

## Article

# Influencer Marketing as a Tool in Modern Communication—Possibilities of Use in Green Energy Promotion amongst Poland’s Generation Z

Beata Zatwarnicka-Madura <sup>1,\*</sup> , Robert Nowacki <sup>2</sup> and Iwona Wojciechowska <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Management, Rzeszow University of Technology, Al. Powstancow Warszawy 10, 35-959 Rzeszow, Poland

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Management, University of Economics and Human Sciences in Warsaw, Okopowa 59, 01-043 Warsaw, Poland

\* Correspondence: bezat@prz.edu.pl

**Abstract:** Generation Z is gaining more and more importance in the market—not only is it attaining purchasing power, but it is also setting trends. This is the generation that spends a lot of time on various social media channels, and the content posted there is a source of information, inspiration and motivation for them. Its representatives are very skeptical about traditional marketing messages, so the best way to reach them is to use influencer marketing. They are also sensitive to environmental problems and ecology. For this reason, the purpose of this paper was to identify the possibility of using influencer marketing to promote green energy in the perspective of Generation Z in Poland. The CAWI method of research was carried out April–June 2022 on a sample of 533 people aged 18 to 26, selected using a quota method. The analysis used statistically significant structure indices (percentages) and measures of correlations between the variables. The results presented confirmed the enormous popularity of social media among the representatives of Generation Z, as well as the great involvement of young consumers in tracking the activity of influencers. More than half of the respondents indicated the usefulness of influencers promoting green energy, but at the same time the vast majority of them declared that the choice of green energy in their case was determined by the opinions of other people, and that the role of influencers was negligible.

**Keywords:** influencer marketing; social media; green energy; generation z



**Citation:** Zatwarnicka-Madura, B.; Nowacki, R.; Wojciechowska, I. Influencer Marketing as a Tool in Modern Communication—Possibilities of Use in Green Energy Promotion amongst Poland’s Generation Z. *Energies* **2022**, *15*, 6570. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en15186570>

Academic Editor: Agnieszka Izabela Baruk

Received: 7 August 2022

Accepted: 28 August 2022

Published: 8 September 2022

**Publisher’s Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Contemporary marketing communication is a process carried out complementarily in the real and virtual world among market participants [1,2].

Omnichannel approaches that characterize modern marketing processes enable opportunities for goods and services consumers to exploit the full set of marketing channels of communication to achieve a continued information inflow and participate in decision making in respect of companies and purchases [3,4]. Mainstream modern marketing, on the other hand, mainly involves the total digitalization of communication processes as well as the significant domination of online channels in order to promote goods and services as well as disseminate information about companies’ activities [5].

Thanks to the universal access to the web and mobile devices, social media is becoming more and more popular. According to the *Digital in 2021 Global Overview* report, in 2021, almost 54% of the population (4.2 billion) used it in the world, which was over 13% (490 million) more than in 2020. In Poland in 2021, there were 25.9 million active users of social media, which accounted for 68.5% of the total population of the country [6]. Social media has become an integral part of life; its functions are systematically changing and its role and scope of use are increasing. Initially, it was mainly used to maintain or establish interpersonal contacts, and the current users, especially young people, more and more

often emphasize the importance of social media (including the most popular Facebook) as the first and the main source which they obtain various types of information from, looking for opinions about the products and services they are interested in [7].

Social media influencer marketing is a growing area and is becoming an inevitable part of the marketing mix of companies [8]. Social media influencers (SMIs) represent a new type of independent third-party endorsers who shape audience attitudes through blogs, tweets and the use of other social media [9–12].

There has been a surge in the role played by social media in the communication between energy sector companies (ESCs) and their customers. Presently, consumers can, on their own, search for, create and share information with other Internet users. Electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) communication requires, first and foremost, the presence of energy companies on social media to enhance consumers' interests in them, and secondly, that they consciously shape their image to meet their customers' expectations [13].

Green energy is becoming more and more popular, and both enterprises and individual households contribute to it. The increase in the demand for energy from renewable sources in Poland is so great that the supply does not keep up with it. More and more companies are ordering green energy since it is the easiest way to reduce the company's emissions factor [14].

However, it seems that influencer marketing is not used in products such as green energy. The purpose of this paper is to identify the possibility of using this marketing tool to promote green energy in the perspective of Generation Z in Poland.

It was hypothesized that despite the popularity of social media and the involvement in influencer tracking and the effectiveness of influencer marketing among young people, influencer marketing will not be perceived by them as an appropriate marketing communication tool for all products, among others, in terms of motivating the use of green energy.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### 2.1. Influencer Marketing as a Communication Tool

The theory of communication has received many studies on the basis of various scientific disciplines: sociology, psychology, philosophy, cultural sciences, management sciences, mathematics and computer science [15–19].

According to Ph. Kotler and K.L. Keller [20] marketing communication means the various ways that companies try to inform consumers and remind them, directly or indirectly, about the products and brands they have to offer. In a way, marketing communication is the voice of the company and its brands; it is the way the company can establish a dialogue and build relationships with consumers.

The internal structure of the communication system is not precisely identified and defined. The proposals for structuring occurring in the literature are characterized by the lack of a single, leading classification criterion and basically take the form of presenting a certain number of elements (instruments, tools), interrelated and partially interdependent, serving the implementation of functions, posed by marketing communication [21]. The most common elements of marketing communication are: advertising, sales promotion, public relations and personal sales [22,23]. However, over time, additional tools began to be exchanged. These include: direct marketing, digital marketing, event marketing and communication on social media [20,24,25].

Social media at the beginning of the 21st century changed marketing communication enormously [26–30]. It resulted in a re-evaluation of the patterns of behavior preserved for decades in many areas of life and it changed habits that were not only limited to the Internet space but also emanated into other spheres [31,32].

It is difficult to find an unambiguous answer regarding the term of social media in the literature. None of the definitions are well established. This may result from the relatively short history of social media, as well as the extremely dynamic nature of the changes in this area. One of the first definitions of social media by H. Rheingold [33] treats it as a social cluster selected on the Internet, where individuals have sufficiently long public

conversations with a great emotional involvement to create personal relationships with other individuals in the cyberspace. In a marketing context, social media is considered as platforms where people build networks and share information and/or moods [34]. It can also be defined as a virtual platform where people share their opinions, experiences, photographs and videos on such social media websites like Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn. N. Dabner defines social media as Internet tools and others based on mobile technologies, which, thanks to appropriate technological solutions, enable users to create, co-create and disseminate texts, sounds and videos [35].

Social media is also defined by the prism of its differences in relation to traditional media. The main differences are: two-way communication (ease of interaction), universal accessibility for authors (no entry barriers), subject additionally to social control, ease of modifying content and speed of information delivery. Social media is definitely more democratic in terms of creating, evaluating, commenting or distributing information than traditional media [36].

The main idea of social media is one of creating content and sharing it with other users, i.e., a community [37]. Therefore, the media builds informal communities whose characteristic feature is solidarity around specific problems. Nowadays, dynamically developing modern information technologies have made it possible to strengthen this type of relationship among members of these informal social groups. In addition, a variety of mobile applications have provided web users with constantly improved tools for dialogue, which is a key element differentiating traditional media from social media.

Social media was created as a result of the social creation of Internet content, which causes a great diversity in their area, as well as huge dynamics of the growth of new forms. There are at least several approaches to the subject of social media classification in the literature [34].

The media plays a huge role in the processes of social change [38,39]. Social media has a big impact on both consumers and corporations [31,40–42].

Corporations can use social media to gain information about potential consumers and directly recommend green products [43]. Often, through social media, consumers obtain information about products and make decisions based on it [44].

The term influencer marketing is related to social media. The concept of influencer was used for the first time in 2001 by R. Cialdini—a social psychologist and economist [45]. He found that an influencer was characterized by social authority, credibility, dedication and consistent action. At that time, he did not mean tiktokers, instagramers or youtubers as such terms appeared years later.

The world of influencers is very diverse as it can include experts, activists, artists, idols and lifestyle designers [46].

Influencer marketing is similar to recommendation marketing, but it only focuses on the opinions of influencers. It is a form of marketing where the advertising people (influencers) play the most important role, not the advertised products or services. An influencer is a person who influences the opinion of other people and builds lasting relationships with many recipients who identify with them very strongly. Most often it is a blogger, vlogger (a person running a video blog), a person active on Instagram, Snapchat, Facebook, YouTube or another social networking site, with a large (at least several hundred people) audience [10–12,47]. An effective influencer is credible and able to skillfully influence the opinions of the community gathered around them. There are many classifications of influencers [48]. There are, for example, mega influencers, macro influencers and micro influencers [49]. The mega influencers include celebrities, actors, artists and athletes who have over a million followers on social media. Their followers are very eager to share their entries or photos on social media. The macro influencers are most often bloggers, youtubers, people running social profiles, scientists and managers. They are frequently experts in their fields and enjoy great trust among their followers. The micro influencers have significantly fewer followers than the other two groups, but the

engagement rate in campaigns conducted by micro influencers is very high, due to the fact that they have more loyal and engaged followers.

