This is the published version of a paper presented at *17th International Conference e-Society 2019 (ES 2019), Utrecht, The Netherlands, April 11-13, 2019*. 

Citation for the original published paper:

Consumers’ Responses to Ads on Social Networking Sites: A Systematic Literature Review (SLR) 

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version: 
http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hh:diva-40375
CONSUMERS’ RESPONSES TO ADS ON SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW (SLR)
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ABSTRACT
A consequence of the growing number of the studies concerning ads on social networking sites, and the failure to provide an in-depth analysis of that stream of research is the need to adopt systematic approaches to assess and aggregate research outcomes. This article presents an up-to-date review of peer-reviewed relevant articles to consumers’ responses to advertisements on SNSs. It helps to identify 100 relevant studies published in the period 2009–2017 from different management and social science fields; including marketing, advertising, communication, social science, and relationship management. It reflects six predominate research trends; 1) Antecedents of acceptance or avoidance of ads 2) Consumers’ perception and assessment of ads’ value 3) consumers’ attitude towards ads 4) Consumers’ purchase intention 5) Consumers’ referral mechanism, and 6) Benefits gained. Also, the topics researched and major results, year of publication, journal, theoretical framework, research method, sampling, and means of analysis were examined for each article. It helps to provide an objective summary of research evidence on the antecedents of consumers’ responses to ads on social networking sites. It concludes by offering an agenda for future studies.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The central focus of this study is social networking sites (SNSs), which are mainly used to maintain private relationships and contacts such as Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter (Schrammel, Köffel & Tscheligi, 2009). In recent years, the increasingly widespread use of SNSs has gradually resulted in a shift in the advertising platforms from traditional media to those sites. Marketers aim to gain additional advantages from using SNSs such as spreading positive WOM (Zhang & Mao, 2016), building brand image and brand equity (Dehaghani & Tumer, 2015; Hanaysha, 2016), or enhancing purchase intention (Duffet, 2015a; Knoll & Schramm, 2015; Zhang & Mao, 2016). Besides, SNSs help companies to gain fresh, profound insights into what customers need and want (Kotler et al., 2016). In regard, scholars more frequently investigate a widening range of phenomena to explain ads on the social networking site (SNSAs) as a marketing tool.

Investigations about consumers’ responses to ads captured the interest of ad researchers’ long time ago (Olney, Holbrook & Batra, 1991). From the SNSs context, researchers used a wide range of research phenomena to explore different levels of consumers’ responses to SNSAs. They had different disciplines, they used a wide range of theory, and they were inevitably limited in scope regarding their flows and sampling variation. That results in some conflicting findings. In such a situation, it is not always clear what the overall picture is, or which results are more reliable and should be used as the basis for theory and management decision. Yet, there is no evidence of existing studies providing an in-depth analysis of this research context. Most all the existing literature reviews concerned online advertising (e.g., Cho & Khang, 2006; Kim & McMillan, 2008), or investigated bodies of research related to ads on social media in general, such as Knoll’s (2016) study, which reviewed ads on social media up to 2014. In this regard, the primary purpose of this article is to provide an in-depth analysis of investigations into the consumers’ responses to SNSAs. Also, it aimed to identify the major trends and areas of deficit in investigating this research field. Accordingly, the research question proposed is as follow:

1. What are the major research trends and areas of deficit in articles concerning the consumers’ responses to SNSAs?
2. SELECTION OF ARTICLES

