

**REBUPLIC OF TURKEY
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
PUBLIC RELATIONS AND ADVERTISEMENT**

**FASHION CONSUMERS' VIEWS AND EVALUATION ON
SOCIAL MEDIA AS A TOOL FOR ONLINE ADVERTISEMENT:
A SAMPLE CASE ON SAKARYA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

Chamssoudine Bahari TAMOUDE

MASTER'S THESIS

Supervisor: Prof.Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN

JUNE – 2021

**REBUPLIC OF TURKEY
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**FASHION CONSUMERS' VIEWS AND EVALUATION
ON SOCIAL MEDIA AS A TOOL FOR ONLINE
ADVERTISEMENT: A SAMPLE CASE ON SAKARYA
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS**

MASTER'S THESIS

Chamssoudine Bahari TAMOUDE

Department: Public Relations and Advertisement

**“The examination was held on 29/06/2021 online and approved unanimously
by the following committee members.”**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS	ASSESMENT
Prof.Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN	Succesful
Assoc Prof. Ayda İNANÇ	Succesful
Assoc Prof. Hassan ÇALIŞKAN	Succesful

RESEARCH ETHICS DECLARATION FORM

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and I declare that all information presented in this document has been obtained following academic rules and ethical conduct. I also fully acknowledge all the consequences of violating these rules by plagiarism or any other way.

Studies that require Ethics Committee Approval are as follows;

- Any research that require data collection from participants using questionnaire, interview, focus group study, direct observation, and experiment and interview techniques alike.
- Using of humans and animals (including materials/data) for experimental or other scientific purposes,
- Clinical trials conducted on humans and animals,

Do you need any ethics committee approval document?

Yes ☒

No ☐

Chamssoudine Bahari TAMOUDE

29.06.2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been completed with encouragement and support of numerous people:

First off, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and respect to my supervisor and teacher, Professor. Aytekin Isman for his valuable contribution and efforts. He was by my side throughout the whole process, and did not spare his support and contributions. Frankly, this study work would have been unsuccessful without the contribution of my advisor. He faithfully advocated for this thesis to be my own work and contributed his time, experience and knowledge. Also, I would like to be grateful for the rich lectures he provided me during my courses. On the other hand, I deeply express my profound gratitude to the jury members; during the defense, members Assoc Prof. Ayda İNANÇ and Assoc Prof. Hassan ÇALIŞKAN for their time, recommendations and valuable contributions to the finalization of my work. Also, I would like to thank all my teachers and my colleagues for their help in the final reading of my thesis.

Also, I thank YTB for granting me the means and opportunity to study in Turkey and my fellow gratitude students for making my stay in Sakarya more enjoyable.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family who I will never be able to pay for their efforts and help in reaching this level.

Chamssoudine Bahari TAMOUDE

29.06.2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE LIST	v
ABSTRACT	xvii
ÖZET	xviii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW	12
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH	25
2.1. Universe and Sample	25
2.2. Data Collection	26
2.3. Data Collection Techniques.....	26
CHAPTER 3: PRESENTATION OF DATA.....	28
3.1. Demographic Characteristics.....	28
3.2. Internet, Social media Usage and Participant's Favorite Social Networks	29
3.2.1. Internet Usage.....	29
3.2.2. Social Media Usage	29
3.2.3. Participants Favorite Social Networks	29
3.3. Participant's Expressions Regarding Purchase Decision in the Pre- Purchasing	33
3.4. Participant's Expressions Regarding Purchase Decision in the Post- Purchasing ..	37
3.5. The Degree of Influence of Each Social Media Channel on Participants' Purchasing Decisions	40
3.6. Independent T test by gender.....	44
3.6.1. For Researching Product on Social Media	45
3.6.2. Trust in product on social media	45
3.6.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision	46
3.6.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision	47
3.6.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision.....	47
3.6.6. Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision.....	48
3.6.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision	49
3.6.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision	49

3.6.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision.....	50
3.6.10. Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media.....	51
3.6.11. For shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media	51
3.6.12. For Purchasing Product Found From Comment.....	52
3.6.13. For Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media	53
3.6.14. For Purchasing Product Found From Page on Social Media	53
3.6.15. For Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile ON Social Media ...	54
3.6.16. For Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile on Social Media	55
3.6.17. For Purchasing Product Found from University Friend's Profile on Social Media.....	55
3.7. Anova Analysis by Age.....	56
3.7.1. Researching Product on Social Media.....	56
3.7.2. Trust in Product on Social Media.....	57
3.7.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision	58
3.7.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision	58
3.7.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision.....	59
3.7.6. Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision.....	60
3.7.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision	61
3.7.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision	62
3.7.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision.....	62
3.7.10. Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media.....	63
3.7.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media.....	64
3.7.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media	65
3.7.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media.....	65
3.7.14. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media	66
3.7.15. Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile on Social Media	67
3.7.16. Purchasing Product Found From Families' Profile on Social Media.....	67
3.7.17. Purchasing Product Found From University Friends' Profile on Social Media.....	68
3.8. Anova by Level of Study.....	69
3.8.1. Researching product on social media.....	69

3.8.2. For Trust in Product on Social Media	70
3.8.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision	70
3.8.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision	71
3.8.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision.....	72
3.8.6. Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision.....	73
3.8.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision	74
3.8.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision	74
3.8.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision.....	75
3.8.10. Participation to Brands Competition	76
3.8.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media.....	77
3.8.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment	77
3.8.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile	78
3.8.14. Purchasing Product Found From Page	79
3.8.15. Purchasing Product Found From Friends' Profile on Social Media	79
3.8.16. Purchasing Product Found From Families' Profile on Social Media.....	80
3.8.17. Purchasing Product Found From University Friends' Profile on Social Media.....	81
3.9. Anova by Internet Usage	82
3.9.1. Research of Product on Social Media	82
3.9.2. Trust in Product on Social Media.....	83
3.9.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision	84
3.9.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision	85
3.9.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision.....	85
3.9.6. Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision.....	86
3.9.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision	87
3.9.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision	88
3.9.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision.....	88
3.9.10. For Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media	89
3.9.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media.....	90
3.9.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media.....	91
3.9.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media.....	91
3.9.14. Purchasing Product Found From Profile From Page.....	92

3.9.15. Purchasing Product Found From Friends' Profile on Social Media	93
3.9.16. Purchasing Product Found From Families' Profile on Social Media)	94
3.9.17. Purchasing Product Found From University Friends' Profile on Social Media.....	94
3.10. Anova by Social Media Usage	95
3.10.1. Researching Product on Social Media.....	95
3.10.2. Trust in Product on Social Media.....	96
3.10.3. For Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision.....	97
3.10.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision	97
3.10.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision.....	98
3.10.6. Impact of Non-University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision.....	99
3.10.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision	100
3.10.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision	100
3.10.9. Impact of Brands Offer on Purchase Decision	101
3.10.10. Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media.....	102
3.10.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media.....	103
3.10.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media	103
3.10.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media.....	104
3.10.14. Purchasing Product Found From Page on Social Media	105
3.10.15. Purchasing Product Found From Comment Friends' Profile on Social Media)	106
3.10.16. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media Family's Profile on Social Media	106
3.10.17. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media University Friends' Profile on Social Media.....	107
DISCUSSIONS	109
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	115
REFERENCES	117
ATTACHMENTS.....	121
CURRICULUM VITAE	124