Influencers who are contemporary opinion leaders, due to the enormous development of social media, will play an increasingly important role [50]. According to the two-stage communication model in advertising, referring to the one created by E. Katz and P.F. Lazarsfeld's 1955 model, also known as the *two-step flow of information* theory, information first reaches opinion leaders or influencers, who then introduce them to the wider community [51,52]. The opinion leaders are important in social networks because they have an ability to informally influence the attitudes and behavior of others [53,54]. On a general level, it can be said that they may be people with personal authority or prestige who are influential and therefore perform specific social functions. They often hold prominent positions in major public or private organizations operating in a given society, and thus gain authority. They are also experts in a given field with extensive knowledge and competence. They are usually characterized by a relatively high level of self-esteem, open attitude to the world, high material and social status, comprehensive professional activity, positive attitude to market novelties, etc. [55–57].

## 2.2. Generation Z

When describing individual generations, the literature usually distinguishes five generations: the oldest generation—the General Generation, then the Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y (also known as Millennials) and Generation Z [58,59].

It is impossible to define the exact timeframe for a given generation. The different critical dates given by the authors are only used to conventionally indicate the period when a given generation was born. At the end of the 20th century, a new generation, called Generation Z appeared. It is assumed that Generation Z are people born after 1996, i.e., in years marked by a rapid technological progress [60,61].

Generation Z is the first one born in an Internet-connected world, the most tech-savvy generation ever. The world without the Internet is abstract to them, and computer use has become an indispensable part of their home life. The hallmarks of Generation Z are [46,62]:

- Confident. Open and accepting diversity, they themselves as a generation are very diverse internally.
- The “we” generation, more socially oriented, strongly interested in the issues of corporate social responsibility. They are even more involved in the issues of global warming, hunger, wars, etc.
- They treat learning and development according to the principle of just-in-time learning, they want to have everything and know everything immediately, preferably online.
- Professional and private life should constitute a whole in which they want to be themselves and be guided by the same values.
- They prefer brands that are not only able to communicate their personality and uniqueness but are well known enough to be recognized.
- They are immensely influenced by video content in their brand selection.
- Despite desiring to be seen as environmentally conscious, they often would avoid related costs.

Representatives of this generation experience difficulties in operating outside the Internet, which is manifested by the loss of contact with the people around them and the inability to focus attention [63]. They perceive reality through the prism of the online world. They most often communicate using social media and messengers. However, they pose a considerable communication challenge since they do not know the time before the digitization era and treat this environment as something natural and common. They even create new styles of communication and interaction [64].

At the beginning of the 21st century, M. Prensky proposed one of the most famous generational classifications, i.e., a division into digital immigrants and digital natives [65,66].

Generation Z treats social media as a space where the users can share opinions, comment, evaluate, create new goods and services, manifest their attitude, obtain necessary information and make purchasing decisions [67].

According to consumer research conducted in Poland in 2020, almost half (44%) of Generation Z made a purchase decision based on an influencer's recommendation, compared to 26% of the general population [68]. The same study found that 70% of people from this generation followed at least one influencer on platforms such as YouTube and Instagram. Generation Z is open minded and uses a wide variety of social networking applications, with 39% of them having four or more social media accounts, compared with 15% of the general population that uses as many social media platforms.

The purchasing power of digitally native, influencer-savvy Generation Z has continued to be one of the most important and talked-about factors by strategic digital marketers worldwide. A study conducted by LTK (LIKE-to-KNOW), the largest creator-powered marketing platform in June 2021, further underscores this, indicating that 92% of Generation Z adults, aged 18–25, make purchases based on influencer recommendations, thus ranking them higher than advertising by brands or retailers, celebrities and store associates [69].

### 2.3. Green Energy in the Context of Promoting Sustainable Development

Renewable energy has gained a special importance in the energy balance of many countries in the face of shrinking and using conventional energy sources and attempts to become independent from countries—the suppliers of conventional energy sources. Renewable energy, i.e., green energy, either renewable energy sources (RES) or unconventional energy, increases its share in obtaining electricity. This results from economic considerations and measures taken to ensure energy security [70–72].

Research on green consumption has increased significantly in recent years [73–78]. Market trends indicate that for current buyers—both consumer and non-consumer products—the image of a “green product” or a “green company” is expected [13]. D. Domalewska's research reveals that both positive approaches towards energy sustainability and environmental identity have been consolidated over the two-year (2018–2020) study period. Social media users are not only increasingly interested in green issues but also indicate their concerns towards posts on sustainability-related topics. Social networking sites provide contexts, where users can not only reinforce their beliefs and values but also mimic the behavior of other users, thus leading to the creation of social media identity bubbles that reinforces shared identity—in this case, an environmental identity [79].

The introduction of green energy and carbon reduction technology has gained significance along with increased environmental awareness. Consequently, studies identifying opinion leaders and followers, interested in green energy and low carbon, have gained in popularity [80].

## 3. Research Methodology

The attitudes of Generation Z representatives towards influencer marketing and green energy were the subject of research conducted in April in 2022. The research was carried out on a sample of 533 people aged 18 to 26, selected in a quota manner. In total, 60.4% of women and 39.6% of men participated in the study. From the point of view of age, two ranges were distinguished: 18–22 years (56.8%) and 23–26 years (43.2%). The respondents were students of two academic centers—Warsaw (34.7%) and Rzeszow (65.3%), taking into account the differentiation between students of humanities and social sciences (43.7%) and science and technology (56.3%). The structure of the population under study is presented in Table 1.

The method of the diagnostic survey was applied in the study. The study was conducted using the Internet questionnaire method, on the basis of a proprietary questionnaire. In the context of the issues described, the following research areas were analyzed:

- The use of social media;
- An assessment of the impact of influencers on social media on consumer behavior;

- Knowledge of green energy and its promotion;
- An evaluation of the usefulness of influencers to promote green energy.

**Table 1.** The structure of the population under study.

Specification		N	%
Total		533	100.0
Gender	Woman	322	60.4
	Man	211	39.6
Age	18–22 years old	303	56.8
	23–26 years old	230	43.2
City	Rzeszow	348	65.3
	Warsaw	185	34.7
Field of study	Social/humanistic	233	43.7
	Technical/scientific	300	56.3

Source: own research (2022).

The research problems were used to verify the hypothesis that: *Despite the popularity of social media and the involvement in influencer tracking and the effectiveness of influencer marketing among young people, influencer marketing is not perceived by them as an appropriate marketing communication tool for all products, including, among others, motivation to use green energy.*

The analysis of the results was carried out with the use of the IBM SPSS Statistics 27.0 statistical package, by means of the descriptive statistics and measures of dependence between the variables. The results of the analyses were presented by taking into account the differentiation into the indicated independent variables (gender, age between 18–22 and 23–26 years old, city and field of study). The analysis used statistically significant structure indices (percentages) and measures of correlations between the variables. The relationships between the independent (explanatory) and dependent (explained) variables were presented on the basis of the non-parametric Mann–Whitney U test, and the strength of the identified relationships was determined using the Cramer V coefficient, with the assumed critical level of significance  $p = 0.05$ .

The nonparametric Mann–Whitney U test allows for the comparison of two independent groups. It is the equivalent of the Student's *t*-test for independent samples, used when the dependent variable does not meet the assumptions related to the normality of the distribution or is expressed on an ordinal scale. When carrying out statistical analysis using the Mann–Whitney U test, the mean ranks are compared with each other.

#### 4. Results

In order to diagnose the involvement of the respondents in social media, an introductory question on the frequency of using the eight indicated media, characterized by the greatest popularity in Poland—Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, Twitter, Snapchat, Pinterest, LinkedIn and TikTok, supplemented with the other category—was asked. The frequency was assessed on an ordinal scale built from three categories: systematically, sporadically and never. The distribution of the answers to this question is presented in Table 2.

The analysis of the results showed a clear dominance of three of the above-mentioned social media—Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. In all of them, over 70% of the respondents declared systematic use. Every third respondent systematically uses Snapchat and TikTok. Other social media is less important—it usually plays a complementary role, and most of the respondents do not use it at all. Importantly, from the point of view of the research project, 99.1% of the respondents systematically use at least one social media, and the average number of social media indicated the level of 3.26. This confirms the assumption that social media is an important element of the modern world for the representatives of Generation Z, which they devote a lot of time to.

**Table 2.** The frequency of using social media (in %).

Specification	Systematically	Occasionally	Never
Facebook	74.1	24.3	1.7
Instagram	73.5	14.3	12.2
YouTube	71.9	26.8	1.3
Twitter	12.8	19.9	67.4
Snapchat	31.5	33.8	34.7
Pinterest	8.3	36.6	55.2
LinkedIn	8.3	29.5	62.3
TikTok	33.4	21.2	45.4
Others	12.9	33.4	53.7
Social media in total	99.1	0.9	-
Average number of social media systematically used	3.27	-	-

Source: own research (2022).

This was also confirmed by the number of followed influencers (Table 3). Over 80% of the respondents systematically follow the activity of at least a few influencers on social media, with almost every respondent following at least four influencers, although some follow a dozen or so influencers.

