



Instagram Advertising Value as a Driver of Behavioral Intentions toward Healthy Food Products: The Mediating Role of Customer Experience and Healthy Eating Value

Dominic Wong¹, Juniarty^{2*}

^{1,2} Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Email: 01011230098@student.uph.edu¹ Juniarty.fe@uph.edu²

*Penulis Korespondensi: Juniarty.fe@uph.edu

Abstract. This study examines how social media advertising stimuli shape advertising value, customer experience, healthy-eating values, attitude, and behavioral intentions in Indonesia. Grounded in the Stimulus-Organism-Response framework, the model tests 13 hypotheses comprising 18 structural paths. A quantitative cross-sectional online survey collected data through purposive sampling from January to July 2026. Of 455 responses, 400 were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling in SmartPLS 4. The findings support 15 of the 18 paths. Informativeness was the strongest determinant of advertising value, followed by incentives, entertainment, credibility, and perceived personalization, whereas irritation had a negative effect. Advertising value improved customer experience, which enhanced utilitarian and hedonic healthy-eating values, attitude, and consumption intention. Both healthy-eating values strengthened attitude, while attitude increased interaction and consumption intentions. However, customer experience did not predict purchase intention, attitude did not influence purchase intention, and consumption intention did not translate into purchase intention. The respondent profile helps explain this pattern: most participants were young, urban, frequent Instagram users, while promotions attracted the greatest attention and long or non-skippable advertisements created the most irritation. The low explained variance in purchase intention indicates that favorable advertising responses are insufficient to generate transactions. Price, affordability, product availability, trust, perceived risk, and behavioral control may be required to bridge this gap. The study extends advertising-value and S-O-R research by positioning customer experience as a mechanism connecting advertising evaluation with healthy-eating responses. Practically, healthy-food marketers should combine credible information and incentives with transparent prices, accessible purchasing channels, and low-friction conversion mechanisms.

Keywords: Advertising Value; Behavioral Intentions; Customer Experience; Healthy-Eating Value; Instagram Advertising.

1. INTRODUCTION

Instagram advertising places healthy-food messages within a competitive environment of entertainment, creator content, and commercial promotions. The research problem is not simply whether users see these messages, but whether they interpret them as valuable and connect them with meaningful consumption decisions. An Indonesian study of food and beverage advertising shows the importance of examining the nutritional implications of digital promotion (Guo et al., 2025). Research on food communication also distinguishes the reach of a message from audience engagement, making exposure an insufficient indicator of effectiveness (Avelino et al., 2024).

Healthy-food advertising faces an additional challenge: an appealing message can generate attention without stimulating a purchase. Food-media research demonstrates that functional framing and affective presentation can shape engagement in different ways (Pancer et al., 2022a, 2022b). A useful explanation must therefore consider what the advertisement communicates, how consumers experience it, and which intended response follows. Platform interaction, dietary readiness, and purchase intention should be examined separately because they involve different commitments and practical requirements.

Advertising value captures the perceived usefulness or worth of a commercial message (Ducoffe, 1995). In healthy-food communication, prior research connects perceived advertising value and attitudes with consumer responses (Cuesta-Valiño et al., 2020). However, this relationship does not fully describe how a valued message becomes an experiential encounter. Customer experience provides the missing conceptual link: consumers may respond cognitively, emotionally, behaviorally, and socially to the same advertisement (Becker & Jaakkola, 2020). Social media evidence likewise positions experience and consumer benefits as relevant mechanisms connecting marketing activities with subsequent evaluations (Wibowo et al., 2021; Zollo et al., 2020).

This study examines six advertising characteristics—informativeness, entertainment, credibility, irritation, perceived personalization, and incentives—as antecedents of advertising value. It then considers customer experience, utilitarian and hedonic healthy-eating value, and advertising attitude as mechanisms associated with interaction, consumption, and purchase intentions. The contribution is the joint differentiation of experiential processing and three behavioral intentions among Indonesian Instagram users. This distinction permits a more precise assessment of where favorable communication responses are associated with readiness to act and where the proposed sequence remains empirically weak.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Advertising Value And The S–O–R Framework

The advertising value model treats usefulness as a consumer judgment rather than an advertiser performance metric (Ducoffe, 1995). Informativeness helps users assess products, entertainment makes exposure enjoyable, and credibility supports belief in the message. Irritation imposes an experiential cost. Personalization can increase relevance, while incentives provide an immediate reason to consider an offer. Research on perceived personalization distinguishes the elements that make an advertisement feel personally relevant (De Keyzer et al., 2022). These characteristics are conceptually separate antecedents, rather than interchangeable indicators of advertising value.