TABLE LIST

Table 1	: Participants' Gender	28
Table 2	: Participant's Level of Study	28
Table 3	: Participants' Age	28
Table 4	: Participants' Internet Usage	29
Table 5	: Participants' Social Media Usage.....	29
Table 6	: Facebook and MySpace.....	30
Table 7	: Forum and Dictionaries	30
Table 8	: Wikis (Wikipedia)	30
Table 9	: Blogs (Webrazzi).....	31
Table 10	: Microblogs (Twitter)	31
Table 11	: Social Media Sharing Networks (Youtube, Instagram)	31
Table 12	: Bookmarketing Networks (Pinterest).....	32
Table 13	: Daily Opportunity Networks (Groupon)	32
Table 14	: Advice and Evaluation Networks (IMDB, TripAdvisor).....	32
Table 15	: Search of Product On Social Media	33
Table 16	: Trustiness.....	33
Table 17	: Social Media Advertisement and Its Impact On Purchase Decision.....	34
Table 18	: Famous People and Their Impact on Purchase Decision	34
Table 19	: Family's Impact on Purchase Decision	34
Table 20	: Non- University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision.....	35
Table 21	: University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision.....	35
Table 22	: Brand's Profile and Its Impact on Purchase Decision.....	36
Table 23	: Brand's Offer and Its Impact on Purchase Decision	36
Table 24	: Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media.....	36
Table 25	: Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media	37
Table 26	: Purchasing Product Found From Comment	37
Table 27	: Purchasing Product Found From Profile	37
Table 28	: Purchasing Product Found From Page	38
Table 29	: Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile.....	38
Table 30	: Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile.....	39
Table 31	: Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile	39

Table 32	: Social Networks (Facebook, MySpace)	40
Table 33	: Forum and Dictionaries	40
Table 34	: Wikis (Wikipedia)	41
Table 35	: Blogs.....	41
Table 36	: Micro Blogs (Twitter)	41
Table 37	: Social Media Sharing Networks (Youtube, Instagram, and Flickr)	42
Table 38	: (Pinterest)	42
Table 39	: Daily Opportunity Networks (Groupon)	42
Table 40	: Advice and Evaluate Networks (IMDB, Trip Advisor)	43
Table 41	: Group Statistics of The Independent T Test Analysis By Gender (Researching Product on Social Media	45
Table 42	: Independent Sample Test if The T Test Analysis By Gender (Researching product on Social Media)	45
Table 43	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Trust in Product on Social Media)	46
Table 44	: Independent Sample Test if The T Test Analysis by Gender (Trust in Product on Social media)	46
Table 45	: Group Statistics of The Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision).....	46
Table 46	: Independent Sample Test If The T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)	46
Table 47	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	47
Table 48	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Famous People's Impact on Purchase Decision)	47
Table 49	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)	48
Table 50	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision).....	48
Table 51	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Non- Niversity Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision)	48

Table 52	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision).....	49
Table 53	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision).....	49
Table 54	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision).....	49
Table 55	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of brand's Profile on Purchase Decision).....	50
Table 56	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	50
Table 57	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	50
Table 58	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision).....	50
Table 59	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Participation in Brand's Competition on Social Media).....	51
Table 60	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media).....	51
Table 61	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)	52
Table 62	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media).....	52
Table 63	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	52
Table 64	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	52
Table 65	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)	53
Table 66	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)	53
Table 67	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Page)	54

Table 68	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)	54
Table 69	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile).....	54
Table 70	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile).....	55
Table 71	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Family's Profile)	55
Table 72	: Independent Sample Test If the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile)	55
Table 73	: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile).....	56
Table 74	: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile)	56
Table 75	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis for Age (Researching Product on Social Media)	57
Table 76	: One Way Anova Analysis for Age (Researching Product on Social Media)	57
Table 77	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis for Age (Trust in Product on Social Media)	57
Table 78	: One Way Anova Analysis For age (Trust in Product on Social Media) ...	58
Table 79	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Social Media on Purchase Decision).....	58
Table 80	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)	58
Table 81	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by age (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	59
Table 82	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Famous Peoplet on Purchase Decision).....	59
Table 83	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision).....	60

Table 84	: One Way Anova Analysis by age (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)	60
Table 85	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)	60
Table 86	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)	61
Table 87	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Niversity Friends on Purchase Decision)	61
Table 88	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)	61
Table 89	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	62
Table 90	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	62
Table 91	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	63
Table 92	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	63
Table 93	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Participation to Brand's Competition)	63
Table 94	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Participation to Brand's Competition)	64
Table 95	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)	64
Table 96	: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)	64
Table 97	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	65
Table 98	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	65
Table 99	: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)	66

Table 100 : One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Profile).....	66
Table 101 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Page).....	66
Table 102 : One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Page).....	67
Table 103 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)	67
Table 104 : One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)	67
Table 105 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile).....	68
Table 106 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile).....	68
Table 107 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile).....	69
Table 108 : One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile)	69
Table 109 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Researching Product on Social Media).....	69
Table 110 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Researching Product on Social Media)	70
Table 111 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Trust in Product on Social Media).....	70
Table 112 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Trust in Product on Social Media)	70
Table 113 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Social Media Advertisement and its Impact on Purchase Decision).....	71
Table 114 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Social Media Advertisement and Its Impact on Purchase Decision)	71
Table 115 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	72

Table 116 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	72
Table 117 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Amily and Impact on Purchase Decision)	72
Table118 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)	73
Table 119 : Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)	73
Table 120 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)	73
Table 121 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)	74
Table 122 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)	74
Table 123 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	75
Table 124 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of study (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	75
Table 125 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	75
Table 126 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	76
Table 127 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media)	76
Table 128 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media)	76
Table 129 : Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media)	77
Table 130 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media)	77
Table 131 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	78

Table 132 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Comment).....	78
Table 133 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)	78
Table 134 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Profile).....	79
Table 135 : Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Page)	79
Table 136 : One Way Anova Analysis By Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Page).....	79
Table 137 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)	80
Table 138 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)	80
Table 139 : Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis By Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile)	81
Table 140 : One Way Anova Analysis By Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile).....	81
Table 141 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile).....	82
Table 142 : One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile)	82
Table 143 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Researching Product on Social Media).....	83
Table 144 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Researching Product on Social Media)	83
Table 145 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Trust In Product on Social Media).....	83
Table 146 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Trust In Product On Social Media)	84
Table 147 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Social Media Advertisement And Its Impact on Purchase Decision)	84

Table 148 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Social Media Advertisement and Its Impact On Purchase Decision).....	84
Table 149 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	85
Table 150 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	85
Table 151 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision).....	86
Table 152 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision).....	86
Table 153 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)	86
Table 154 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision).....	87
Table 155 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)	87
Table 156 : One Way Anova Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)	87
Table 157 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	88
Table 158 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	88
Table 159 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision).....	89
Table 160 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	89
Table 161 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition).....	89
Table 162 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition And Its Impact on Purchase Decision)	90
Table 163 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media).....	90

Table 164 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Shopping From Brand Followed)	90
Table 165 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	91
Table 166 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment).....	91
Table 167 : Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)	92
Table 168 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile).....	92
Table 169 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page)	92
Table 170 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page).....	93
Table 171 : Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile).....	93
Table 172 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Friend's Profile)	93
Table 173 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile)	94
Table 174 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile)	94
Table 175 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from University Friend's Profile)	95
Table 176 : One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from University Friend's Profile)	95
Table 177 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Researching Product on Social Media).....	96
Table 178 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Researching Product on Social Media)	96
Table 179 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Social Media Usage (Trust In Product on Social Media).....	96