**Table 3.** Involvement of Generation Z respondents in the systematic tracking of influencers (in %).

Specification	Yes, One	Yes, from 2 to 10	Yes, More Than 10	No, None	
Total	4.1	58.2	24.6	13.1	
Gender	Woman	4.0	55.0	30.4	10.6
	Man	4.3	63.0	15.6	17.1
Age	18–22 years old	2.3	59.4	29.4	8.9
	23–26 years old	6.5	56.5	18.3	18.7
City	Rzeszow	3.2	58.9	25.9	12.1
	Warsaw	5.9	56.8	22.2	15.1
Field of study	Social/humanistic	6.0	57.5	24.9	11.6
	Technical/scientific	2.7	58.7	24.3	14.3

Source: own research (2022).

The differences in the number of observed influencers are visible primarily in terms of gender, age and city, but they do not occur in the field of study. There is a slightly higher frequency of observing more influencers in the case of women, younger people and students in Rzeszow. However, these differences are not statistically significant—this was confirmed by the analysis of dependence using the Mann–Whitney U test. For each of these cross-sections, the asymptotic significance of the Z test exceeded the limit value of  $p = 0.05$ , which means that there is no basis for stating the existence of a relationship between the dependent variable (the number of observed influencers) and the explanatory variables (gender, age, city, field of study) (Table 4).

The analysis of the impact of influencers on consumer behavior was also analyzed (Table 5). The respondents primarily declared a high level of a lack of confidence in influencers—38.8% indicated that their credibility was assessed as definitely or rather low. This translates into little interest in the activities promoted by influencers (the percentage of responses that were rather high and definitely high was at the level of 14.8%), the tendency to make decisions influenced by influencers (7.3%), changing consumption habits (12.4%), using featured apps (15.2%) and purchasing products or using services (17.5%). Only in the case of recommendations by influencers of places worth visiting, the percentage of respondents declaring a rather or definitely high propensity to take an influencer's recommendation into account increased to 35.4%.

**Table 4.** An assessment of the relationship between the number of followed influencers and the variables describing the respondents.

Specification	Average Rank	Test Value (Z)	Critical Significance Level ( $p$ )	V-Cramer Coefficient	Statistical Significance of Assessment Divergence
Gender					
Woman	271.80	−1.003	0.316	0.178	No
Man	259.67				
Age					
18–22 years old	267.04	−0.007	0.994	0.203	No
23–26 years old	266.95				
City					
Rzeszow	268.02	−0.237	0.813	0.086	No
Warsaw	265.08				
Field of study					
Social/humanistic	259.61	−1.101	0.271	0.090	No
Technical/scientific	272.74				

Source: own research (2022).

**Table 5.** An assessment of the impact of influencers on social media on the behavior of Generation Z consumers.

Specification		Definitely Low	Rather Low	Neither High Nor Low	Rather High	Definitely High
<b>To what extent do you rate the credibility of influencers?</b>						
	Total	12.2	26.6	53.1	7.9	0.2
Gender	Woman	12.4	21.1	58.1	8.1	0.3
	Man	11.8	35.1	45.5	7.6	-
Age	18–22 years old	7.9	30.4	53.5	7.9	0.3
	23–26 years old	17.8	21.7	52.6	7.8	-
City	Rzeszow	12.1	28.4	50.9	8.3	0.3
	Warsaw	12.4	23.2	57.3	7.0	-
Field of study	Social/humanistic	9.4	20.2	59.7	10.7	-
	Technical/scientific	14.3	31.7	48.0	5.7	0.3
<b>How do you rate your interest in activities promoted by influencers?</b>						
	Total	17.8	33.6	33.8	14.4	0.4
Gender	Woman	14.6	35.7	34.2	15.5	-
	Man	22.7	30.3	33.2	12.8	0.9
Age	18–22 years old	15.8	32.0	36.3	15.2	0.7
	23–26 years old	20.4	35.7	30.4	13.5	-
City	Rzeszow	17.8	34.2	33.0	14.9	-
	Warsaw	17.8	32.4	35.1	13.5	1.1
Field of study	Social/humanistic	15.0	31.3	37.3	15.5	0.9
	Technical/scientific	20.0	35.3	31.0	13.7	-

Table 5. Cont.

Specification		Definitely Low	Rather Low	Neither High Nor Low	Rather High	Definitely High
<b>To what extent are you willing to make decisions suggested by influencers?</b>						
	Total	29.5	39.2	24.0	6.9	0.4
Gender	Woman	24.6	37.3	27.6	8.7	-
	Man	34.1	42.2	18.5	4.3	0.9
Age	18–22 years old	24.6	41.9	25.1	5.9	0.7
	23–26 years old	33.5	35.7	22.6	8.3	-
City	Rzeszow	30.2	39.1	24.1	6.6	-
	Warsaw	28.1	39.5	23.8	7.6	1.1
Field of study	Social/humanistic	25.3	36.1	27.9	9.9	0.9
	Technical/scientific	32.7	41.7	21.0	4.7	-
<b>To what extent are you influencer-influenced to use recommended applications?</b>						
	Total	25.9	32.6	26.3	14.8	0.4
Gender	Woman	23.9	33.5	24.5	18.0	-
	Man	28.9	31.3	28.9	10.0	0.9
Age	18–22 years old	25.7	29.4	27.4	16.8	0.7
	23–26 years old	26.1	37.0	24.8	12.2	-
City	Rzeszow	26.4	33.0	25.3	15.2	-
	Warsaw	24.9	31.9	28.1	14.1	1.1
Field of study	Social/humanistic	22.3	30.0	30.5	16.3	0.9
	Technical/scientific	28.7	34.7	23.0	13.7	-
<b>To what extent are you influencer-influenced to visit recommended places?</b>						
	Total	14.4	16.3	33.8	33.0	2.4
Gender	Woman	11.2	17.1	31.7	38.2	1.9
	Man	19.4	15.2	37.0	25.1	3.3
Age	18–22 years old	12.9	13.2	36.0	35.0	3.0
	23–26 years old	16.5	20.4	30.9	30.4	2.4
City	Rzeszow	13.2	15.5	33.6	35.1	2.6
	Warsaw	16.8	17.8	34.1	29.2	2.2
Field of study	Social/humanistic	11.2	14.2	37.3	34.3	3.0
	Technical/scientific	17.0	18.0	31.0	32.0	2.0
<b>To what extent are you prone to changing your consumption habits under the impact of an influencer?</b>						
	Total	25.1	34.5	28.0	11.8	0.6
Gender	Woman	21.1	33.2	30.7	14.6	0.3
	Man	31.3	36.5	23.7	7.6	0.9
Age	18–22 years old	22.8	36.6	28.1	11.9	0.7
	23–26 years old	28.3	31.7	27.8	11.7	0.4
City	Rzeszow	25.9	35.3	26.1	12.4	0.3
	Warsaw	23.8	33.0	31.4	10.8	1.1
Field of study	Social/humanistic	21.9	30.9	34.3	11.6	1.3
	Technical/scientific	27.7	37.3	23.0	12.0	-

Table 5. Cont.

Specification		Definitely Low	Rather Low	Neither High Nor Low	Rather High	Definitely High
<b>To what extent are you influenced by the influencer to buy products/use services?</b>						
Total		20.8	31.3	30.4	15.4	2.1
Gender	Woman	17.4	27.6	32.6	19.6	2.8
	Man	26.1	37.0	27.0	9.0	0.9
Age	18–22 years old	19.1	32.7	30.0	16.5	1.7
	23–26 years old	23.0	29.6	30.9	13.9	2.6
City	Rzeszow	21.8	31.0	27.6	17.2	2.3
	Warsaw	18.9	31.9	35.7	11.9	1.6
Field of study	Social/humanistic	18.0	26.6	34.3	17.6	3.4
	Technical/scientific	23.0	35.0	27.3	13.7	1.0

Source: own research (2022).

In the case of the assessment of susceptibility to influencers' actions, there were quite large differences in individual correlation cross-sections. Table 6 presents the appraisal of the statistical significance of these differences based on the Mann–Whitney U test. Out of twenty-eight relationships (seven dimensions of evaluation times four correlation cross-sections), twelve cases showed the significance level of the calculated test at a level not exceeding the critical level  $p = 0.05$ . However, the strength of these relationships, calculated using the Cramer V coefficient, was small, and in no case exceeded the level of 0.2 (the maximum value was 0.198 in the case of the relationships between the willingness to buy or use services under the influence of influencers and gender—this was much more common in women than men).

**Table 6.** An assessment of the relationship between the assessment of the impact of influencers on social media on consumer behavior and the variables describing respondents.

Specification		Average Rank	Test Value (Z)	Critical Significance Level ( $p$ )	V-Cramer Coefficient	Statistical Significance of Assessment Divergence
<b>To what extent do you rate the credibility of influencers?</b>						
Gender	Woman	278.56	−2.351	0.019	0.008	Yes
	Man	249.36				
Age	18–22 years old	272.93	−1.120	0.263	0.005	No
	23–26 years old	259.19				
City	Rzeszow	264.48	−0.569	0.569	0.075	No
	Warsaw	271.74				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	293.73	−3.879	<0.001	0.181	Yes
	Technical/scientific	246.24				
<b>How do you rate your interest in activities promoted by influencers?</b>						
Gender	Woman	274.15	−1.384	0.186	0.048	No
	Man	256.09				
Age	18–22 years old	277.51	−1.891	0.059	0.099	No
	23–26 years old	253.15				
City	Rzeszow	265.93	−0.229	0.819	0.089	No
	Warsaw	269.01				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	282.02	−2.074	0.038	0.114	Yes
	Technical/scientific	255.34				

Table 6. Cont.