In the present model, the six advertising characteristics constitute the most concrete stimuli. Social media advertising value is an initial cognitive appraisal of those stimuli. Customer experience, utilitarian and hedonic healthy eating values, and attitude are organism states because they describe internal responses generated during interpretation of the advertisement. Interaction, consumption, and purchase intentions are responses because they represent approach-oriented behavioral readiness. Advertising value is placed at the boundary between stimulus and organism: it summarizes the perceived qualities of the advertising environment while simultaneously reflecting the consumer's appraisal. This staged

representation is theoretically preferable to treating every construct as an independent predictor of intention because it makes the psychological process explicit.

The first six hypotheses specify positive relationships from informativeness (H1), entertainment (H2), credibility (H3), personalization (H5), and incentives (H6) to advertising value, and a negative relationship from irritation (H4). In healthy-food advertising, the balance between information and intrusion is particularly relevant: useful content may lose value if its presentation disrupts the user. Research linking personalization, informativeness, privacy concern, and flow experience to advertising attitudes supports attention to the quality of the encounter (Mo et al., 2023).

Customer Experience And Healthy-Eating Value

Customer experience refers here to responses arising while encountering healthy-food advertising, rather than satisfaction after consuming a product. Becker and Jaakkola (2020) distinguish experience from narrower evaluative constructs. Wibowo et al. (2021) and Zollo et al. (2020) likewise support examining experience alongside social media marketing activities and consumer benefits. H7 proposes that advertising value is positively associated with customer experience: a useful and credible advertisement should provide a more meaningful encounter.

Utilitarian value captures the instrumental benefits associated with healthy eating, while hedonic value captures enjoyment and anticipated pleasure. Their distinction prevents useful information from being equated with an enjoyable experience. Research on immersive digital experiences examines both forms of value as mechanisms connecting experience with continued engagement (Rodríguez-Ardura et al., 2024). Evidence on food purchase intentions also supports considering utilitarian and hedonic evaluations jointly (Bai et al., 2024). H8a and H8b propose positive relationships from customer experience to utilitarian and hedonic healthy-eating value, respectively.

A functional benefit supplies a reason to approve an advertisement, whereas anticipated enjoyment can make its recommendation attractive. H9a and H9b therefore specify positive relationships from utilitarian and hedonic value to attitude. H10 proposes an additional direct relationship from customer experience to attitude, recognizing that the encounter may influence evaluation beyond these two benefits. Research on healthy-food consumer experience and co-creation provides related contextual support, although it does not establish the exact advertising paths examined here (Meeprom et al., 2023).

Attitude and Differentiated Behavioral Intentions

The attitude–intention logic draws on Ajzen (1991), without claiming to test the full theory of planned behavior because subjective norms and perceived behavioral control are absent. The attitude object is healthy-food advertising; the response objects are interaction,

consumption, and purchase. Their imperfect correspondence is consequential. A user can appreciate an advertisement without planning to purchase its product, and a general healthy-eating intention need not imply a transaction with a particular seller.

H11a and H11b specify positive direct relationships from customer experience to purchase and consumption intentions. H12a, H12b, and H12c specify positive relationships from attitude to interaction, consumption, and purchase intentions. H13 proposes that consumption intention is positively associated with purchase intention. Social media advertising research identifies engagement as a potential mechanism connecting advertising with purchase intention (Supotthamjaree & Srinaruewan, 2021), while research on digital persuasion also examines psychological routes to purchase readiness (Dong et al., 2021). These arguments motivate the hypotheses without treating engagement as equivalent to buying.

Practical conditions may interrupt this sequence. Organic-food and healthy-food studies examine attitudes and purchase intentions in relation to additional consumer determinants (Bazhan et al., 2024; Escobar-Farfán et al., 2025). Research on sustainable diets identifies external constraints relevant to the intention–behavior gap (Fink et al., 2021). The present model therefore tests a bounded communication process; it does not presume that favorable psychological responses overcome affordability, availability, or competing household priorities.