A search was conducted through two multiple bibliographic databases (OneSearch & Scopus). In addition to reviewing some of the top marketing journals. The OneSearch database was selected as it is a Halmstad University mega index database containing the majority of resources from Emerald, IEEE Xplore, Inderscience publishers, JSTOR, Libris, Sage journals online, ScienceDirect, Taylor & Francis online, SpringerLink, Web of Science, Wiley online library, and others. To ensure the relevance of the collected studies to SNSAs, they were required to contain the term ‘advertise’ (e.g., advertising, advertiser, ads, ad, advertisement, or marketing promotion) in their titles in one of three search fields. In the second search field, the articles were required to contain one of the following terms in their titles: ‘social networking sites,’ ‘social network site,’ ‘social media,’ ‘online social network’, ‘Facebook, or ‘Twitter.’ Finally, the term ‘Facebook’ was searched throughout the text of the articles because it is currently among the most popular SNSs: The name of this site is in almost all the articles on SNSs and is sometimes used in the title, abstract, or keywords. This criterion ensured that the articles selected also contained a reference to SNSs. The search was limited to full text, peer-reviewed academic papers in management domain and social science subjects, such as ‘advertising’, ‘marketing’, ‘public relation’, ‘communication management’, ‘social science’, ‘purchase intention’, ‘brand awareness,’ and so on. Peer-reviewed journals were considered based on their knowledge validity and their highest impact on the research field (Podsakoff et al., 2005). The search revealed 398 articles, which were further limited to those directly related to testing a sort of consumers’ responses. Also, articles examined other media-type not SNSs were excluded (e.g., Miller & Lammas 2012; Smith, Fischer & Yongjian, 2012). After applying this criterion, the final dataset comprised a shortlist of 100 articles from 29 countries that were published between 2009 and 2017.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Journals and years of publication

All the 100 articles identified were published from 2009 to 2017 (see Figure 1). The most significant number of publications was recorded for the year 2017 (25 articles, 25%). Moreover, the majority of these articles (75%) were published during the last four years (2014–2017). These facts notably highlight the trend of an increasing number of journal publications concerning the consumers’ responses to SNSAs. This growing trend in the publications indicates the importance of this area and increasing awareness among researchers investigating SNSs. SNSs is still a relatively new phenomenon that is continually changing (Khang, Ki & Ye, 2012). These facts serve to highlight the value of up-to-date review, as recommended by Knoll (2016).

Looking at the journal outlets (see table 1), the 100 articles were published in 68 journals. 85.3% of the total were journals specialized in different business and marketing disciplines such as general marketing (18 Journals), management and business (22 Journals), advertising (5 Journals), consumer behavior (4 Journals), Electronic Commerce (4 Journals), and communication (5 Journals). The remaining 51 articles were published in different 51 journals. This diversity indicates that there is not a high concentration of research in this field within a specific journal.
Table 1. Journal outlets of publication about consumers’ responses to SNSAs per year (2009-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. American Behavioral Scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. American Journal of Marketing Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asian Pacific Public Relation Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Asian Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication Research Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Computers in Human Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Electronic Commerce Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. European Journal of Business and Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. IEEE Digital Explorer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Information and Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Int. J. Business Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Int. J. Electronic Marketing and Retailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Int. J. Internet Marketing and Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. International Business Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. International Journal of Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. International Journal of Business and Management Invention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. International Journal of Consumer Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. International Journal of Information Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. International Journal of Market Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. International Journal of Marketing Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. International Marketing Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Internet Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Journal of Advertising Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Journal of Business and Retail Management Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Journal of Business Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Journal of Competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Journal of Consumer Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Journal of Creative Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Journal of Current Issues &amp; Research in Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Journal of Electronic Commerce Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Journal of Global Fashion Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Journal of Interactive Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Journal of Interactive Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Journal of Marketing Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Journal of Marketing Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Journal of Marketing Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Journal of promotion management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Journal of Retailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Online Information Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Problems and Perspectives in Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Procedia Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Psychology &amp; Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Service Marketing Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. The international journal of cybemetics, systems and management sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. The Journal of Applied Business Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. The Journal of Business Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. The Romanian Economic Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Young Consumers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Zagreb International Review of Economics &amp; Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Publications Per Year: 1 1 4 11 8 15 19 16 25 100
3.2 Country of Affiliation

The 100 articles identified were affiliated with institutions in 33 different countries, as shown in Figure 2. According to the findings, researchers from US institutions published the highest amount of publications per country of affiliation (22 articles, 22% of the total publications).

Moreover, researchers from the European institutions had 34 articles (34% of the total), Netherlands (8 articles), Belgium (5 articles), Spain (4 articles), Turkey and Portugal (3 articles each), Austria, Sweden and UK (2 articles each), and Bulgaria, Cyprus, Ireland and France (1 article each).