Specification		Average Rank	Test Value (Z)	Critical Significance Level ( $p$ )	V-Cramer Coefficient	Statistical Significance of Assessment Divergence
<b>To what extent are you willing to make decisions suggested by influencers?</b>						
Gender	Woman	282.09	−2.946	0.003	0.165	Yes
	Man	243.97				
Age	18–22 years old	272.64	−1.024	0.306	0.110	No
	23–26 years old	259.57				
City	Rzeszow	264.05	−0.640	0.522	0.088	No
	Warsaw	272.56				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	289.77	−3.170	0.002	0.161	Yes
	Technical/scientific	249.32				
<b>To what extent are you influencer-influenced to use recommended applications?</b>						
Gender	Woman	274.72	−1.485	0.138	0.144	No
	Man	255.22				
Age	18–22 years old	275.23	−1.471	0.141	0.107	No
	23–26 years old	256.16				
City	Rzeszow	264.55	−0.524	0.600	0.091	No
	Warsaw	271.61				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	284.62	−2.419	0.016	0.129	Yes
	Technical/scientific	253.31				
<b>To what extent are you influencer-influenced to visit recommended places?</b>						
Gender	Woman	280.68	−2.643	0.008	0.168	Yes
	Man	246.13				
Age	18–22 years old	279.50	−1.245	0.025	0.123	Yes
	23–26 years old	250.53				
City	Rzeszow	274.75	−1.663	0.096	0.072	No
	Warsaw	252.42				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	280.85	−1.909	0.056	0.111	No
	Technical/scientific	256.25				
<b>To what extent are you prone to changing your consumption habits under the impact of an influencer?</b>						
Gender	Woman	284.84	−3.445	<0.001	0.163	Yes
	Man	239.78				
Age	18–22 years old	271.39	−0.788	0.431	0.070	No
	23–26 years old	261.21				
City	Rzeszow	263.47	−0.758	0.449	0.077	No
	Warsaw	273.65				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	284.38	−2.394	0.017	0.158	Yes
	Technical/scientific	253.51				
<b>To what extent are you influenced by the influencer to buy products/use services?</b>						
Gender	Woman	289.83	−4.387	<0.001	0.198	Yes
	Man	232.16				
Age	18–22 years old	270.57	−0.637	0.524	0.069	No
	23–26 years old	262.30				
City	Rzeszow	267.07	−0.016	0.987	0.103	No
	Warsaw	266.86				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	288.27	−2.917	0.004	0.148	Yes
	Technical/scientific	250.48				

Source: own research (2022).

The knowledge of green energy and its promotion was determined on the basis of a five-point scale (Table 7). A high awareness of this issue should be noted—78.8% of respondents declared they knew it—and the conviction that it is necessary to use it—82.5% were certain of it in the context of the entire economy and 76.7% would be interested in switching to green energy. The respondents were also characterized by a high level of knowledge of the activities promoting green energy on the Internet. A total of 62.7% of them had contact with such activities. They also appreciated the potential role of influencers in this type of promotion. In total, 57.2% believed that they can effectively encourage the use of this energy, of which 11.8% were definitely convinced of it.

**Table 7.** Knowledge of green energy issues and its promotion among consumers of Generation Z.

Specification		Definitely Not	Rather Not	Neither Yes Nor No	Rather Yes	Definitely Yes
<b>To what extent are you familiar with the term “green energy”?</b>						
Total		2.4	5.9	12.9	55.9	22.9
Gender	Woman	1.9	5.0	13.0	60.2	19.9
	Man	3.3	7.0	12.8	49.3	27.5
Age	18–22 years old	3.6	6.6	14.9	56.1	18.8
	23–26 years old	0.9	4.8	10.4	55.7	28.3
City	Rzeszow	1.5	5.2	16.1	54.6	22.7
	Warsaw	4.3	7.0	7.0	58.4	23.2
Field of study	Social/humanistic	3.4	7.3	8.6	60.9	19.7
	Technical/scientific	1.7	4.7	16.3	52.0	25.3
<b>Should Poland switch to “green energy”?</b>						
Total		0.9	3.0	13.5	46.9	35.6
Gender	Woman	0.6	2.2	11.8	47.5	37.9
	Man	1.4	4.3	16.1	46.0	32.2
Age	18–22 years old	-	3.3	13.2	47.5	36.0
	23–26 years old	2.2	2.6	13.9	46.1	35.2
City	Rzeszow	0.9	3.2	15.8	46.6	33.6
	Warsaw	1.1	2.7	9.2	47.6	39.5
Field of study	Social/humanistic	0.4	3.4	8.2	46.4	41.6
	Technical/scientific	1.3	2.7	17.7	47.3	31.0
<b>Would you be interested in using “green energy”?</b>						
Total		0.9	4.7	17.6	45.2	31.5
Gender	Woman	0.3	4.7	16.1	45.7	33.2
	Man	1.9	4.7	19.9	44.5	28.9
Age	18–22 years old	1.0	6.9	18.8	44.2	29.0
	23–26 years old	0.9	1.7	16.1	46.5	34.8
City	Rzeszow	1.1	4.6	19.8	47.1	27.3
	Warsaw	0.5	4.9	13.5	41.6	39.5
Field of study	Social/humanistic	-	3.4	15.0	42.1	39.5
	Technical/scientific	1.7	5.7	19.7	47.7	25.3

Table 7. Cont.

Specification		Definitely Not	Rather Not	Neither Yes Nor No	Rather Yes	Definitely Yes
<b>Have you come across any activities promoting “green energy” on the Internet?</b>						
	Total	3.4	20.5	13.5	40.0	22.7
Gender	Woman	2.5	27.0	14.6	38.2	17.7
	Man	4.7	10.4	11.8	42.7	30.3
Age	18–22 years old	5.0	23.4	12.9	37.0	21.8
	23–26 years old	1.3	16.5	14.3	43.9	23.9
City	Rzeszow	3.7	18.4	12.1	43.7	22.1
	Warsaw	2.7	24.3	16.2	33.0	23.8
Field of study	Social/humanistic	3.4	21.9	15.5	40.3	18.9
	Technical/scientific	3.3	19.7	12.0	39.7	25.7
<b>Do you think the promotion of “green energy” by influencers can encourage its use?</b>						
	Total	2.3	12.2	28.3	45.4	11.8
Gender	Woman	1.6	10.9	27.6	46.6	13.4
	Man	3.3	14.2	29.4	43.6	9.5
Age	18–22 years old	2.0	9.6	27.7	46.9	13.9
	23–26 years old	2,6	15.7	29.1	43.5	9.1
City	Rzeszow	2,6	11.5	30.5	42.2	13.2
	Warsaw	1,6	13.5	24.3	51.4	9.2
Field of study	Social/humanistic	1,3	13.3	25.3	49.4	10.7
	Technical/scientific	3,0	11.3	30.7	42,3	12.7

Source: own research (2022).

Additionally, in this case, statistically significant differences were visible. The use of the Mann–Whitney U test (Table 8) for their identification and analysis showed the existence of statistically significant differences in ten out of twenty correlations (five dimensions of assessment times four correlation cross-sections). The independent variable, age, was found to be statistically significant with regards to being familiar with the concept of green energy as it was most often mentioned by respondents in the older group. Gender and field studies were, on the other hand, found to be statistically significant in respect of opinions concerning switching to green energy. This was most often indicated by women and persons with education in humanities and social sciences. While the men and persons from the older group indicated the most support for the use of the internet in promoting green energy, gender and age, as independent variables, were found to be statistically significant (in opposing relationship, though) in their belief in the potential effectiveness of influencers in encouraging green energy use. This view was more often expressed by women and younger respondents.

The last issue raised in the study concerned the preferences of the respondents with regard to the people most effectively influencing the decision to use green energy (Table 9). The respondents indicated primarily an expert in the daily energy sector—such an answer was given by 56.7% of respondents. Relatives (friends) also had a significant power of influence—29.8% of responses. Although the respondents seemed to indicate that regular users, influencers and celebrities are of little significance in their decision-making process, it worthy of note that they had earlier suggested their suitability for promoting green energy.

**Table 8.** An assessment of the relationship between the knowledge of green energy and its promotion and the variables describing the respondents.