3. METHODS

This study used a quantitative, cross-sectional design to test the proposed Stimulus-Organism-Response model. Primary data were collected in Indonesia from January to July 2026 through an online, self-administered questionnaire administered to consumers who had encountered social media advertising for healthy food products. A total of 455 responses were collected. After data screening, 400 usable responses were retained for analysis. The respondents were relatively balanced by gender, comprising 51.1% women and 48.9% men. The sample was predominantly young, with 39.4% aged 18–23 years and 31.2% aged 23–28 years. Thus, 70.6% of the respondents were below 29 years of age. Most respondents lived within Greater Jakarta, particularly Jakarta (39.2%), Bekasi (17.7%), Tangerang (14.7%), Bogor (12.0%), and Depok (10.0%). Only 6.5% lived outside Greater Jakarta. Bachelor's degree holders constituted the largest educational group (44.9%), followed by high-school graduates (22.4%) and diploma holders (17.5%). Students (28.2%) and private-sector employees (27.7%) represented the two largest occupational groups. Monthly expenditure was primarily concentrated between IDR 2 million and IDR 5 million. Regarding Instagram behavior, 62.9% used the platform for one to four hours per day, while 70.0% encountered healthy food advertisements either daily or several times per week. Promotions or discounts

attracted the largest proportion of respondents (44.6%), whereas advertisements that were excessively long or could not be skipped were the most frequently reported source of irritation (36.9%). Purposive sampling was employed to ensure that participants could evaluate the advertising, experiential, attitudinal, and behavioral constructs. Multi-item measures were adapted from established studies and rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The model included six advertising stimuli (informativeness, entertainment, credibility, irritation, perceived advertising personalization, and incentives), five organism variables (advertising value, customer experience, utilitarian and hedonic healthy-eating value, and attitude), and three behavioral responses (interaction, consumption, and purchase intentions). The 13 hypotheses comprised 18 structural paths because H8, H9, H11, and H12 contained sub hypotheses.

Data were analyzed using SmartPLS 4 and partial least squares structural equation modeling. Measurement assessment considered outer loadings, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio. The structural assessment examined inner VIF, R^2 , f^2 , bootstrapped coefficients, t statistics, and p values. The significance threshold was $p < 0.05$. Measurement quality and structural relationships were assessed separately to distinguish the adequacy of the indicators from the explanatory contribution of the hypothesized paths.

The cross-sectional, self-reported design supports analysis of associations rather than temporal or causal identification. The structural paths evaluate the proposed sequence of advertising appraisal, customer experience, healthy-eating value, and behavioral intentions. Specific indirect effects and their bootstrap confidence intervals are not reported; mediation therefore remains a theoretical proposition rather than a confirmed empirical finding. Interpretation is restricted to the estimated direct relationships and the variance explained in each endogenous construct.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Measurement Model

All 57 retained indicators loaded satisfactorily on their assigned constructs. Outer loadings ranged from .729 to .901, exceeding the recommended .70 benchmark. Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.757 to 0.879, composite reliability (ρ_C) from 0.860 to 0.914, and average variance extracted from 0.612 to 0.727. These values support internal consistency and convergent validity. Discriminant validity was supported because every HTMT value was below 0.90; the largest value was 0.689 between hedonic and utilitarian healthy-eating value.

Table 1 reports the reliability and convergent-validity statistics for all 14 constructs. The HTMT matrix has a maximum of 0.689 between hedonic and utilitarian value, below the reported 0.90 criterion. This supports treating the two values as empirically distinguishable within the analyzed sample. The reliability evidence does not, by itself, resolve possible common-method bias or establish that the measures operate equivalently across demographic groups.

Table 1. Measurement Model Assessment

Construct	α	ρC	AVE
Attitude toward healthy-food social media advertising	0.870	0.911	0.720
Credibility	0.847	0.896	0.683
Customer experience	0.879	0.912	0.674
Entertainment	0.839	0.891	0.673
Hedonic healthy eating value	0.757	0.860	0.673
Incentives	0.876	0.914	0.727
Informativeness	0.850	0.898	0.688
Intention to consume healthy food	0.856	0.902	0.698
Intention to interact with social media advertising	0.834	0.889	0.668
Intention to buy healthy food products	0.856	0.888	0.666
Irritation	0.860	0.905	0.704
Perceived advertising personalization	0.874	0.904	0.612
Social media advertising value	0.826	0.885	0.657
Utilitarian healthy eating value	0.790	0.876	0.702

Structural Explanatory Power

For the 18 prespecified paths, inner VIF values ranged from 1.000 to 1.593, indicating that collinearity did not threaten the path estimates. The model explained 57.6% of the variance in social media advertising value and 37.2% of the variance in intention to consume healthy food. Explanatory power was smaller for the remaining endogenous constructs and was particularly low for intention to buy healthy food products ($R^2 = 0.015$).