Table 180 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Trust in Product on Social Media)	97
Table 181 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Social Media Usage (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision).....	97
Table 182 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)	97
Table 183 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	98
Table 184 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)	98
Table 185 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)	98
Table 186 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)	99
Table 187 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)	99
Table 188 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)	99
Table 189 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision)	100
Table 190 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision).....	100
Table 191 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	101
Table 192 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)	101
Table 193 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	101
Table 194 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)	102
Table 195 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media	102

Table 196 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media).....	102
Table 197 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media).....	103
Table 198 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media).....	103
Table 199 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	104
Table 200 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)	104
Table 201 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)	104
Table 202 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile).....	105
Table 203 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page)	105
Table 204 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page).....	105
Table 205 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Friend's Profile).....	106
Table 206 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Friend's Profile)	106
Table 207 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile).....	107
Table 208 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile)	107
Table 209 : Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from My University Friend's Profile)	108
Table 210 : One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile).....	108

ABSTRACT	
Title of Thesis: Fashion Consumers' Views and Evaluation On Social Media As A Tool For Online Advertisement: A Sample Case On Sakarya University Students	
Author of Thesis: Chamssoudine Bahari TAMOUDE	
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN	
Accepted Date: 29.06.2021 Number of Pages: xviii (pre text) + 121 (m.b.)+ 3 (app)	
The Purpose of this study was to investigate on the impact of social media on fashion consumers. In the last decade, social media has been playing an important role in fashion business by creating a new dimension of marketing and permitting to brands to introduce products and services online. Today, many fashion brands, especially fast fashion attract consumers on social media via advertisement. In fact, the emergence of social media in fashion changed the way of communication between brands and consumers. On one hand, it brings consumers to the brand closely, facilitates interaction and increase trustiness and loyalty. On another hand, it gives consumers an opportunity to discuss and evaluate products and services from different perspectives. Recently, with the increase usage of internet, consumers spend a lot of time exploring fashion products on social media. However, since the integration of social media in fashion marketing, a significant impact on people's lives style can be seen. Therefore, it has become crucial to know the degree of change that social media made in consumers' life. The study contributes to a further theoretical understanding of social media's impact on fashion consumer's behavior. The research included Sakarya University Students those are fashion consumers and social media users from communication and media department. The data collected from participants was analyzed and interpreted by SPSS frequency. To reach the target, the research method used is survey. It is useful to reach a large number of individual and it can provide quantitative data related with consumers.	
Keywords: Social Media, Consumer, Fashion, Fashion Consumer, Consumer Behavior, Advertisement, Social Media Advertisement.	

ÖZET	
Başlık: Online Reklam Aracı Olarak Sosyal Medyada Moda Tüketicilerin Görüşmeleri ve Değerlendirmeleri: Sakarya Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Örneği	
Yazar: Chamssoudine Bahari TAMOUDE	
Danışman: Prof. Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN	
Kabul Tarihi: 29.06.2021	Sayfa Sayısı: xviii (ön kısım) + 121 (tez)+ 3 (ek)
Bu çalışmanın amacı, sosyal medyanın moda tüketicileri üzerindeki etkisini araştırmaktır. Son on yılda sosyal medya, yeni bir pazarlama boyutu yaratarak ve markalara çevrimici ürün ve hizmetler sunma izni vererek moda sektöründe önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Günümüzde birçok moda markası, özellikle hızlı moda, reklam yoluyla sosyal medyada tüketicileri cezbetmektedir. Aslında moda alanında sosyal medyanın ortaya çıkması, markalar ile tüketiciler arasındaki iletişimin yolunu değiştirmektedir. Bir yandan tüketicileri markaya yaklaştırıyor, etkileşimi kolaylaştırıyor ve markalar ile tüketiciler arasındaki güveni ve bağlılığı artırır. Diğer yandan tüketicilere, ürünü ve hizmetleri farklı bakış açılarından tartışma ve değerlendirme fırsatı verir. Son zamanlarda internet kullanımının artmasıyla tüketiciler moda ürünlerini sosyal medyanın tüketicilerin hayatında yaptığı değişimin derecesini bilmek çok önemli hale geldi. Ancak, sosyal medyanın moda pazarlamasına entegrasyonundan bu yana insanların yaşam tarzları üzerinde önemli bir etki görülebilmektedir. Aslında, moda tüketicilerin kararı, sosyal medyadaki bilgilerin mevcudiyeti nedeniyle etkilenmektedir. Çalışma, sosyal medyanın moda tüketicisinin davranışları üzerindeki etkisine dair daha fazla teorik anlayışa katkıda bulunuyor. Araştırma, iletişim ve medya bölümünden moda tüketicisi ve sosyal medya kullanıcı olan Sakarya Üniversitesi öğrencilerini yapmaktadır. Katılımcıların toplanan veriler analiz edilmiş ve SPSS tek yönlü varyans frekans ile yorumlanmıştır. Hedefe ulaşmak için kullanılan araştırma yöntemi ankettir. Çok sayıda bireye ulaşmak faydalıdır ve tüketicilerle ilgil nicel verileri sağlayabilir.	
Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal Medya, Tüketici, Moda, Moda Tüketicisi, Tüketici Davranışı, Reklam, Sosyal Medya Reklamları.	

INTRODUCTION

Social media has affected the world of business and one of the specific domains that have been drastically affected is fashion (McCarthy, 2013). Clearly, social media brought fresh and innovative elements into the online shopping experience and potentially catalysts for additional profits, gives consumers an opportunity to see the last works of their favorite brands (Ahmad, Salman & Ashiq, 2015). Therefore, fashion companies embraced social media and considered it as one of their marketing tools to reach consumers (Ananda, Garcia & Lamberti, 2015). In fact, many fashion brands collaborate with influential social media users to reach more consumers. They are persuading consumers by sharing brands' advertisement and activities. Whatever, before the existence of social media, there is no way for consumers to get much information about products? Today, social media makes consumers living evolution of fashion. From social media, fashion consumers can interact with companies to get the information they need. The integration of social media in fashion business gives voice to consumers to interact with each other to show their satisfaction or dissatisfaction regarding fashion companies' products and services. Fashion consumers via social media obligated fashion companies to listen to their opinion and to be more transparent. However, due to increasing demand of fashion products on social media this study tries to understand consumers' behavior towards social media.

Subject of Study: Social media

Social media can be defining as an online platform in which people are creating, sharing and exchanging their ideas with others. Also, it is a platform which people use to connect and build social relations with other people those have the same interests and activities (Akram & Kumar, 2017). Social media is a digital space which allows users to register, create personal accounts or profiles, decide and select who should make friend and communicate with (Farhud, 2017; Agosto & Abbas, 2011). In marketing, Social media is a platform where marketers can reach targeted consumers and a place that consumers can interact, generate and exchange information about products (Hajli, 2014; Lai & Turban, 2008). It is a place in which consumers has altered the way to get information and make buying decision (Yasmin, Farooq & Zreen, 2018). Due to the increase usage of social media between consumers, the traditional media is gradually

being replaced by Social media in fashion marketing. This innovation has led to increased online interaction between consumers and fashion influencers. Today, many consumers pick up fashion ideas from social media via influencers, models and celebrities. Also they communicate and interact with each other to receive advice either positive or negative about different products. Social media as marketing tool can be used to generate rapid awareness through consumers' base by announcing and advertising (Deghani, 2013). The increase usage of social networks such as Facebook, Twitter and Instagram consumers' affinity will be grown and improve thus attract new and present consumers to use social networks in turn reducing costs for fashion companies

Facebook

Facebook is an online platform that permits to users to communicate with each other via message, call, sharing status, picture or video. It is probably the largest social network in term of users. Launched in 2004, Facebook has more than one billion users in 2010 (Sbarai 2013; Camelo da Cunha & Sales do Monte, 2014). Facebook permits to business marketers to create marketing pages to advertise their products. Consumers via Facebook can follow their favorite brands and explore products they want to buy. They are enabling to communicate with each other to know more about products, prices and promotions. Facebook gives consumers an opportunity to create an open and close group so they can discuss and exchange ideas. Facebook is useful for marketing issue. To reach Facebook users, brands have to use Facebook functionalities and create their commercial pages for advertising and interacting with consumers. After that, they can edit their pages by adding information such as brands' name, service, contact etc. To advertise products, brands can create a post containing product image with good slogan to affect consumers. On Facebook, brands can promote their pages with cheap fee to reach more consumers.