Specification		Average Rank	Test Value (Z)	Critical Significance Level (p)	V-Cramer Coefficient	Statistical Significance of Assessment Divergence
<b>To what extent are you familiar with the term “green energy”?</b>						
Gender	Woman	263.94	−0.629	0.529	0.123	No
	Man	271.67				
Age	18–22 years old	250.06	−3.236	0.001	0.149	Yes
	23–26 years old	289.31				
City	Rzeszow	264.90	−0.481	0.631	0.155	No
	Warsaw	270.96				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	262.40	−0.675	0.500	0.156	No
	Technical/scientific	270.57				
<b>Should Poland switch to “green energy”?</b>						
Gender	Woman	277.06	−2.022	0.043	0.103	Yes
	Man	251.65				
Age	18–22 years old	269.62	−0.490	0.624	0.114	No
	23–26 years old	263.55				
City	Rzeszow	258.68	−1.856	0.063	0.099	No
	Warsaw	282.65				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	289.00	−3.154	0.002	0.164	Yes
	Technical/scientific	249.92				
<b>Would you be interested in using “green energy”?</b>						
Gender	Woman	274.58	−1.504	0.133	0.99	No
	Man	255.43				
Age	18–22 years old	254.75	−2.258	0.024	0.134	Yes
	23–26 years old	283.13				
City	Rzeszow	254.40	−2.777	0.005	0.135	Yes
	Warsaw	290.71				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	292.79	−3.652	<0.001	0.174	Yes
	Technical/scientific	246.97				
<b>Have you come across any activities promoting “green energy” on the Internet?</b>						
Gender	Woman	244.44	−4.371	<0.001	0.235	Yes
	Man	301.42				
Age	18–22 years old	254.76	−2.204	0.028	0.139	Yes
	23–26 years old	283.13				
City	Rzeszow	271.83	−1.038	0.299	0.119	No
	Warsaw	257.92				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	254.34	−1.750	0.080	0.089	No
	Technical/scientific	276.83				

Table 8. Cont.

Specification		Average Rank	Test Value (Z)	Critical Significance Level (p)	V-Cramer Coefficient	Statistical Significance of Assessment Divergence
<b>Do you think the promotion of “green energy” by influencers can encourage its use?</b>						
Gender	Woman	277.13	−1.999	0.046	0.096	Yes
	Man	251.54				
Age	18–22 years old	280.23	−2.426	0.015	0.115	Yes
	23–26 years old	249.57				
City	Rzeszow	265.93	−0.234	0.815	0.109	No
	Warsaw	269.01				
Field of study	Social/humanistic	271.18	−0.588	0.557	0.100	No
	Technical/scientific	263.76				

Source: own research (2022).

Table 9. The preferences of Generation Z respondents with regard to people who most effectively influence the decision to use green energy (in %).

Specification		Celebrity	Influencer	Experts	Regular User	Relatives
Total		3.0	3.2	56.7	7.3	29.8
Gender	Woman	3.1	3.1	51.9	6.5	35.4
	Man	2.8	3.3	64.0	8.5	21.3
Age	18–22 years old	1.3	4.0	52.8	8.3	33.7
	23–26 years old	5.2	2.2	61.7	6.1	24.8
City	Rzeszow	1.4	2.0	57.8	7.8	31.0
	Warsaw	5.9	5.4	54.6	6.5	27.6
Field of study	Social/humanistic	4.7	4.3	53.6	9.4	27.9
	Technical/scientific	1.7	2.3	59.0	5.7	31.3

Source: own research (2022).

## 5. Discussion

Social media research is well established in the traditional consumer sector. Although green marketing has consistently demonstrated its positive customer response in the area of green consumption, there is still room for further research. However, it was shown that social media plays a major role in increasing awareness and promoting environmentally friendly behavior [81].

According to LTK—the largest global digital marketing platform—“With nearly 75% of Generation Z doing their shopping online, these consumers naturally look to their favorite influencers to serve as their guides to the Internet—flagging the best sales, researching the best quality items and curating all the must-haves of seasonal trends” [69].

The analysis of our research results showed very similar trends in the use of social media. Three social media platforms dominate—Facebook, Instagram and YouTube. In each of them, over 70% of the respondents declared systematic use, and every third respondent systematically uses Snapchat and TikTok. The results of our research showed that other social media was of less importance.

However, the results of the impact of influencers on social media on the behavior of Generation Z consumers looked completely different. The impact of influencers on purchase intentions is of key importance here. The purchase intention measures the willingness of consumers to purchase a product or service. It means the sum of the cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects towards the adoption, purchase and use of a product, a service, an idea or certain behavior [82]. In 1969, Howard and Sheth developed a consumer decision model—The Theory of Buyer Behavior Theory [83]. This theory

included the psychological, marketing and social conditions influencing the decision-making processes of consumers. On this basis, Javed et al. [84] presented the multi-step flow theory suggesting that influencers have an extended network that passes the content to different levels. However, the attitude towards the influencer is not a precisely defined construct [85].

Their impact on consumers' purchase intentions is determined by the perceived credibility of the influencer. Credibility is the degree to which consumers trust the products, as well as the degree to which they trust the content about them [86]. According to the theory, knowledge, similarity and attractiveness are elements of source credibility [87]. Munnukka et al. [88], Lou and Yuan [89] as well as Balaban and Mustăţea [90] stated that attractiveness, credibility, knowledge and likeness were seen as important elements of perceived trust towards influencers on social media. In situations of uncertainty, consumers tend to seek information from other consumers who are similar to them [91,92].

Empirical research has shown the positive impact of perceived credibility (experts' authority) [45] on attitudes towards influencers, the brand as well as purchase intentions [93,94]. In addition, the perceived credibility of the content in question has remained one of the key factors considered while subscribing and indicating intention to buy on YouTube [95]. Likewise, the credibility of influencers who are active on the social networks YouTube and Instagram is positively associated with one's intention to buy [96]. However, it should be remembered that social media credibility ratings are often biased, and false feedback is generated by the deliberate manipulation of online reviews [97]. The trustworthiness of a given influencer plays a major role in changing consumers' perceptions of their level of honesty, sincerity and truthfulness, constituting a fundamental element in determining their purchase intention [98].

In this way, trust is created in the influencer and the content they transmit. Trust refers to the general expectation and belief that most others are well meaning and reliable as well [99]. Influencers must develop a sense of trust in their followers. The user's attitude towards the content changes with trust in the source [100]. It has been proven that the influencer's knowledge and credibility have an impact on the brand value [101]. Credibility is closely related to honesty, which means that the recipient is sure of the content presented by the influencer [102–104]. Trust is essential in any relationship as it improves efficiency, increases flexibility and helps in long-term relationships between both parties [47,105,106]. Trust has long been identified as a significant factor in consumer-company relationships [107–110]. Morgan and Hunt [111] define trust as confidence in the reliability and integrity of an exchange partner. Reliability and integrity are associated with consistency, competency, honesty, fairness, responsibility, helpfulness and benevolence. This value-based approach is supplemented with Rousseau et al.'s psychological view of the importance of human interactions [112].

There are a number of studies on the credibility and trust of influencers and their impact on purchasing intentions and decisions [90,92,98,113–119].

Our research shows little impact of influencers and a low level of trust in them. This is in contrast with the aforementioned Kantar research conducted in Poland in 2020 [68], where almost half of the respondents from Generation Z made a purchasing decision following the recommendation of an influencer. Such discrepancies can be related to many aspects. Influencers, for instance, have their favorite industries which they want to cooperate with: fashion, beauty, luxury goods, tourism or food, and they are very effective in these industries. The technology industry is slightly less popular [120].

The variety of influencers and the type of products advertised by them, as well as the group of recipients, largely determine the results of the research. As previously stated, influencers can be contemporary opinion leaders. For many years, research on the influence exerted by opinion leaders has focused on the extent to which this phenomenon is related to a specific thematic, product category, etc., and to which it can be generalized. The most classic is the division made by R. Merton into monomorphic and polymorphic opinion leaders [121]. In his view, monomorphic leaders are experts in specific areas.

Polymorphic leaders rely on broad interpersonal influence over many, often unrelated domains. Perhaps Generation Z needs influencers—leaders of monomorphic opinions—since our research shows that more than half of the respondents believe that influencers can effectively encourage the use of green energy, but in addition, the largest number of respondents (56.7%) indicated that experts in the daily energy sector are the people who most effectively influence the decision to use green energy. It should be noted, however, that there must be a relationship between the influencer and the energy issue. This is generally consistent with the results of other studies—the perceived influencer–product congruence has a positive effect on the perception of credibility and the attitudes of followers towards influencers [122]. In particular, the credibility of the influencer, trust in the message and the creation of the intention to purchase are affected by the skillful presentation of the message, e.g., through the use of storytelling [123].

Consumer perspectives regarding sustainable energy technologies are influenced by several factors, including: the perceived costs, risks and benefits, positive and negative feelings in response to the technology, trust, procedural fairness and distributive fairness [124]. Trust is, as a category, therefore, a crucial factor impacting the green Energy market. Interesting research results have emerged from studies conducted by Chinese scientists. Their study identifies opinion leaders on the issue of green power in social communities based on social community support level and influence power level [80].

The results show the huge popularity of social media among the representatives of Generation Z. They also indicate a high degree of involvement of young consumers in tracking the activities of influencers. The tendency to use their recommendations in market activities is, however, accorded slightly less popularity. To some extent, this also applies to green energy. This is evidenced by the fact that over half of the respondents indicated the usefulness of influencers to promote their ideas. Despite this, the vast majority of respondents declared that the choice of green energy is determined by the opinions of other people, while the role of influencers is negligible. Thus, this confirms the hypothesis.