Table 2. Coefficients Of Determination

Endogenous Construct	R^2
Social media advertising value	0.576
Intention to consume healthy food	0.372
Attitude toward healthy food social media advertising	0.293
Utilitarian healthy eating value	0.173
Intention to interact with social media advertising	0.154
Customer experience	0.144
Hedonic healthy eating value	0.129
Intention to buy healthy food products	0.015

The results distinguish explanation of advertising value from explanation of transactions. Although the six stimuli account for 57.6% of advertising-value variance, only 14.4% of customer-experience variance is explained by advertising value. Other features of the encounter may therefore matter. Purchase intention has the lowest R^2 , at 0.015, indicating limited explanatory coverage. These are in-sample explanatory statistics; predictive performance cannot be inferred without an out-of-sample assessment.

Hypothesis testing

Bootstrapping supported 15 of the 18 path-level tests contained in H1-H13. All six advertising characteristics significantly predicted social media advertising value in the expected direction. Informativeness, incentives, entertainment, credibility, and personalization had positive coefficients, while irritation had the hypothesized negative coefficient. Advertising value positively predicted customer experience, which in turn predicted both healthy-eating value dimensions, attitude, and intention to consume healthy food. Customer experience did not directly predict purchase intention.

Table 3. Structural Model Results

H	Structural relationship	β	t	p	f ²	Decision
H1	INF $\rightarrow$ AV	0.364	10.806	0.001	0.301	Supported
H2	ENT $\rightarrow$ AV	0.316	9.673	0.001	0.229	Supported
H3	CRE $\rightarrow$ AV	0.310	10.002	0.001	0.225	Supported
H4	IRR $\rightarrow$ AV	-0.243	6.766	0.001	0.135	Supported
H5	PAP $\rightarrow$ AV	0.274	7.402	0.001	0.173	Supported
H6	INC $\rightarrow$ AV	0.340	9.149	0.001	0.269	Supported
H7	AV $\rightarrow$ CX	0.379	7.277	0.001	0.168	Supported
H8a	CX $\rightarrow$ UTI	0.416	7.978	0.001	0.210	Supported
H8b	CX $\rightarrow$ HED	0.359	7.782	0.001	0.148	Supported
H9a	UTI $\rightarrow$ ATT	0.250	4.556	0.001	0.058	Supported
H9b	HED $\rightarrow$ ATT	0.162	2.939	0.003	0.026	Supported
H10	CX $\rightarrow$ ATT	0.271	5.331	0.001	0.083	Supported
H11a	CX $\rightarrow$ BUY	0.008	.103	0.918	0.000	Not supported
H11b	CX $\rightarrow$ CON	0.245	4.283	0.001	0.066	Supported
H12a	ATT $\rightarrow$ INT	0.392	7.419	0.001	0.182	Supported
H12b	ATT $\rightarrow$ CON	0.285	5.543	0.001	0.100	Supported
H12c	ATT $\rightarrow$ BUY	-0.052	.643	0.520	0.002	Not supported
H13	CON $\rightarrow$ BUY	-0.077	1.155	0.248	0.004	Not supported

Both healthy eating value dimensions positively predicted attitude, and attitude predicted intentions to interact with the advertisement and to consume healthy food. Three purchase-intention paths were not significant: customer experience (H11a); attitude (H12c), and consumption intention (H13). At the numbered-hypothesis level, H1-H10 were supported, H11 and H12 received partial support, and H13 was not supported. The pattern indicates that the model explains advertising evaluation and diet-related readiness more effectively than transaction readiness. The very low purchase-intention R² suggests that transaction-specific

factors not represented in the model may be needed to explain whether favorable advertising responses become purchase plans.

Interpreting Advertising Value and Experience

Informativeness has the largest coefficient among advertising-value antecedents ($\beta = 0.364$), followed by incentives ($\beta = 0.340$). Entertainment, credibility, and personalization also contribute positively, whereas irritation contributes negatively. The pattern is compatible with the advertising-value account in which audiences weigh benefits against the costs of exposure (Ducoffe, 1995). Its relevance to healthy-food promotion lies in the simultaneous importance of informational usefulness and attractive execution, rather than a choice between educational and enjoyable content (Cuesta-Valiño et al., 2020).

The positive advertising-value–experience relationship ($\beta = 0.379$) indicates that favorable message appraisal is associated with the quality of the encounter. Experience then relates to utilitarian value ($\beta = 0.416$), hedonic value ($\beta = 0.359$), and attitude ($\beta = 0.271$). This ordering is consistent with experience-based accounts of social media responses (Wibowo et al., 2021; Zollo et al., 2020). However, the coefficients alone do not establish that customer experience mediates advertising-value effects. A bootstrap test of each specific indirect path remains necessary before reporting the strength or significance of mediation.