Twitter

Twitter is a microblogging and communication platform that permits to users to express and interact with each other by sharing tweet attached by picture or video. In 2015, Twitter counted around 320 millions monthly users (Patruti-Baltes, 2016; Twitter, 2015). Twitter as fashionable tool permits to consumers to see the latest offer of

fashion brands. From Twitter consumers can interact with influencers and fashion celebrities to get advices about products they want to purchase. Consumers via Twitter are enable to retweet brands or influencers' tweet. They can also make hashtag to pay attention to other consumers. When consumers hashtagging an advertisement, others get attract curiosity to take a look to know what it is about. By using promoted trend, brands can introduce a product via short advertisement. The advertisement can be retweet and add by followers in favorite list. Also, by using promoted account, brands can increases followers. Promoted brand's account can be show to followers as an sponsor so they can follow brand's account. Furthermore, by using promoted tweet, brands can get more likes and comments from followers.

Instagram

Instagram is a platform that gives an access to consumers to see fashion products presented by advertisers and influencers (Khan, 2018). According to Instagram Press "approximately 40 million photos are posted each day, along with site traffic translating to 8500 "likes" per second, and 1000 comments per second" (Sydney McCarthy, 2013; Instagram Press). Instagram as marketing tool permits to brands to advertise their products on Instagram by using official account, or via influencers. It is the most suitable platform for fashion advertisement. Consumers when using Instagram are curious to know what their friends wear and from which brand they bought it. Generally, consumers choose their products after get influenced by friends or influencers. Since brands understand that influencers have an impact on consumers, they engaged many of them to introduce their products. Today, many consumers try to imitate influencers' look. They comment their posts continually and ask them by direct message the information and details they need to know about products.

Fashion

Fashion can be describing as an object, style, or activity stands out against a backdrop of stability ready to offer in specific time and context (Ann- Marie &Patrick, 2015). It is a complex sector that keep developing and changing every season. , Also, it is a fascinating world to the fashion consumers, which love style and good looking. Fashion regroups all consumers with higher and lower purchase of shopping from all gender.

With integration of social media, fashion enters to new eras. It is now one of the most sectors perfectly suited and fit for social media (Manyan, Swarnalatha & Padma, 2018).

Consumer

Consumer is defined as an individual whom use or consume a product that provided to satisfy his needs. In fact, consumer use social media as an avenue to interact with brands and other consumers. Today, consumer is allowed to watch online the last works of fashion brands by following their account and pages on social media. Also, with huge availability of information on social media, consumer is now more knowledgeable and capable of evaluating information he receives and purchase the best option of products (Rathnayaka, 2018). Many consumers communicate with their friends on social media those already bought products to know their experience regarding services. Also, they can connect with their favorite brands on social media at a massive scale and telling their friends which businesses and products they love (Kavoura, 2014). Social media permits to consumers to share their ideas, experience and recommandations regarding products and services (Henri Gros, 2012; Brown, and Hayes, 2008, p179-180). The search and experience leads consumers to have many choices (Ertemel, Ammoura, 2016; Evans, 2008). Consumers on social media are shifting the power from marketers by communicating with each other and exchanging information before purhcasing products. Since marketers and brands discovered that, they did change their old methods to satisfy consumer needs by interacting with them in individuals on direct messages on social networks (Ammoura, 2016). Social media allows to consumers to get the best services and to be part of co-creation of products (AbuHashkeh, 2014; Xiang & Gretzel, 2010).

Fashion Consumer

Fashion consumer is an individual who pays fashion products and services such as clothes for personal use to appear in good look and be attractive. Fashion Consumers on social media can customize their pages and accounts to receive information regarding new products and promotion. In the past, Fashion consumers were just passive spectators. Today, Fashion consumers through social media found their selves as part of brands' strategy. On social media, fashion consumers can go directly to apps to get much information about products. From apps they can share their favorite fashion finds

and outfits (Mohr, 2013). Fashion brands interact with fashion consumers on social media to know their opinion and develop their services and quality of products (Camelo Da Cunha & Sales do Monte, 2014). However, the borders between companies and fashion consumers will become more and more blurred because fashion consumers have a greater influence on the way new products are shaped. Moreover, with more choices and advantages that social media offer to fashion consumers, the competitive strength of fashion companies increases everyday. By surfing on social media fashion consumers can easily move to a new producer (Mróz-Gorgoń, 2014; Rosa & Smalec, 2012, p. 176). The obsession to look great and handsome leads a lot of fashion consumers to high consumption level by purchasing products on social media continually (Camelo Da Cunha & Sales do Monte, 2014; Cobra, 2007, p. 17).

Consumer Behavior

Consumer behavior is a process of actions that a person is engaged with to satisfy with needs such as searching, choosing, evaluating before buying (Suelin & Tan, 2010; Belch & Belch, 2004). "Consumer buying behavior is the process by which individuals search for, select, purchase, use, and dispose of goods and services, in satisfaction of their needs and wants" (Stankevich, 2017). With the emergence of social media in fashion, consumers' behavior changed because of online connection and social information which is outside of marketer's control. Today, Brands engaged influencers to persuade consumers. Influencers are impressing consumers by sharing their posts on social media and wearing products from brands they do represent. Also, they are influencing individuals by giving them advice about the ability and usage of product. They share their activities and participations in advertisements online. Influencers with their sense of persuasion can easily influence consumers' feelings and behavior towards products. Consumer behavior theories suggest that it is not necessary for fashion consumers to trust influencers but necessary to do listen to many of them before making any purchase decision (Al Mashhadani, 2019).

Advertisement

"Advertisement is a paid, mediated form of communication from an identifiable source designed to persuade the receiver to take some action, now or in the future" (Terkan, 2014; Karimova, 2014; Richards & Curran, 2002: 74). Since early, fashion companies

did integrated advertisement in their marketing. They benefit from advertisement to improve their market via traditional media. Today, marketers incorporated social media beside traditional media to reach all groups and categories of consumers. Social media gives an opportunity to fashion companies to communicate with consumers online via advertisement. Also, it gives them an opportunity to reach large number of consumers by advertising their products and services. Advertisement in traditional media is totally different from social media. On social media, advertisement can be expand easily since consumers are connected to social media. Advertisement has the communication role in marketing to let people know the companies' products and services. Also, advertisement is the way to impact consumers for more shopping. Furthermore, it is a creative way to educate consumers and give them information regarding needs and desires. When companies realize advertisements and share them, consumers try to define the products and services in their mind.