That was followed by researchers from the Asian institutions published 33 articles (33% of the total), India, Pakistan, and Taiwan (6 articles each), Malaysia and South Korea (4 articles each), then China (2 articles) and Bangladesh, Iran, Indonesia, Singapore, and Vietnam (1 article each).

Researchers from Africans and Middle East institutions followed the European institutions by publishing 12 articles (12% of the total). African and the Middle East institutions led by South African (4 articles), Chana (2 articles), then Dubai, Jordan, Kenya, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia and Syria (one article each). Finally, researchers from the Australian institutions published three article in 2012, 2014 and 2017.

3.3 Research Topics

Based on the primary subjects the author(s) aimed to examine in their articles, and the steps of consumers’ responses to ads as presented in the association model of the advertising communication process (Preston, 1982) the body of research concerning the consumers’ responses to SNSAs is classified into six main research trends as follow;

3.3.1 Acceptance and Avoidance of Ads

Seventeen articles (17 % of the total) investigated factors encouraging or inhibiting ads-clicking on SNSs. Zeng, Huang and Dou (2009) were the first to write about this research trend, followed by (Kelly, Kerr & Drennan, 2010; Hadija, Barnes & Hair, 2012; Li, Lee & Lien, 2012; Barreto, 2013; Gironda & Korgaonkar, 2014; Li, Lin & Chiu, 2014; Mahalangu, 2014; Mir, 2014; Aguirre et al., 2015; De Keyzer, Dens and De Pelsmacker, 2015; Mir, 2015; Pinho & Soares, 2015; Kim, Kang, Choi & Sung, 2016; Van den Broeck, Poels & Walrave, 2017; Lee et al., 2017; Mir, 2017).

3.3.2 Perception & Assessment of Ads’ Value

Fourteen articles (14 % of the total) had a focus on testing factors’ predicting consumers’ beliefs toward SNSAs. According to the different aims of the articles under this research trend, authors were either concerned about the assessments of ads’ value or to explore users’ perception toward specific constructs such as trust, value corruption, consumer boundaries, image belief, or media types. The assessment of ads’ value was addressed by nine articles (Logan, Bright & Gangadharbta, 2012, Saxena & Khanna, 2013; Dao et al., 2014; Dar et al., 2014; Deraz, Awuah & Abrah, 2015a; Deraz, Awuah & Abrah, 2015b; Haida & Rahim 2015; Martínez-Navarro & Bigné 2017; Shareef et al. 2017). While the other four studies explored different constructs such as trust (Abdelkkaader, 2013), beliefs (Natarajan et al., 2014; Beuckels, Cauberghe & Hudders, 2017), feelings (Morris, Choi & Ju, 2016), and advertising literacy (Lawlor, Dunne & Rowley, 2016).
3.3.3 The Consumers’ Attitude towards SNSAs

The third research trend involved antecedents influencing consumers’ attitude toward SNSAs. It focuses on individuals’ cognitive response which represents the verbal statements of belief (Jain, 2014). This trend of research is the most dominant. Twenty four articles (24% of the total) investigated the cognitive antecedents of SNSAs as perceived by SNSs’ users (see Chi, 2011; Chu, 2011; Taylor, Lewin & Strutton, 2011; Kamal & Chu, 2012; Mir, 2012 Beauchamp, 2013; Yaakop, Marhana, and Khaitijah, 2013; Gaber & Wright, 2014; Sabri & Michel, 2014; Celebi, 2015; Luna-Nevarrez & Torres, 2015; Boerman & Kruikemeier, 2016; Can & Kaya, 2016; Jung et al., 2016; Kim, Jeong & Hwang, 2016; Shen et al., 2016; Singh, 2016; Walrave et al., 2016; Cole, DeNardin & Clow, 2017; Dondolo, 2017; Ferreira & Barbosa, 2017; Mukherjee & Banerjee, 2017; Tran, 2017; Wang & Haung, 2017).