Both healthy-eating values predict attitude, although the utilitarian coefficient ($\beta = 0.250$) exceeds the hedonic coefficient ($\beta = 0.162$). The coefficients suggest that practical benefits are more strongly associated with attitude within this model, but their difference has not been formally tested. The finding supports retaining both instrumental and pleasurable evaluations in the account of healthy-food communication. It is compatible with the broader consideration of dual value in food decisions and immersive experiences (Bai et al., 2024; Rodríguez-Ardura et al., 2024).

Why Positive Responses do Not Imply Purchase Readiness

Attitude predicts interaction intention ($\beta = 0.392$) and consumption intention ($\beta = 0.285$), but not purchase intention ($\beta = -0.052$, $p = 0.520$). Customer experience also predicts consumption intention ($\beta = 0.245$), while its purchase path is negligible ($\beta = 0.008$, $p = 0.918$). Consumption intention does not significantly predict purchase intention ($\beta = -0.077$, $p = 0.248$). The negative coefficients should not be interpreted as evidence that favorable attitudes or healthy-eating goals discourage buying; the available tests do not distinguish these estimates from zero at the specified threshold.

A plausible interpretation is that engagement and healthy-eating readiness require less commitment than a purchase. Users may save a recipe or endorse a dietary goal without selecting a product, allocating a budget, or arranging delivery. Research on organic-food purchase determinants and external dietary constraints makes affordability and access relevant

candidates for subsequent models (Bazhan et al., 2024; Fink et al., 2021). These factors were not directly tested here, so they remain explanations to investigate rather than demonstrated causes of the nonsignificant paths.

The predominantly young and urban sample provides context but does not prove a demographic mechanism. Descriptive percentages cannot establish that age, education, or expenditure moderates a structural relationship. Similarly, the prominence of promotions among descriptive responses is consistent with the incentives coefficient but is not an independent causal test. Future research should measure the proposed constraints explicitly and examine whether product-specific attitudes and perceived behavioral control explain purchase readiness beyond attitudes toward advertising (Ajzen, 1991; Escobar-Farfán et al., 2025).

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

The study contributes a differentiated account of communication outcomes. It identifies a coherent set of associations connecting advertising characteristics, appraisal, experience, value, and selected intentions, while exposing the limited explanatory coverage of purchase intention. This boundary is theoretically useful: a model can explain favorable message processing without explaining market action. The results also caution against treating an advertising attitude as equivalent to a product-purchase attitude, particularly when the advertisement addresses healthy eating in broad terms.

Managers can use the observed pattern to prioritize useful product and nutrition information, credible claims, relevant personalization, and clearly explained incentives. Irritating repetition and long, unskippable execution should be reviewed because irritation is negatively associated with perceived advertising value. Content should also make healthy eating enjoyable and practical. The evidence supports evaluating these communication elements, while campaign experiments are needed to determine which changes produce incremental sales.

Campaign measurement should separate interactions, dietary interest, and transactions. Saves and comments can indicate engagement; product visits and purchase completion concern a different outcome. Transparent prices, availability information, and accessible ordering channels are reasonable interventions to test against the observed purchase-intention gap. They should not be presented as proven solutions from this dataset. Linking future exposure records to actual purchase behavior would clarify whether the proposed psychological sequence predicts commercially meaningful action.

5. CONCLUSION

The analysis supports 15 of 18 structural paths. Informativeness, incentives, entertainment, credibility, and personalization positively predict advertising value, while

irritation predicts it negatively. Advertising value is associated with customer experience, and experience relates to both healthy-eating values, attitude, and consumption intention. Attitude predicts interaction and consumption intentions. In contrast, the three tested purchase-intention paths are nonsignificant, and purchase-intention R^2 is only 0.015. The central conclusion is that favorable advertising responses are associated with engagement and dietary readiness more clearly than with purchase readiness.