## 6. Conclusions and Limitations

The research findings may contribute to a better understanding of the attitudes and behaviors of Generation Z in the context of influencer marketing and green energy consumption. Undoubtedly, it should be emphasized that social media and the influencer marketing used within them play a large role in shaping the attitudes and behavior of Generation Z. The key problem, however, is the critical assessment of influencers' credibility and the diversified tendency to follow their suggested behaviors (as evidenced by the high percentage of respondents (40%) indicating a lack of trust in influencers, and a small tendency to submit to their suggestions, as shown by the impact indicators of 50–60%). In particular, this applies to activities of great importance, as well as in the area of decision making regarding energy use. The selection of reliable influencers is crucial in this respect. In order to effectively influence Generation Z followers, influencers must have features that increase their credibility in a specific field, e.g., expert knowledge (an expert is considered, in this study, as a person most effective in influencing the decision to use green energy by over 56% of respondents). Relying on universal recognition, which often relies on controversies accompanying such influencers and the aggressive promotion of many goods and services, is not a guarantee for building trust in the influencer. Rather, it only contributes to how they are treated as celebrities whose activity is followed on social media but does not necessarily result in imitation. The data on a large number of tracked influencers showed that over 72% of people follow just a few influencers seems to support this argument.

When analyzing the results, one could notice some limitations. The first is the study population itself. The research was conducted on a group of young people belonging to Generation Z but recruited only among students of two academic centers. Generally, they are characterized by a higher level of knowledge, including knowledge about green energy and its features and benefits, more than young people who do not study. It would

certainly be worthwhile to include other groups with lower education, living in various types (sizes) of localities, not having contact with the knowledge of green energy, with different professional activities and with different housing statuses.

In future studies, taking into account the significance of the issue, we propose to extend the scope by increasing the sample and diversifying its structure in order to reach the full cross-section of Generation Z and thus increase the representativeness of the study. It would also allow researchers to look for other, more in-depth relationships between the attitudes of the respondents. It would also be worth focusing on deepening the attitudes towards social networks and influencer activity as well as their impact on the behavior of followers and their intentions to purchase various products and services, including municipal services. It would also be important to recognize the features that credible influencers should have.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, B.Z.-M., R.N. and I.W.; methodology, B.Z.-M., R.N. and I.W.; formal analysis, R.N.; investigation, B.Z.-M., R.N. and I.W.; resources, B.Z.-M., R.N. and I.W.; data curation, R.N.; writing—original draft preparation, B.Z.-M. and R.N.; writing—review and editing, I.W.; visualization, R.N. and I.W.; project administration, B.Z.-M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Kitchen, P.J.; Proctor, T. Marketing communications in a post-modern world. *J. Bus. Strategy* **2015**, *36*, 34–42. [CrossRef]
2. Adamska, M. Practical application of forms and tools of marketing communication in the SME Sector. *EM Econ. Manag.* **2020**, *23*, 193–209. [CrossRef]
3. Duffett, R. A multi-dimensional approach of green marketing competitive advantage: A perspective of small medium and micro enterprises from Western Cape, South Africa. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 3764. [CrossRef]
4. Chen, Y.; Kwilinski, A.; Chygryn, O.; Lyulyov, O.; Pimonenko, T. The green competitiveness of enterprises: Justifying the quality criteria of digital marketing communication channels. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 13679. [CrossRef]
5. Bozhkova, V.V.; Ptashchenko, O.V.; Saher, L.Y.; Syhyda, L.O. Transformation of marketing communications tools in the context of globalization. *Mark. Manag. Innov.* **2018**, *1*, 73–82. [CrossRef]
6. Kemp, S. Digital in 2021 Global Digital Overview. Available online: <https://wearesocial.com/digital-2021> (accessed on 20 July 2022).
7. Lisun, Y. Analysis of the social media marketing: Business environment and modern trends in Poland and Ukraine. *Mod. Manag. Rev.* **2020**, *27*, 51–69. [CrossRef]
8. Dewangan, J.; Siddiqui, I.; Trehan, U. Social media influencer marketing: A systematic literature review. *Int. J. Bus. Excell.* **2022**, *1*, 1–18. [CrossRef]
9. Freberg, K.; Graham, K.; McGaughey, K.; Freberg, L.A. Who are the social media influencers? A study of public perceptions of personality. *Public Relat. Rev.* **2010**, *37*, 90–92. [CrossRef]
10. Djafarova, E.; Rushworth, C. Exploring the credibility of online celebrities' Instagram profiles in influencing the purchase decisions of young female users. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* **2017**, *68*, 1–7. [CrossRef]
11. De Veirman, M.; Cauberghe, V.; Hudders, L. Marketing through Instagram influencers: The impact of number of followers and product divergence on brand attitude. *Int. J. Advert.* **2017**, *36*, 798–828. [CrossRef]
12. Ryu, E.A.; Han, E. Social media influencer's reputation: Developing and validating a multidimensional scale. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 631. [CrossRef]
13. Czarnecka, M.; Kinelski, G.; Stefańska, M.; Grzesiak, M.; Budka, B. Social media engagement in shaping green energy business models. *Energies* **2022**, *15*, 1727. [CrossRef]
14. Skłodowska, M. Wszyscy Chcą Kupować Zieloną Energię. Available online: <https://wysokienapiecie.pl/42482-wszyscy-chca-kupowac-zielona-energie/> (accessed on 22 July 2022).
15. Baylon, C.; Mignot, X. *Komunikacja*; Sowa, M., Translator; Wydawnictwo Flair: Kraków, Poland, 2008.
16. Mattelart, A.; Mattelart, M. *Teorie Komunikacji: Krótkie Wprowadzenie*; Mikułowski Pomorski, J., Translator; Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN: Warszawa, Poland; Kraków, Poland, 2001.
17. Kulczycki, E. *Teoretyzowanie Komunikacji*; Wydawnictwo Naukowe Instytutu Filozofii Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu: Poznań, Poland, 2012.
18. Clevenger, T.J. Can one not communicate? A conflict of models. *Commun. Stud.* **1991**, *42*, 35. [CrossRef]

19. Cartier, F.A.; Harwood, K.A. On definition of communication. *J. Commun.* **1953**, *3*, 71. [CrossRef]
20. Kotler, P.; Keller, K.L. *Marketing*; Dom Wydawniczy Rebis: Poznań, Poland, 2012; p. 510.
21. Wiktor, J.W. System komunikacji marketingowej w perspektywie produktu systemowego. *Studia Ekon. Zesz. Nauk. Uniw. Ekon. Katowicach* **2016**, *262*, 51.
22. Meffert, H. *Marketing. Grundlagen der Absatzpolitik*; Gabler: Wiesbaden, Germany, 1986.
23. Bennett, P.D. *Dictionary of Marketing Terms*; AMA: Chicago, IL, USA, 1988.
24. Bruhn, M. *Kommunikationspolitik, Systematischer Einsatz der Kommunikation für Unternehmen*; Verlag Franz Vahlen: München, Germany, 2013.
25. Belch, G.E.; Belch, M.A. *Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective*; Kindle edition; Irvin/McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 2014.
26. Wang, X.; Yu, C.; Wei, Y. Social media peer communication and impacts on purchase intentions: A consumer socialization framework. *J. Interact. Mark.* **2012**, *26*, 198–208. [CrossRef]
27. Li, F.; Larimo, J.; Leonidou, L.C. Social media marketing strategy: Definition, conceptualization, taxonomy, validation, and future agenda. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2021**, *49*, 51–70. [CrossRef]
28. He, H. A comprehensive review on the role of online media in sustainable business development and decision making. *Soft Comput.* **2022**, *2022*, 1–15. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
29. Rejman, K.; Porada, M. Social media—A new era of communication. *Humanit. Soc. Sci.* **2022**, *29*, 43–49. [CrossRef]
30. Zatwarnicka-Madura, B. Online marketing communication directed to women in the car market. *Humanit. Soc. Sci.* **2016**, *23*, 229–236. [CrossRef]
31. Hajli, M.N. A study of the impact of social media on consumers. *Int. J. Mark. Res.* **2014**, *56*, 387–404. [CrossRef]
32. Sharma, B.; Bhatt, V. Impact of social media on consumer buying behavior—A descriptive study on TAM Model. *J. Manag.* **2018**, *13*, 34. [CrossRef]
33. Rheingold, H. *The Virtual Community. Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*; Addison-Wesley Reading; Addison-Wesley: Boston, MA, USA, 1993.
34. Kaplan, M.; Haenlein, M. Users of the World, Unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Bus. Horiz.* **2010**, *1*, 59–68. [CrossRef]
35. Dabner, N. Breaking Ground” in the use of social media: A case study of a university earthquake response to inform educational design with Facebook. *Internet High. Educ.* **2012**, *15*, 69–78. [CrossRef]
36. Morgan, N.; Jones, G.; Hodges, A. Social Media. The Complete Guide to Social Media from the Social Media Guys. Available online: <http://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/5539277/the-completeguide-to-social-media-the-social-media-guys> (accessed on 23 July 2022).
37. van Dijck, J. *The Culture of Connectivity, a Critical History of Social Media*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2013.
38. Couldry, N.; Hepp, A. Conceptualizing mediatization: Contexts, traditions, arguments. *Commun. Theory* **2013**, *23*, 191. [CrossRef]
39. Schultz, W. Reconstructing Mediatization as an analytical concept. *Eur. J. Commun.* **2004**, *1*, 88–91. Available online: <https://studysites.uk.sagepub.com/mcquail6/Online%20readings/17d%20Schulz.pdf> (accessed on 22 July 2022).
40. Sun, Y.; Wang, S. Understanding consumers intentions to purchase green products in the social media marketing context. *Asia Pac. J. Mark. Logist.* **2020**, *32*, 860–878. [CrossRef]
41. Forbes, L.P.; Vespoli, E.M. Does social media influence consumer buying behavior? An investigation of recommendations and purchases. *J. Bus. Econ. Res.* **2013**, *11*, 107–112. [CrossRef]
42. Liu, X.; Shin, H.; Burns, A. Examining the impact of luxury brand’s social media marketing on customer engagement: Using big data analytics and natural language processing. *J. Bus. Res.* **2021**, *125*, 815–826. [CrossRef]
43. Lee, D.; Hosanagar, K.; Nair, H.S. Advertising content and consumer engagement on social media: Evidence from facebook. *Manag. Sci.* **2018**, *64*, 5105–5131. [CrossRef]
44. Hajli, M.N. Ethical environment in the online communities by information credibility: A social media perspective. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2018**, *149*, 799–810. [CrossRef]
45. Cialdini, R.B. *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*; Harper Collins Publishers Inc.: New York, NY, USA, 2007.
46. Wielki, J. Analysis of the role of digital influencers and their impact on the functioning of the contemporary on-line promotional system and its sustainable development. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 7138. [CrossRef]
47. Atiq, M.; Abid, G.; Anwar, A.; Ijaz, M.F. Influencer marketing on Instagram: A sequential mediation model of storytelling content and audience engagement via reliability and trust. *Information* **2022**, *13*, 345. [CrossRef]
48. Michaelsen, F.; Collini, L.; Goanta, C.J.V.B.D.C.; Kettner, S.E.; Bishop, S.; Thorun, P.H.V.B.P.D.C.; Yesiloglu, S. The impact of influencers on advertising and consumer protection in the Single Market. In *Policy Department for Economic, Scientific and Quality of Life Policies Directorate-General for Internal Policies*; PE 703.350; European Parliament’s Committee: Strasbourg, France, 2022.
49. Duffy, B.E. Social media influencers. In *The International Encyclopedia of Gender, Media, and Communication*; John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2021.
50. Fakhreddin, F.; Foroudi, P. Instagram influencers: The role of opinion leadership in consumers’ purchase behavior. *J. Promot. Manag.* **2021**, *28*, 795–825. [CrossRef]
51. Katz, E.; Lazarsfeld, P. *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the FLOW of Mass Communication*; The Free Press: New York, NY, USA, 1955.