3.3.4 Consumers’ Intention to Purchase

The fourth research trend involved antecedents influencing consumers’ intention to purchase advertised products on SNSs. This trend of research is the second dominant one. It had twenty two articles (22% of the total) (see Bhakuni & Aronki, 2012; Chang, Chen & Tan, 2012; Miller & Lammas, 2012; Yousif, 2012; Chu, Kamal & Kim, 2013; Okazaki & Taylor, 2013; Tan, Kwek & Li, 2013; Campbell, Ferraro & Sands, 2014; van Noort, Anthuonis & Verlegh, 2014; Voorveld & van Noort, 2014; Boateng & Okoe, 2015; Dehghani & Tumer, 2015; Duffett, 2015a; Eleboda & Majekodunmi, 2015; Zhang & Peng, 2015; Lee & Hong, 2016; Zhang & Mao, 2016; Hajarian et al., 2017; John et al., 2017; Kim, Seely & Jung, 2017; Rambe & Jafeta, 2017; Thornhill, Xie & Lee, 2017; Vanwesenbeeck, Ponnet & Walrave, 2017; Vassileva, 2017; Zarouali et al., 2017).

3.3.5 Consumers’ Referral Intention

The SNSs users’ referral intention to share, forward, recommend, or comment on SNSAs is the fifth trend of research that was investigated by some researchers. Sixten articles (16 % of the total) mainly focused on factors predicting the consumers’ referral mechanism on SNSs and their intention to engage in WOM (see Royo-Vela & Casamassima, 2011; De Vries, Gensler & Leeflang, 2012; Clark & Çalli, 2014; Liu, 2014; Okazaki, Rubio & Campo, 2014; Kim, Lee & Yoon, 2015; Knoll & Schramm, 2015; Lin, Li & Wu, 2015; Hayes, King & Ramirez Jr., 2016; Ketelaar et al., 2016; Arli & Dietrich, 2017; Boerman, Willemsen & Van Der Aa, 2017; Tinko, 2017).

3.3.6 Gained Benefits

The last identified research trend is the gained benefits of using SNSs as advertising platforms. Just five studies had the main focus on this research trend. They investigated the role of SNSAs in creating brand awareness and brand equity (Alhaddad, 2015; Duffet, 2015b; Hanaysha, 2016), the role of building corporate image on Facebook users’ behavioural response to SNSAs (Amegbe, Owino & Kerubo, 2017), and the role of Facebook ads to gain customer relationship management and to promote new products (Ertunga, 2017).

3.4 Theoretical Framework

One of the aims of reviewing the literature is to establish the type of theory(s) used to examine the questions in a related study. According to the coding process, 65 articles (65% of total) used an explicit theoretical framework, presented testable hypotheses or generalizations based on theory, or derived theory from systematic observations. Researchers investigated 25 different theories; the most used theories were as follows:


2. Ducoffe’s (1995, 1996) model of ads’ value (9 articles) (see Logan, Bright & Gangadhar-batla, 2012; Saxena & Khanna, 2013; Dar et al., 2014; Deraz, Awuah & Abraha 2015a; Deraz, Awuah & Abraha 2015b; Haida & Rahim, 2015; Natarajan et al., 2015; Jung et al., 2016; Shareef et al., 2017).

3. Pollay and Mittal’s (1993) advertising beliefs and attitudes model (5 articles) (see Kamal & Chu, 2012; Natarajan et al., 2014; Mir, 2015; Natarajan et al., 2015; Dondolo, 2017).


6. Consumer behavior theories (3 articles) (see Chu, Kamal & Kim, 2013; Gironda & Korgaonkar, 2014; Boateng & Okoe, 2015).
8. Theory of reasoned action (3 articles) (see Kim, Lee & Yoon, 2015; Lee & Hong, 2016; Zhang & Mao, 2016)
11. Media richness theory (2 articles) (see Liu, 2014; Rambe & Jafeta, 2017).

4. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RESEARCH AGENDA

This study is the most up-to-date (to December 2017) systematic literature review regarding SNSAs. This study aims to review all possible academic, and peer-reviewed articles address the consumers’ responses to SNSAs. This review extends knowledge from existing reviews on online advertising (Cho & Khang, 2006) and advertising in social media (Khang, Ki & Ye, 2012; Knoll, 2016) by focusing explicitly on SNSAs. Other types of social media, such as YouTube, and research on private online communities were excluded from this review. In this respect, this review ends by providing a conclusion on each part of the analysis, and finally sets a research agenda for neglected research topics and theoretical and methodological issues.

