* 26 (4), 531-554.
- Sarkar, S., Chauhan, S., and Khare, A. (2020). “A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of trust in mobile commerce,” *International Journal of Information Management* 50, 286-301.
- Stelzner, M. (2021). “The Rise of Social Commerce: Shopping on Facebook and Beyond”, Retrieved from 20 March, 2023, from: <https://www.socialmediaexaminer.com/the-rise-of-social-commerce-shopping-on-facebook-and-beyond/>
- Shafieizadeh, K. and Tao, C. W. W. (2020). “How does a menu's information about local food affect restaurant selection? The roles of corporate social responsibility, transparency, and trust,” *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 43, 232-240.
- Shen, X. L., Cheung, C. M., and Lee, M. K. (2013). “What leads students to adopt information from Wikipedia? An empirical investigation into the role of trust and information usefulness,” *British Journal of Educational Technology* 44 (3), 502-517.
- Shi, S. and Chow, W. S. (2015). “Trust development and transfer in social commerce: Prior experience as moderator,” *Industrial Management and Data Systems* 115 (7), 1182-1203.
- Stanley, H. (2022). “What is Social Commerce?” Definition and Guide., Retrieved from 25 March, 2023, from: <https://www.shopify.com/enterprise/social-commerce-trends>
- Sun, Q. and Xu, B. (2019). “Mobile Social Commerce: Current State and Future Directions,” *Journal of Global Marketing* 32 (5), 306-318.
- Sussman, S. W. and Siegal, W. S. (2003). “Informational influence in organizations: An integrated approach to knowledge adoption,” *Information Systems Research* 14 (1), 47-65.
- Tang, A. K. (2019). “A systematic literature review and analysis on mobile apps in m-commerce: Implications for future research,” *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications* 37, 100885.
- Tighe, D. (2022). “Consumers who bought an item after seeing it on social media in the U.S. 2022, by age”. Retrieved from 25 November, 2022, from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1260868/social-media-influence-on-shopping-by-generation-us/>
- Tseng, S. Y. and Wang, C. N. (2016). “Perceived risk influence on dual-route information adoption processes on travel websites,” *Journal of Business Research* 69 (6), 2289-2296.
- Uma, S. and Bougie, R. (2013). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*, 6th Editio., Wiley.
- Yahia, I. B., Al-Neama, N., and Kerbache, L. (2018). “Investigating the drivers for social commerce in social media platforms: Importance of trust, social support and the platform perceived usage,” *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 41, 11-19.
- Yang, X. (2019). “Consumers’ decisions in social commerce: the role of guanxi elements,” *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 31 (4), 759-772.
- Yeon, J., I. Park and Lee, D. (2019). “What creates trust and who gets loyalty in social commerce?,” *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 50, 138-144.
- Wang, Y. and C. Shah (2017). “Investigating failures in information seeking episodes,” *Aslib Journal of Information Management* 69 (4), 441-459.
- Xu, X. and Yao, Z. (2015). “Understanding the role of argument quality in the adoption of online reviews: An empirical study integrating value-based decision and needs theory,” *Online Information Review*, 39 (7), 885-902.
- Zhang, W. and Watts, S. A. (2008). “Capitalizing on content: Information adoption in two online communities,” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 9 (2), 73-94.

- Zhao, J. D., Huang, J. S. and Su, S. (2019). "The effects of trust on consumers' continuous purchase intentions in C2C social commerce: A trust transfer perspective," *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 50, 42-49.
- Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G. and Chen, Q. (2010). "Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and Truths about Mediation Analysis," *Journal of Consumer Research* 37 (3), 197-206.
- Zhou, T. (2021). "Understanding online health community users' information adoption intention: An elaboration likelihood model perspective," *Online Information Review* 46(1), 134-146.
- Zhu, D. H., Chang, Y. P. and Luo, J. J. (2016). "Understanding the influence of C2C communication on purchase decision in online communities from a perspective of information adoption model," *Telematics and Informatics* 33 (1), 8-16.