52. Zatwarnicka-Madura, B. *Modele Komunikacji a Postacie w Przekazie Reklamowym*; Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Rzeszowskiej: Rzeszów, Poland, 2020; pp. 1–262.
53. Cho, Y.; Hwang, J.; Lee, D. Identification of effective opinion leaders in the diffusion of technological innovation: A social network approach. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2012**, *79*, 97–106. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Li, J.; Xing, G.; Wang, Y.; Ren, Y. Training opinion leaders in microblog: A game theory approach. In Proceedings of the 2012 Second International Conference on Cloud and Green Computing, Xiangtan, China, 1–3 November 2012; pp. 754–759. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Weiman, G.; Tustin, D.H.; Van Vuuren, D.; Joubert, J.P.R. Looking for opinion leaders: Traditional vs. modern measures in traditional societies. *Int. J. Public Opin. Res.* **2007**, *19*, 173–190. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Kopller, K. *Opinion Leaders*; Heinrich Bauer Verlag: Hamburg, Germany, 1984.
57. Chan, K.K.; Misra, S. Characteristics of the opinion leader: A New Dimension. *J. Advert.* **1990**, *19*, 53–60. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Fenney, C. Managing and Communicating across the Generations. Singapore Business Review 2012. Available online: [www.sbr.com.sg/hr-education/commentary/managing-and-communicating-across-generations](http://www.sbr.com.sg/hr-education/commentary/managing-and-communicating-across-generations) (accessed on 28 July 2022).
59. Robbins, S.; Judge, T. *Organizational Behavior*; Pearson: New York, NY, USA, 2012; p. 46.
60. Hossain, M. Understanding the attitude of generation z consumers towards advertising avoidance. *Eur. J. Bus. Manag.* **2018**, *10*, 86–96.
61. Šramková, M.; Sirotiaková, M. Consumer behaviour of generation Z in the context of dual quality of daily consumption products on EU market. In *SHS Web of Conferences*; EDP Sciences: Les Ulis, France, 2021; Volume 92, p. 06038. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Kim, A.; McInerney, P.; Rüdiger Smith, T.; Yamakawa, N. What Makes Asia-Pacific’s Generation Z Different? McKinsey&Company. 2020. Available online: <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/marketing-and-sales/our-insights/what-makes-asia-pacifics-generation-z-different> (accessed on 20 July 2022).
63. Stillman, D.; Stillman, J. *Gen Z @ Work: How the Next Generation is Transforming the Workplace*; Harper Business: New York, NY, USA, 2017.
64. Ajmain, T. Impacts and effective communication on generation Z in industrial revolution 4.0 era. *J. Engl. Teach. Appl. Linguist.* **2020**, *2*, 37–42. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. Prensky, M. Digital natives, digital immigrants Part 1. *Horizon* **2001**, *9*, 1–6. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Prensky, M. Digital natives, digital immigrants Part 2. Do they really think differently? *Horizon* **2001**, *9*, 1–6. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. Thangavel, P.; Pathak, P.; Chandra, B. Consumer decision-making style of gen Z: A generational cohort analysis. *Glob. Bus. Rev.* **2019**, *23*, 710–728. [[CrossRef](#)]
68. Kantar: Pokolenie Z Polega na Influencerach Podejmując Decyzje Zakupowe. Available online: <https://www.wiadomoscikosmetyczne.pl/artykuly/kantar-pokolenie-z-polega-na-influencerach-podejmu,61442> (accessed on 19 July 2022).
69. LTK Study Reveals: Influencers Are the Single Most Important Online Purchase Driver for Gen Z Adults. Available online: <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20211019005053/en/LTK-Study-Reveals-Influencers-are-the-Single-Most-Important-Online-Purchase-Driver-for-Gen-Z-Adults> (accessed on 22 July 2022).
70. Marks-Bielska, R.; Bielski, S.; Pik, K.; Kurowska, K. The importance of renewable energy sources in Poland’s energy mix. *Energies* **2020**, *13*, 4624. [[CrossRef](#)]
71. Niekurzak, M. The potential of using renewable energy sources in Poland taking into account the economic and ecological conditions. *Energies* **2021**, *14*, 7525. [[CrossRef](#)]
72. Woźniak, M.; Badora, A.; Kud, K.; Woźniak, L. Renewable energy sources as the future of the energy sector and climate in Poland-truth or myth in the opinion of the society. *Energies* **2022**, *15*, 45. [[CrossRef](#)]
73. Zhao, G.M.; Geng, Y.; Sun, H.; Tian, X.; Chen, W.; Wu, D. Mapping the knowledge of green consumption: A meta-analysis. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2020**, *27*, 44937–44950. [[CrossRef](#)]
74. Yao, J.; Guo, X.; Wang, L.; Jiang, H. Understanding green consumption: A literature review based on factor analysis and bibliometric method. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 8324. [[CrossRef](#)]
75. Hasterok, D.; Castro, R.; Landrat, M.; Pikoń, K.; Doepfert, M.; Morais, H. Polish energy transition 2040: Energy mix optimization using grey wolf optimizer. *Energies* **2021**, *14*, 501. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Sobczyk, W.; Sobczyk, E.J. Varying the energy mix in the EU-28 and in Poland as a step towards sustainable development. *Energies* **2021**, *14*, 1502. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. Witek, L.; Kuźniar, W. Green purchase behavior: The effectiveness of sociodemographic variables for explaining green purchases in emerging market. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 209. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Lundheim, S.H.; Pellegrini-Masini, G.; Klöckner, C.A.; Geiss, S. Developing a theoretical framework to explain the social acceptability of wind energy. *Energies* **2022**, *15*, 4934. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Domalewska, D. A longitudinal analysis of the creation of environmental identity and attitudes towards energy sustainability using the framework of identity theory and big data analysis. *Energies* **2021**, *14*, 647. [[CrossRef](#)]
80. Huang, C.-C.; Liang, W.-Y.; Chen, P.-A.; Chan, Y.-C. Identification of opinion leaders and followers-A case study of green energy and low carbons. *Appl. Sci.* **2020**, *10*, 8416. [[CrossRef](#)]
81. Saghati Jalali, S.; Khalid, H. The influence of Instagram influencers’ activity on green consumption behavior. *Bus. Manag. Strategy* **2021**, *12*, 78–90. [[CrossRef](#)]