Social media Advertisement

Social media advertisement permits to advertisers to share their products and services and communicate with consumers those are interest in advertisers' sharing. Via social media brands and consumers can communicate and have relationship at the same time consumers can communicate and have relationship with each other (Lipsman et al., 2012; Mangold and Faulds, 2009). Social media advertisement permits to brands to collaborate with consumers to know their needs, opinions and identify problems they are facing to find good solutions for them (Uchechi Cynthia Ohajonu, and Dr. Soney Mathews, 2015). Also, social media advertisement encourage consumers to share their favorite products shared by brands with friends via social media (McFarland, 2016). Via online communication tools, consumers can say to marketers and brands what they think about advertisement. (Tiago & Verissimo, 2013). Likewise, a relationship between marketers and consumers rely greatly upon trust and commitment which also involve dialogues, openness, acceptance and support (Nasruddin & Ali, 2018; Osarenkhoe & Bennani, 2007). Social media advertisement allows to brands and marketers to reach more consumers around the World with cheap prices (Sakas, Dunitrius & Kavoura, 2015; Zheng, Cheung, Lee and Liang 2015). Social media advertisement contributes to the participation of consumers online to discuss and

evaluate products. Also, it offers some advantages to consumers to get information they needs regarding products available for online purchase.

Problem of Study

Social media is now playing an important role in business. It is giving consumers an opportunity to get informations about products and evaluate them from different perspectives. Also, it has changed today's marketing approach by giving marketers an opportunity to connect with consumers. Via social media, marketers can attract consumers and being closer to them by engaging influencers those turn their accounts to personnel and impress their followers and other social media users (Glucksman, 2017). According to Global Web Index study in 2010, 89% of active Internet users in Turkey are engaged in research of products on social media. Also, according to the same resource, 62% of active Iternet users in Turkey think that the most important reason why they connect to internet is to do research about product before buying (Çakır and Eru, 2014; smgconnect.com, 2012). According to Nolsheska 2017, fashion consumers' interaction has a big impact on their purchase decision (Nolsheska, 2017; Chopra and Gupta, 2020). However, on social media, everyone is free to say his opinion, comment or repost products shared by brands and marketers. This kind of participation can be a problem for many fashion consumers and represent a challenge for some of them to know with opinion is right. In fact, not all fans or followers are really aware or experienced on fashion. Unfortunately, some social media users turn out their account to market account to scam fashion consumers why they are victim of scaming. Also, fashion consumers are considering the feedback and interaction on social media as determinant to decide which product to buy. In fact, when users like or comment any advertisement of brand this does not mean that product is good. Another problem on social media is that consumers can get influenced by advertisers and bloggers via activities and posts shared on social media. Today, many fashion consumers want to wear products shared by their favorite models and influencers no matter how they cost and in which brand' store are they available. This pushes them to make a lot of purchase and spend a lot of money continuously. For fashion consumers with limited income, if they can not buy products shared by fashion brands or influencers, they do looking for counterfeit goods sell by marketers on social media to imitate their role models and

impress their friends. The risk of buying counterfeits on social media is that it is not trusted because of unknown industry that produce them and marketers' credibility.

Aim of Study and Hypothesis

The aim of this study is to analyses the impact of social media on fashion consumers. It examines the degree of change that social media made on fashion consumers. It analyzes the degree of change made by social media on fashion consumers' lives. Social media enabled fashion consumers to interact with each other by exchanging their ideas and information among themselves regards brands and products (Ublova; Kim & Ko, 2012). Consumers on social media; especially Instagram, Twitter and Facebook are researching products they want to purchase and communicate with their friends to know their opinions (Ahmad, Salman & Ashiq, 2015). In fact, the expansion of social media and marketing competition between brands forced fashion brands to turn to social media as marketing channel to communicate with fashion consumers via social media advertising and influencers (Ammoura, 2016). Since social media has become a source of information to fashions consumers, there is a possibility for advertisers to share publicity, adds and novelties with the purpose of exploiting their brands in the target market (Alvarado2012,Florez, Escobar, Restrepo, Botero & Arias; 2017). However, many social media users are enable to create fashion contents just to say their opinions and give advices to others (Fuller et al, 2009; Chopra and Gupta. 2020). The interaction between consumers and advertisers increases trustiness and loyalty between brands and consumers. Trustiness is important for brands' image since the communication on social media is virtual (Chong et al, 2010; Kour, & Kaur 2020). In this study, many dimensions have been examined such as social media advertisement, role of family, friends and celebrities on social media to influence consumers buying decisions. This study tries to know views and opinions of fashion consumers regarding social media advertisement, influences and brands in the pre and post purchase. Also, today's generation is more connected to the rest of the world than they have ever been therefore this research is done to understand young people and Sakarya university students attitude and buying behavior on social media.

The hypothesis of this study are:

H1: There is significant difference between men and women buying behavior in the pre purchase decision on social media.

H2: There is significant difference between men and women buying behavior in the post purchase decision on social media.

H3: Age has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

H4: Age has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the post purchase decision.

H5: Level of study has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

H6: Level of study has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

H7: Internet Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

H8: Internet Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the post purchase decision.

H9: Social Media Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

H10: Social Media Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the post purchase decision

Importance of Study

The findings of this study will be redound to the benefit of social science researchers and fashion consumers companies considering that social media plays an important role in fashion business and consumers' lives. This study can help social science researchers to understand fashion consumers' attitude and views on social media. The study will help to improve the quality of fashion consumers' lives and academic performance. This study can contribute to know the degree of change made by social media in fashion

business and consumers' buying behavior. Also, it can help to know the attitude and view of fashion consumers regarding online purchasing. In addition, since consumers are surrounded by social media and it became part of their lives, such as study can help to know if there is differences between men and women buying behavior. Also, it can help to know if there is an effect of demographic characteristics on fashion consumers buying behavior. Furthermore, the investigation on fashion consumers' attitude toward social media can raise awareness and increase knowledge for better social media usage. Today, many influencers, celebrities and fashion models and unanticipated circumstances for product encourage fashion consumer's purchase (Kotler and Armstrong, 2014; Voramontri and Klieb, 2018). Also, many fashion consumers would like to do shopping online because of information and advertisement they see on social media. It has been observed that since the advent of fashion and the era of marketing development, fashion consumers spend their money proportion continually to buy new products. Today, fashion consumers became more desired to do shopping because of social media and business online. The integration of social media provide an opportunity for brands to influence fashion consumer's purchase (Mercy, Malthouse and Calder, 2010; Khatib, 2016). Social media allow to fashion consumers to follow brands and influencers they do like. It permits them to click on like and comment posts and activities shared by brands and influencers or repost them to pay attention of their friends and followers. From social media, fashion consumers are enable to search information about product, get aware and choose better service. Social media connects people around the World those did not meet before in real life and permits to them to affect the purchase decisions of each other. Fashion consumers use social media to meet new products or to get information on products they want to purchase (Kyriakopoulou and Kitsios, 2017). Therefore, it is crucial to know fashion consumers' views and evaluation on social media. There have been some studies on the impact of social media on people's life, but less in-depth study has been conducted pertaining specifically to influence of social media on fashion consumer's purchase. This study is valuable because fashion and social media are both aspects of lives. There is many reasons to investigate on fashion consumers and one of them is unconscious of some people and their unawareness regarding social media and its impact on purchase behavior. Also, everyday consumer needs to pick what to wear and how it look on them why most time

he takes a look on social media to see the latest fashion works. The choice of this topic was due to an increased usage of social media for fashion issues. Recently, with the change that social media made on fashion consumers' lives, it is important to know the evaluation and views of fashion consumers on social media and purchase decision.

Limitations

The study is regrouping Sakarya University students; male and female aged from 17 years to 40 years old. The participants in the study are from media and communication department and all are social media users and fashion consumers.

Method of Study

A survey was distributed to the participants involved in the study to achieve the goal and get good results. A survey was distributed to students from department of communication by hands. This way is providing quantitative data that permit to know the behavior of large students toward social media. The sampling method used is random and participants were selected carefully. This can avoid a risk to false the results of the questionnaire and help to get the good answers for the analysis need. Indeed, the limit of this research and main issue is the length of the survey. It is covering all information to remain relevant for the analysis of data. The main mass consists of 675 students. 200 copies of the survey have been distributed for the study.