Healthy-food marketers should combine credible information and engaging execution with testable improvements to purchase access. Future studies should investigate affordability, availability, product-specific attitudes, and behavioral control; use longitudinal or experimental designs; and include observed behavior. Generalization is limited by purposive sampling, self-reporting, and concentration among young Greater Jakarta users. The proposed mediation requires specific indirect-effect estimates and bootstrap confidence intervals before a confirmed mediating effect can be claimed.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Avelino, D. C., Lin, C. A., Waring, M. E., Barbosa, A. J., & Duffy, V. B. (2024). Assessing the reach and engagement effectiveness of disseminating food and nutrition information on social media channels. *Foods*, 13(16), 2535. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods13162535>
- Bai, L., Wu, J., Sha, Y., & Gong, S. (2024). Perceived utilitarian and hedonic values: Understanding Chinese consumers' street food purchase intentions. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 38, 101046. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2024.101046>
- Bazhan, M., Shafiei Sabet, F., & Borumandnia, N. (2024). Factors affecting purchase intention of organic food products: Evidence from a developing nation context. *Food Science & Nutrition*, 12(5), 3469–3482. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fsn3.4015>
- Becker, L., & Jaakkola, E. (2020). Customer experience: Fundamental premises and implications for research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48, 630–648. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00718-x>
- Cuesta-Valiño, P., Rodríguez, P. G., & Núñez-Barriopedro, E. (2020). Perception of advertisements for healthy food on social media: Effect of attitude on consumers' response. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(18), 6463. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17186463>
- De Keyser, F., Dens, N., & De Pelsmacker, P. (2022). Let's get personal: Which elements elicit perceived personalization in social media advertising? *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 55, 101183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2022.101183>
- Dong, D., Malik, H. A., Liu, Y., Elashkar, E. E., Shoukry, A. M., & Khader, J. A. (2021). Battling for consumer's positive purchase intention: A comparative study between two psychological techniques to achieve success and sustainability for digital entrepreneurs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 665194. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.665194>

- Ducoffe, R. H. (1995). How consumers assess the value of advertising. *Journal of Current Issues & Research in Advertising*, 17(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10641734.1995.10505022>
- Escobar-Farfán, M., García-Salirrosas, E. E., Guerra-Velásquez, M., Veas-González, I., Gómez-Bayona, L., & Gallardo-Canales, R. (2025). Psychological determinants of healthy food purchase intention: An integrative model based on health consciousness. *Nutrients*, 17(7), 1140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu17071140>
- Fink, L., Strassner, C., & Ploeger, A. (2021). Exploring external factors affecting the intention-behavior gap when trying to adopt a sustainable diet: A think aloud study. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 8, 511412. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2021.511412>
- Guo, I. J., Padmita, A. C., Matsuzaki, M., Gittelsohn, J., Feeley, A., Watson, F., ... Colozza, D. (2025). The use of social media to promote unhealthy food and beverage consumption among Indonesian children. *BMC Nutrition*, 11, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40795-025-01040-2>
- Meeprom, S., Jaratmetakul, P., & Boonkum, W. (2023). Examining the effect of consumer experience on co-creation and loyalty for healthy meat consumption. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 7, 1123984. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1123984>
- Mo, L., Zhang, X., Lin, Y., Yuan, Z., & Peng, Z. (2023). Consumers' attitudes towards online advertising: A model of personalization, informativeness, privacy concern and flow experience. *Sustainability*, 15(5), 4090. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054090>
- Pancer, E., Philp, M., & Noseworthy, T. J. (2022a). Boosting engagement with healthy food on social media. *European Journal of Marketing*, 56(11), 3007–3031. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-07-2021-0565>
- Pancer, E., Philp, M., Poole, M., & Noseworthy, T. J. (2022b). Content hungry: How the nutrition of food media influences social media engagement. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 32(2), 336–349. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1246>
- Rodríguez-Ardura, I., Meseguer-Artola, A., & Fu, Q. (2024). The utilitarian and hedonic value of immersive experiences on WeChat: Examining a dual mediation path leading to users' stickiness and the role of social norms. *Online Information Review*, 48(2), 229–256. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-04-2022-0208>
- Supotthamjaree, W., & Srinaruewan, P. (2021). The impact of social media advertising on purchase intention: The mediation role of consumer brand engagement. *International Journal of Internet Marketing and Advertising*, 15(5/6), 498–526. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIMA.2021.118264>
- Wibowo, A., Chen, S. C., Wiangin, U., Ma, Y., & Ruangkanjanases, A. (2021). Customer behavior as an outcome of social media marketing: The role of social media marketing activity and customer experience. *Sustainability*, 13(1), 189. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010189>
- Zollo, L., Filieri, R., Rialti, R., & Yoon, S. (2020). Unpacking the relationship between social media marketing and brand equity: The mediating role of consumers' benefits and experience. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 256–267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.001>