4.1 Journals and Years of Publication

As only two of the 100 articles investigated were published before 2011 (see Figure 1), research related to consumers’ responses to SNSAs can be considered a relatively new field. As in the field of social media, the area of researching ads has only recently been developed (Knoll, 2016), and is still a relatively new phenomenon that is continually changing (Khang, Ki & Ye, 2012). These facts serve to highlight the value of up-to-date review, as recommended by Knoll (2016). Moreover, Figure 1 notably highlights the trend of an increasing number of journal publications concerning consumers’ responses to SNSAs. This growing trend in the publications especially the last year (2017 has 25 % of the total) indicates the importance of this area and awareness among scholars to investigate.

By looking at the journal outlets (Table 1 in the appendix), we can see that the 100 articles have been published in 68 journals. 85.3% of those journals were journals specialized in different business and marketing disciplines such as general marketing (18 Journals), management and business (22 Journals), advertising (5 Journals), consumer behavior (4 Journals), Electronic Commerce (4 Journals), and communication (5 Journals). There were also 10 journals (14.7%) in other disciplines such as the economy, fashion, electronic engineering, social science, engineering management, banking, internet research, psychology, information system and so forth. This diversity indicates that there is not a high concentration of research in this field within a specific journal. In general, the small number of articles in this research area and the variety of journals suggest that extensive research is still required to develop knowledge concerning consumers’ relation to SNSAs as one of the new marketing tools.

4.2 Country of Affiliation

By looking at figure 2, it is clear that researchers were mainly limited to specific affiliations from few countries. That affects the frame of a sample of those studies to be limited to the countries of these affiliations. By considering the effect of culture on SNSs users’ behaviour toward SNSAs (see Deraz, Awuah & Abraha, 2015b; Kamal & Chu, 2012; Kim, Jeong & Hwang, 2016) future research could contribute by replicating such studies with more national culture for supporting or negating the existing knowledge, or even by conducting more multi-nationals studies. Also, by replicating the recent findings in cross-cultural studies, we will be able to compare results and to attribute potential differences to culture.

4.3 Research Populations & Non-Student Samples

Regarding sampling methods, all the 96 empirical studies identified used non-probability sampling methods; mainly they used conventional methods to target SNS users. Using convenience methods is logical because of
the difficulties encountered in generating a random sample from online communities (Sheehan, 2002). However, around 58.3% of those empirical studies employed convenient samples in the form of college students and adolescents, who are certainly not representative of all SNS users. As a result, their findings are limited to a certain population that only represents around 25% of the active users of SNSs (Statista, 2015). This limitation may lead to misguiding results concerning SNSAs.

Furthermore, most of the studies identified targeted a specific sampling frame. As a result, the findings often seem applicable only to a particular kind of social media, a specific sample, and a specific situation. Thus, future research concerning SNSAs could widen the frame of reference by drawing on larger samples (nationally and internationally), and by addressing users of different ages and demographic profiles.

### 4.4 Main Contributions of the Collected Data

The following discussion presents the main contributions that may affect the body of research regarding SNSAs.

#### 4.4.1 The Effect of Ad-Types

Clark and Çalli’s (2014) study is the first article in this review that highlighted the impact of ad-types on Facebook users referral behavior. However, since 2016, scholars gave more intention to compare the impact of different ad-types on the consumers’ responses to SNSAs (see. Boerman & Kruinkemier, 2016; Kim, Jeong & Hwang, 2016; Jung et al., 2016; De Keyzer, Dens & Warlave, 2017; Ferreira & Barbosa, 2017; Tran, 2017; Zraouali et al., 2017; Kim, Seely & Jun; Tinko, 2017).

In sum, all those studies confirmed that SNSs’ users have divergent responses to SNSAs’ based on different ad-types. With extend, it is not logic to investigate SNSAs in a general question, but we need to be more specific to an identified ad-type while investigating SNSAs. If we do not target specific ad-type, respondents will answer based on their understanding of the ad-type interpreted in their minds. For example, one of them may answer as it is a sponsored story, another as it is re-targeted ad, and the third as it is check-in-ad. That misunderstanding may lead the respondents to give different answers to the same question, which will affect the gained knowledge. Also, we need to identify primary constructs that have effects on each ad-type specifically. That will help future researchers to gain deeper insight, as it will help marketing planners to organize more effective campaigns.