CHAPTER 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

For impact of social media on purchase decision, Cakir and Eru (2013) has done a research on the effect of social media on young consumers' consumption expenditure. The study investigated the impact of social media on students from Abbant Izzet Baysal University. Also, it investigated on the expense and purchase of young people on social media. The study discussed young people as the ones who follow spotlight developments, technological developments and fashion. Also, they are consumers who known much about the last development of fashion. The study found that students those are following companies' accounts on social media and adverts of brands which they are interested in are getting affect on their consumption expenses. Also, the study found that students with intension to buy products are interested on ads and care much about prices. Also the quality of the product which they would like to buy is important. According to study, companies can internalize these kind of results to develop relationships with existing young customers and attract new customers. The difference between this study and the one in progress is that this study didn't specify which social networks influence young people while the study in progress specified kind of social networks used by consumers and the degree of each social network's impact on fashion consumers. This study investigated personal expense while the study in progress didn't investigate personal expense.

Hajli (2013), has done a research on the impact of social media on consumers' purchase. The research discussed the engagement of consumers in social media and the effect of social media on purchase decision. The results of study revealed that social media affect consumers' purchase decision by offering to consumers some advantages through online conversation, recommandations and reviews regarding their needs. Also, the results found that the intention of buy is influenced by social media advertising. In addition, , the consumers most of time prefer to make their purchase online on social media after evaluation of products. Furthermore, the study found that trust has a significant effect on perceived usefulness. When consumer trust products, he wants to purchase them from brand's account online. This determinated the importance of trust in business and the role of social media to influence consumers to trust companies. The study confirmed that internet and social media empower consumer. Also, consumers exchange

information and collaborate via interactions on social media. They share information about products and services with others and discussed their experiences. This mean that social media facilitated alot of factors for consumers in term of shopping. This study differs from the one in progress in some points. First of, the factors of analysis in this study are trustness, perceived usefulness and intension of buy. Secondly, this study is showing the role of trustness on social media to increase purchase decision while the study in progress considered trustiness as one of factors analyzed in the pre and post purchase. Thirdly, study's hypothesis related both trustness and intension of buy only while the study in progress related other variables such as social media advertismnet, research of product and brand's offer. In the end, this study considered social network's perceived usefulness as another factor influencing intension of buy while the study in progress did not discussed it.

Camelo da Cunha (2015), has done a study on social media and fashion business. The study discussed the importance of social media for the fashion business and influence of consumers' purchase. It investigated the role of some social networks like Facebook, Instagram and Pinterest to help brands to improve their performance and affect consumers' purchase. The results of study found that social media facilitates easily the interaction of fashion companies with the target audience. Also, it found that brands those are doing business on social media have more possibility to be known and influence consumers' purchase. The firms when advert on social media opens discussion with consumers to interact, asking questions and get answers. Consumers on social media are allowed to complain, criticize and give suggestions in post comments or by direct messages. This opportunity is an advantage for companies to improve their marketing and influence consumers' purchase. Finally, the study revealed that companies those are analyzed for their works, transparency and activities have great public acceptance. The difference between this study and the one in progress is that this study focused on brands' benefit and influence on purchase decision more than impact of social media on consumers' purchase decision. The study in progress focused more on views and evaluation of fashion consumers in the pre and post purchase.

Saleem and Ellahi (2017), have done a study on influence of electronic word of mouth on purchase decision of fashion products on social media. The study discussed the role

of electronic word of mouth to impact fashion consumers' purchase intention. It investigated consumers' purchase decision and factors those are influencing them. Facebook social network users were consumers those investigation was focused on. The results of study found that the electronic word of mouth is main factor influencing purchase intention for any brand. Also, it found that trust worthiness, the role of homophiles, informational influence, expertness and high fashion involvement are main factors influencing electronic word of mouth. The difference between this study and the one in progress is that this study investigated on Facebook users those are fashion consumers while the one in progress investigated on different kind of social network users. Also, this study didn't investigate brands or social media advertisement effect while the study in progress investigates deeply the degree of each social network, brands' effect and role of advertisers to influence fashion consumers' purchase.

Toor, and Husnain (2017); performed a study on the impact of social media marketing on consumer purchase intention in Pakistan. The study discussed influence of social networks on consumer purchase intention and how consumers are influenced by what marketers share on social media. The study included 300 existing users from Pakistan all active on social media. It found that there is significant relation between social media marketing and consumer purchase intention. Also, it found that a lot of Pakistanis are engaged and attached with social media platforms like Facebook. In addition, it found that Pakistan is one of the countries those experienced a rapid growth in term of social media usage in the last few years. Furthermore, the study found that social media as a marketing tool impacted consumer purchase intention by allowing to consumers to say their opinions and share their experiences and informations regarding products, brands and services. The study offer significant contributions for social media studies and consumer purchase. It is suggesting a comparison for both electronic word of mouth and the traditional marketing to see how companies and brands put their effort in marketing business and consumers satisfaction. Moreover, It is suggesting an analyze of the impact of other demographic factors on social media marketing and their effects for marketers to advertise and reach consumers. This study is different from the one in progress in some points: First of, it focused on consumers without specifying which type of consumers while the one in progress focused on fashion consumers. The survey in this study is administrated to Pakistani people no matter if they are young people or not

while the one in progress administrated survey to young people and students fashion consumers. Also, this study didn't indicate the factors influencing the participants on social media.

Fregidou-Malama (2017), did a study on the impact of Facebook communication on fashion clothing purchase decision. The study discussed and analysed Facebook communication and its role to influence students of University of Gävle purchasing decision. It included 150 participants those are consumers and students of the university. The results found that Facebook has an impact on consumers purchase decision (Purchase-intention or intention to purchase). Also, the study found that there is significant impact of Facebook communication on students purchasing decision when engage to make purchase for fashion products. It found that consumers are influenced by social media options those are available online such as informative advertisements, online store suggestions, direct purchase options, virtual marketing, social interaction between virtual communities, motivation and marketers promotional activities. Also, they are influenced by discounts, price comparasion and variety of products. The results revealed that students buying decision is influenced by advertisements reposted or shared by a friend, advertisement presents a new commercial of a marketers or brand, advertisements contains consumers favorite issues and when Facebook communication has an informative video regarding products or sevice of brands. Also, the study found that Facebook communication is the easiest and succesful way to reach large numbers of consumers in short time. Finally, it found that consumers' opinions and suggestions are important for brands and marketers to know how to satisfy their needs. The difference between this study and the one in progress is that this study focused on one social network (Facebook) while the study in progress focused on different kind of social networks. Also, this study focused more on options and advantages that social media is giving to consumers while the study in progress focused more on purchasing decision and the role of influencers such as advertisers and other influencers to influence fashion consumers purchase decision on social media.

Lim, Radzol, Cheah (Jacky) and Wong (2017), have done a study on the impact of social media influencers on purchase intention and the mediation effect of customer attitude. The study discussed active influencers on social media and their role to impact

consumer's purchase intention. It investigated the way that influencers on social media attract consumers, match-up products, meaning of transfer and the source of credibility. 200 respondents have been analysed in this study. All hypotheses have been found except for the degree of source of credibility. The study found an insignificant relationship of source credibility of influencers on social media with attitude and purchase intention. The participants acknowledged and confirmed lack of credibility towards the product that they endorsed while influencers on social media are they ones giving information they needs. Also, it found that there is no influence of source attractiveness of social media influencers on consumers' purchase intention. In addition, it found a significant social media influencers' product match-up with consumer attitude and purchase intention. The results revealed a positive relationship in illustrating consumer attitude and purchase intention with meaning transfer of social media influencers. Also, it revealed that consumer attitude is the most influential effect for purchase intention of consumers. The difference between this study and the one in progress is that the first did not specified type of influencers if they are marketers, celebrities or friends while the study in progress specified type of influencers. Also, it did not specified types of social media and influence of each of them while the study in progress does.