82. Dadwal, S.S.; Jamal, A.; Harris, T.; Brown, G.; Raudhah, S. Technology and sharing economy-based business models for marketing to connected consumers. In *Handbook of Research on Innovations in Technology and Marketing for the Connected Consumer*; IGI Global: London, UK, 2020; pp. 62–93. [[CrossRef](#)]
83. Howard, J.A.; Sheth, J.N. A theory of buyer behavior. In *Marketing: Critical Perspectives on Business and Management*; Baker, M.J., Ed.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2001; Volume III, pp. 81–105.
84. Javed, S.; Rashidin, M.S.; Xiao, Y. Investigating the impact of digital influencers on consumer decision-making and content outreach: Using dual AISAS model. *Econ. Res.-Ekonom. Istraživanja* **2021**, *35*, 1183–1210. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Taillon, B.J.; Mueller, S.M.; Kowalczyk, C.M.; Jones, D.N. Understanding the relationships between social media influencers and their followers: The moderating role of closeness. *J. Prod. Brand Manag.* **2020**, *29*, 767–782. [[CrossRef](#)]
86. Li, X.; Zhang, G. Perceived credibility of Chinese social media: Toward an integrated approach. *Int. J. Public Opin. Res.* **2018**, *30*, 79–101. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. Hovland, C.I.; Weiss, W. The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opin. Q.* **1951**, *15*, 635–650. [[CrossRef](#)]
88. Munnukka, J.; Uusitalo, O.; Toivonen, H. Credibility of a peer endorser and advertising effectiveness. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2016**, *33*, 182–192. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. Lou, C.; Yuan, S. Influencer marketing: How message value and credibility affect consumer trust of branded content on social media. *J. Interact. Advert.* **2019**, *19*, 58–73. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Balaban, D.; Mustățea, M. Users' perspective on the credibility of social media influencers in Romania and Germany. *Rom. J. Commun. Public Relat.* **2019**, *21*, 31–46. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Cialdini, R.B. *Harnessing the Science of Persuasion*; Harvard Business Review: Brighton, MA, USA, 2001; pp. 72–80.
92. Ibáñez-Sánchez, S.; Flavián, M.; Casaló, L.V.; Belanche, D. Influencers and brands successful collaborations: A mutual reinforcement to promote products and services on social media. *J. Mark. Commun.* **2021**, *28*, 469–486. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. Reinikainen, H.; Munnukka, J.; Maity, D.; Luoma-aho, V. 'You really are a great big sister'—Parasocial relationships, credibility, and the moderating role of audience comments in influencer marketing. *J. Mark. Manag.* **2020**, *36*, 279–298. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Su, B.-C.; Wu, L.-W.; Chang, Y.-Y.-C.; Hong, R.-H. Influencers on social media as References: Understanding the Importance of Parasocial Relationships. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 10919. [[CrossRef](#)]
95. Park, J.; Lee, Y. Luxury haul video creators' nonverbal communication and viewer intention to subscribe on YouTube. *Soc. Behav. Personal. Int. J.* **2021**, *49*, 1–15. [[CrossRef](#)]
96. Sokolova, K.; Kefi, H. Instagram and YouTube bloggers promote it, why should I buy? How credibility and parasocial interaction influence purchase intentions. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2020**, *53*, 101742. [[CrossRef](#)]
97. Berhanu, K.; Raj, S. The trustworthiness of travel and tourism information sources of social media: Perspectives of international tourists visiting Ethiopia. *Heliyon* **2020**, *6*, e03439. [[CrossRef](#)]
98. Alyahya, M. The marketing influencers altering the purchase intentions of Saudi consumers: The effect of sociocultural perspective. *Pol. J. Manag. Stud.* **2021**, *24*, 24–40. [[CrossRef](#)]
99. Rotter, J.B. A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *J. Personal.* **1967**, *35*, 651–665. [[CrossRef](#)]
100. Zainal, N.T.A.; Harun, A.; Lily, J. Examining the mediating effect of attitude towards electronic words-of mouth (eWOM) on the relation between the trust in eWOM source and intention to follow eWOM among Malaysian travellers. *Asia Pac. Manag. Rev.* **2017**, *22*, 35–44. [[CrossRef](#)]
101. Spry, A.; Pappu, R.; Cornwell, B.T. Celebrity endorsement, brand credibility and brand equity. *Eur. J. Mark.* **2011**, *45*, 882–909. [[CrossRef](#)]
102. Seno, D.; Lukas, B.A. The equity effect of product endorsement by celebrities: A conceptual framework from a co-branding perspective. *Eur. J. Mark.* **2007**, *41*, 121–134. [[CrossRef](#)]
103. Ohanian, R. Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. *J. Advert.* **1990**, *19*, 39–52. [[CrossRef](#)]
104. Ha, N.M.; Lam, N.H. The effects of celebrity endorsement on customer's attitude toward brand and purchase intention. *Int. J. Econ. Financ.* **2017**, *9*, 64–77. [[CrossRef](#)]
105. Chen, S.C.; Dhillon, G.S. Interpreting dimensions of consumer trust in e-commerce. *Inf. Technol. Manag.* **2003**, *4*, 303–318. [[CrossRef](#)]
106. Nooteboom, B.; Six, F. *The Trust Process in Organizations: Empirical Studies of the Determinants and the Process of Trust Development*; Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.: Cheltenham, UK, 2003; pp. 16–36.
107. Bachnik, K.; Nowacki, R. How to build consumer trust: Socially responsible or controversial advertising. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 2173. [[CrossRef](#)]
108. Kang, J.; Hustvedt, G. Building trust between consumers and corporations: The role of consumer perceptions of transparency and social responsibility. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2014**, *125*, 253–265. [[CrossRef](#)]
109. Esch, F.-R.; Langner, T.; Schmitt, B.H.; Geus, P. Are brands forever? How brand knowledge and relationships affect current and future purchases. *J. Prod. Brand Manag.* **2006**, *15*, 98–105. [[CrossRef](#)]
110. Fournier, S.; Yao, J.L. Reviving brand loyalty: A reconceptualization within the framework of consumer-brand relationships. *Int. J. Res. Mark.* **1997**, *14*, 451–472. [[CrossRef](#)]
111. Morgan, R.M.; Hunt, S.D. The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *J. Mark.* **1994**, *58*, 20–38. [[CrossRef](#)]

112. Rousseau, D.M.; Sitkin, S.B.; Burt, R.S.; Camerer, C. Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1998**, *23*, 393–404. [[CrossRef](#)]
113. Kemeç, U.; ve Yüksel, H.F. The relationships among influencer credibility, brand trust, and purchase intention: The case of Instagram. *Tüketici Ve Tüketim Araş-Tırmaları Derg.* **2021**, *13*, 159–193.
114. Sesar, V.; Martinčević, I.; Boguszewicz-Kreft, M. Relationship between advertising disclosure, influencer credibility and purchase intention. *J. Risk Financ. Manag.* **2022**, *15*, 276. [[CrossRef](#)]
115. Koay, K.Y.; Cheung, M.L.; Soh, P.C.-H.; Teoh, C.W. Social media influencer marketing: The moderating role of materialism. *Eur. Bus. Rev.* **2021**, *34*, 224–243. [[CrossRef](#)]
116. Masuda, H.; Han, S.H.; Lee, J. Impacts of influencer attributes on purchase intentions in social media influencer marketing: Mediating roles of characterizations. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2022**, *174*, 121246. [[CrossRef](#)]
117. Naderer, B.; Matthes, J.; Schäfer, S. Effects of disclosing ads on Instagram: The moderating impact of similarity to the influencer. *Int. J. Advert.* **2021**, *40*, 686–707. [[CrossRef](#)]
118. Saima Khan, M.A. Effect of social media influencer marketing on consumers' purchase intention and the mediating role of credibility. *J. Promot. Manag.* **2020**, *27*, 503–523. [[CrossRef](#)]
119. Wiedmann, K.-P.; von Mettenheim, W. Attractiveness, trustworthiness and expertise—social influencers' winning formula? *J. Prod. Brand Manag.* **2020**, *30*, 707–725. [[CrossRef](#)]
120. Paço, A.; Oliveira, S. Influence marketing in the fashion and beauty industry. *Estud. Comun.* **2017**, *1*, 119–136. [[CrossRef](#)]
121. Merton, R. Patterns of influence. In *Communication Research*; Lazarsfeld, P., Stanton, F., Eds.; Harper and Brothers: New York, NY, USA, 1949; pp. 180–219.
122. Belanche, D.; Casaló, L.V.; Flavián, M.; Ibáñez-Sánchez, S. Building influencers' credibility on Instagram: Effects on followers' attitudes and behavioral responses toward the influencer. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2021**, *61*, 102585. [[CrossRef](#)]
123. Zatwarnicka-Madura, B.; Nowacki, R. Storytelling and its impact on effectiveness of advertising. In *Book of Proceedings 8th International Conference on Management Leadership, Innovativeness and Entrepreneurship in a Sustainable Economy*; Bylok, F., Albrychiewicz-Słocińska, A., Cichobłaziński, L., Eds.; Politechnika Częstochowska: Częstochowa, Poland, 2018; pp. 694–699.
124. Huijts, N.; Molin, E.; Steg, L. Psychological factors influencing sustainable energy technology acceptance: A review-based comprehensive framework. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2012**, *16*, 525–531. [[CrossRef](#)]