#### 4.4.2 Defining the Main Constructs

By looking at the collected studies, we can easily observe that researchers used serval definitions to define a specific construct. They used different items to measure the same construct, which may affect the gained knowledge. For example; Chang, Chen, and Tan (2012), and Lee and Hong (2016) used the construct of purchase intention to explain ads’ effectiveness. On the other hand, Li, Lee, and Lien (2012) and Li, Lin and Chiu (2014) used the construct of click-through-rate to explain ads effectiveness. Moreover, Vooroveld and van Noort (2014), and Wang and Huang (2017) used cognitive response attitude as a construct to explain ads’ effectiveness. Finally, Ertugan (2017) tested ads effectiveness by its ability to spread information. All these ways are applicable, but they may give different results, and shows that scholars did not follow the same coherence. For that, the research committee of SNSAs needs to give precise definitions to the main constructs related to SNSAs. That way may reduce the contradictory findings and may help future researchers to have clear related definitions.

#### 4.4.3 Distinguish between Different Types of Social Media

Up-to-date, researchers keep mixing between social media and social networking sites. According to Schrammel, Köffel, and Tscheleli (2009; 277), social media is classified into four main types:

- **Business Networking Sites:** Which are mainly used to maintain and administer existing and new business contacts such as LinkedIn and private business networks.
- **Social Networks:** Which are used to maintain private relationships and contacts such as Facebook and Twitter.
- **Content and Media Sharing Networks:** With a significant focus on sharing content with others and not on maintaining relationships such as Flickr and YouTube.
- **Social News and Bookmarking Sites:** Such as delicious.com and dig.com, which are used to share and discover entertaining links to news and contents on the web.
So, all the four types are under the umbrella of SM, but researchers found that different types of SM influence consumers’ response to ads each media carries (Prendergast et al., 2009; Dao et al., 2014). Each type possesses own distinct image, personality, and characteristics (Clemons, 2009). Thus, it is not logical to generalize the findings of SM while investigating one of the above types. We need to investigate each type independently, not to research SNSs and bring findings from research about YouTube. Off-course that way of mixing the findings may lead to contradictory findings. To avoid that, future researchers need to be more focus on what they are investigating, not mixing the findings from all the types together. Also, researchers and marketing planners have to focus on each type to find media that receive a more favorable response from the online users, and to gain deeper insights about crucial predictors of each of those media in specific.

4.4.4 Unconfirmed Constructs

To create knowledge about the online users’ response to SNSAs we have a lot to do. Researchers keep exploring new constructs, but we have a lot of these constructs just have been tested once, and others show adverse effects. We need to keep our eyes on these constructs to confirm their effects on SNSs users’ response, and to gain more insights about the refused once. For example, celebrity endorsement as social context ads has a positive influence on the online users’ impression towards SNSAs (Hadija, Barnes & Hair, 2012; Li, Lee & Lien, 2012; Li, Lin & Chiu, 2014). However, when it moderated the effect of sponsored Facebook ads on the users’ persuasion knowledge, it causes SNS’s users to develop distrusting beliefs about that post, which in turn decreases their intention to engage in eWOM (Boerman, Willemsen and Van Der Aa, 2017). As a research community, we need to understand better the reasons behind those different effects of celebrity endorsement. Is it increase the credibility of ads or develop the distracting beliefs?

4.5 Limitations

There are two primary constraints and research issues that can be addressed in further studies. First, this study aimed to review all related studies concerning consumers’ response to SNSAs and searched a broad range of keywords within two central databases. However, it is difficult to be confident that the 100 articles identified to represent the full range of relevant scholarly publications. Second, this study focused on SNSAs within the broad management domain and did not consider previous studies of communication systems from information technology backgrounds and other studies that not focus on the SNSs’ response. Thus, future reviews might explicitly focus on the use of SNSAs without any such limitations.
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