Ogunyombo, Oyero and Azeez (2017) have done a study on influence of social media advertisements on purchase decisions of undergraduates in three Nigerian Universities. The study discussed advertisement on social media and its influence on younger consumers' purchasing decisions in Nigeria. The study included young people and undergraduate students in three Nigerian Universities. The number of participants in the study is 385 students. The study investigated them to know their opinions and views on the role of social media advertisement and its influence on their purchasing decision. The study found that students in Nigeria would generally view advertisement on social media. Around 66.9% of participants said that social media advertisements are very visible in terms of high exposure but not influencing their purchase. The study analyzed many factors influencing young people purchasing decision in Nigeria like the level of creativity in the advertisements, the reaction to social media advertisement and the relevance of the product to the users. The study suggest that those factors are related with elements such as display, gratification and graphics and they have big role in

advertisement to attract young people. Around 38.4% of students said that the creativity in the advert content is the most attractive factor making them review an advertisement while 25.6% said that the relevance of the product is attracting cause cultural change. The study found that 31.5% of students in Nigeria are very interesting on Facebook advertisement. This finding is due to a huge usage of Facebook in Nigeria since Facebook is considered as the most social network used among young people in Nigeria. In the end, the results revealed that social media advertisements have low influence on users purchasing decisions. This study differs from the one in progress in main topic. This study discussed only social media advertisement and its elements used to influence purchase decision while the study in progress considered social media advertisement as one of the factors influencing consumer's purchase.

Wiegmann (2011), has done a study on the effectiveness of advertising on social media. The study discussed the effective of social media platforms on customers' purchase decisions and Facebook as a marketing tool. It investigated the advertisement on Facebook, consumer awareness, communication and consumer purchase decision. The study found that Facebook ads are not satisfy Facebook users' needs because of the way that brands are presenting products. Also, the study found that the way brands are presenting products is totally not fitting the desire of consumers. The study revealed that there is no interaction between users and ads. The majority of participants in this study answered that ads in Facebook are annoying. Also, they think that ads in Facebook are not benefic that is why they escaped them. According to author, if companies want to achieve their goal they must to follow the new rules for social network marketing by creating relationship with customers. Social media is an ideal platform for marketing to interact with customers. The study found that any company can interact with users and customers and build a good relationship based on trust. This study differs from the one in progress in term of case of study. The study here tried to know if consumers are influenced by Facebook ads. Also, it tries to know the reasons why consumers are not satisfied with Facebook Ads. The study in progress is not looking for reasons why consumers are not satisfied with social networks but the degree of social networks to influence fashion consumers purchase decision.

Kavukcu (2018), has done a study on the impact of advertisements on social media on consumers' purchasing decisions. The study investigated consumers' purchasing decision and how they get influence by advertisement of marketers. The sample contains 302 participants between graduated and non graduated university students. More than 90% of participants are graduated from university. When participants were asked if advertisement on social media impact their purchasing decision or has an influence on shopping online 119 persons respond yes and 183 said no. More than half of participants (51%) agreed that advertisement on Facebook is influencing their purchasing decision. Also, 34 % agreed that Instagram has an impact on their purchase decision. For other social networks influencing purchasing decision, 7.6% said Youtube has an influence on their purchase decision, 3.1% said Twitter, 0.7% said Pinterest, 2.7% said other and only 0.3% said LinkedIn. The results of the study found that advertising in social media is positively related to consumers' purchasing and those perceptions and purchasing intentions against social media advertisements are influential on purchasing decision. The difference between this study and the study in progress is that participants in this study are graduated and non graduated students while the study in progress is included students those still studying in the university.

McCarthy (2013), performed a research on the effect of social media on fashion consumption. The study discussed social media and its role in fashion and the change it made in fashion in the last decade. Also, it discussed social networks those have much impact on fashion business and consumers' purchase like Instagram, Facebook and Twitter. The study investigated fashion consumers those are college students and how they get influenced by social media. It examined the attitude and purchase decision of fashion consumers toward social media. The results of the study found that social media has an impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision. Also, it confirmed that social media is not just marketing tool but also a platform to exchange ideas and opinions. The study got a deeper understanding of the consumer's motivation to buy products. It found that 32.10% of respondent's reason to use an online social network is to get promotions and offers. Around 45.3% agreed that they often use social media to know about fashion trends. Also, Around 56.6% agreed that they do share products they want to purchase through social media. Furthermore, 44.3% agreed that they shared a product that they already purchased through social media which affect their purchase decision. For the

effectiveness of advertising on social media and purchasing a product online or in a store because of social media advertisement, 59.4% answered that they purchased online while 40.6% said have never purchased a product online. For purchasing products from a store because of social media advertisement, 60.4% of respondents said they did purchase products they saw on social media advertisement from store and 39.6% said no. This study differs from the study in progress in term of survey. Most questions in this study are close questions to answer yes or no while the survey in the study in progress contains multiple choices questions. Also, this study focused more on the reason of social media usage and purchase online and from store. Also, it focused on social media advertisement while the study in progress is wider and investigates other factors influencing consumer purchase decision.

For Consumer behavior, Michaela and Orna (2015) have done a research on the impact of social media on customers' behavior. The research discussed fashion consumers' consciousness, the power of social media in marketing and fast fashion to influence consumers' behavior. Also, it investigated the impact of buying behavior and the correlation between negative and positive conversation in social media. The study found that social media has an impact on fashion consumer's behavior. The impact is in all aspects of purchase; research of fashion trends, comparing prices and buying process. Also, the study found that consumers are influenced by what people saying about brands and products on social media. Furthermore, The research recommend that fashion companies especially fast fashion should use social media as marketing tool to reach consumers by advertising their products, influencing consumers' buying and using social media as a tool to influence different segments. The research indicated that the impact of the social media is an important attribute of value perception. The study same as the study in progress discusses the impact of social media on fashion consumers. The difference between this study and the one in progress is hypotheses. This study focused on comparing shopping spree and fast fashion while the study in progress focused on the factors those influencing fashion consumers behavior.

Ertemel and Ammoura (2016) conducted a research on the role of social media advertising in consumer buying Behavior. The study investigated the impact of social media advertising on consumer behavior. The study focused on the changes in

consumer's behavior such as what product to buy and from which brand and store. The research analysed some steps model to consumer purchase behavior, information research, need recognition, the buying decision, post-purchase evaluation and evaluation of alternative. The study found that social media advertising is playing a big role for fashion industry those used it to influence consumers' buying. Also, it found that there is relation between social media advertising and consumer buying behavior in fashion industry. In addition, it found that there is differences in the way that social media advertises and consumer buying behavior in fashion industry. The study found a weak relation between need recognition and social media advertising, strong relation between evaluate of alternative and social medi advertising, no relation between search for information and social media advertising, a moderate relation for buying behavior. In the end, the study found that there is no change for demographic factors of age and level of study but there is change between males and females in relation with search of information and consumer need recognition. This finding confirmed the research objective of impact of social media advertising on consumer buying behavior. The difference between this study and the one in progress is that this study investigated on social media advertising and its impact on consumer behavior as main topic while the study in progress considered social media advertisement as part of factors affecting fashion consumers.

Pate and Adams (2013), have done a research on the the influence of social media on buying behaviors of millennials. The study investigated influencers, friends, followers, family, celebrities and models and their influence on buying behaviors on young people. Also, it investigated advertisements on social media and its role to influence young generation. In addition, it investigated the impact of the more influenced social networks; Facebook, MySpace, Youtube and Instagram. Furthermore, the study investigated the role of social advertising and shooping orientation. The study found that young people between 18 and 24 years old are more attached to social media and their friends have a big influence on their opinions. Also, their behavior and attitude is based on advices they get from their friends. They participants indicated that they prefer to purchase products liked by their friends more than other influencers. Also, they did indicate that they purchase around 1 to 5 items suggested by their friends. Participants said that they do react and follow trends suggested by their friends or found from

celebrities they do follow. Most consumers research products online before the purchase. Respondents in this study were not likely to purchase items based on personal testimonies. Millennials in this study were likely to follow the trends started by close friends or celebrities. The difference between this study and the one in progress is that this study didn't discuss about social media advertisement, brands' effect and their role to influence consumers' buying decision. This study focused more on role of friends and celebrities to influence consumers' behavior, The survey in this study didn't contain questions about favorite social networks of participants and degree of their influence. Neither, it didn't include the degree of trustness of products recommended by friends and celebrities.

Vinerean, Cetina, Dumitrescu and Mihai Tichindelean (2013), have done a study on the influence of social media marketing on online consumer behavior. The study discussed social media and consumer behavior and tried to know consumers those are active on online social networks and how interact and exchange informations and experiences on social media. It identified factors those help to understand consumer's behavior and consumers' perception regarding social media usage. The study included 236 students and social media users from Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu. The study suggest that analysis of consumer behavior is central for all marketing success. Also, it suggest that to know consumer's behavior it is important to know how he react to ads, is he trusting product and services on social media, is he trusting information from friends and other influencers, what is importance of social media to him, is he like or coment posts shared by brands and marketers he follow, how many hours is he spending on social media and his experience and knowledge of social media. This study differs from the one in progress in tem of objectives. This study aim to identify which factors must to be analyze to understand consumer's behavior while the study in progress analysis those factors as the way to understand consumer's behavior.

Khan (2018), has done a study on Instagram as a Marketing Tool for Luxury Brands. The study tries to understand marketing and marketers' way to use Instagram to reach consumers and influence their behavior. It discussed the relationships between three variables; brand equity, Instagram marketing and consumer behavior towards brand. Also, it discussed the importance of Instagram in marketing and how it changed

consumer behavior. In addition, it discussed the role of Instagram in creativity of brand' preference, loyalty, preference and possibility to get price for products and services. The results of study found that there is a positive influence of Instagram marketing on consumer and brand equity. Also, it found a statistically significant of the components of Instagram Marketing efforts. In addition, it found that brand equity has an effect on the luxury brand image more than awareness. Furthermore, it found a positive impact of brand loyalty, preference and pay of premium price. The study here investigated about one of the most influenced social networks (Instagram) and its impact on consumer behavior while the study in progress investigated about different social networks. Also the study here focused on marketing and marketers and how they benefit from Instagram to reach customers while the study in progress focused on consumers and how they are affected by marketers.

Durmaz (2014) has done a study on the impact of social factors on consumer buying behavior. The study discussed consumer buying behavior of people in Turkey. 1400 people from different provinces of Turkey were selected to represent seven regions of Turkey. It investigated the factors those influencing consumer buying behavior such as family, reference group, social roles and statues. According to the result, 55.5% of participants considered family as an important factor in buying goods and services. 43% of participants considered reference group effect as factor impacting buying goods and services. This study differs from the study in progress in some point: The first study, analyses only two factors influencing consumer buying behavior family and reference group while the study in progress analyses many factors beside family and reference group. Also, the first study is regrouping different regions of Turkey while the study in progress is only focused on students those still studying in Sakarya University.

Siddiqui and Singh (2016), have studied social media and its impact with positive and negative aspects. The study discussed about advantages, disadvantages and effect of social media on people buying behavior. It described how social media affect consumer and society in a broad way. The results of study found that everyday, people become more attached to social media and the effect of social media vary from person to another. The study found that 90% of university students in India are using social media which means the impact on purchase decision. In this study, 17% of participants

answered that social media networks as their principle reason for internet usage and one of the most aim to use social media is purchasing products online. The study found that social media helps to understand the audience when they say their opinion by comment and like brands' sharing. Social media helps the business for promotional activities. Also, it is helpful to attract new consumers by advertising products and services. Moreover, the study found that by social media brands can compete with their rivals to impact purchase decision no matter how strong they are since advertisement does not cost much. In addition, the study revealed that when marketers use social media they enhance their performance by showing to the audience their mission, objective and making promotion and sales. Conversely, the study discussed about some social media's negativity such as lack of control of fans and followers when commenting or saying their opinion. According to study, a negative feedback from fan or followers can cause brands failure. Most industries have difficulty measuring the results of social media advertising. The difference between this study and the one in progress is this study focused on people in general no matter if they are consumers or not while the study in progress focused more on fashion consumers.

Yr Hallgrímsdóttir (2018), has done a study on advertisement on social media and consumer's behaviour and attitude towards social media. The study discussed the way consumers are influenced by social media advertisement. It tries to find if advertisement on social media really affects the behavior and attitudes of participants. The study included 375 individuals did participate in this study and answered an online questionnaire regarding the advertisement field. The results found a positive impact of social media advertisement on participants' attitude and behavior and social media advertisement has an impact on consumer purchasing decisions. Further, found that demographic characteristics of age and gender has a significant difference between behaviors and believes of advertisement. Another results found in this study is effect of influencers on consumer's behavior. The study found a relation between purchasing behavior and influencers' impact. Also, it found that after consumer see an advertisement his behavior get affect no matter if he is going to purchase or not. In addition, it found that demographic characteristics of relationship status, age and gender affects consumer behavior. Women are affected more than men by social media advertisement and influencers. Also, their purchase decision are more affected than men. The study found

that advertisement has a big role on affecting personal image and young people are the most impacted by it. Also, it found that single people are spending time on social media and follow different influencers more than others. In the end the study found that most of participants agreed about impact of sponsored advertising on reliability regarding product. Also, it found that there is a significant difference between demographic character of gender and reliability regarding product men are less to doubt about reliability of advertising than women. This study differs from the one in progress in term of factors analysis. The study here considered influencers as main factor and advertisement as variable influencing consumers' behavior, while the study in progress explains other factors influencing consumers such as friends, family, celebrities etc...

Gul, Shahzad and Khan (2014), have done a study on the relationship of social media with fashion consciousness and consumer buying behavior. The study tries to know if there is relationship between social media and fashion consumer consciousness and social media and consumer buying behavior. The study targeted students of Higher Educational institutes of Karachi. It found that social media has an effect on consumer buying behavior and fashion consumer consciousness. It revealed that behavior of consumers is changing because consumers are shopping more often through social media. The study found that awareness about social media fashion advertisement is increasing. Also, consumers are more considering their own experience via reviews and ratings of product. Around 85% of the participants whose use social media tools in this study are impacted by social media advertisement. Eighty percent of participants said that they never get impacted by the online fashion apparel advertisement as the point to get affected. The respondents in this study said that their decision is not influenced by social media but social media help them to find good product compare them and make good choice. Also, participants agreed that opinion of public; friends and influencers is encouraging for more shopping. This study differs from the one in progress in term of separating consumer behavior and consumer conscious. The study here try to understand the relationship between social media and consumer conscious and social media effect on buying behavior while the study in progress concentrated on social media and consumer behavior.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

This chapter covers research methodology. It includes universe and sample, data collection and data collection techniques. The research design used for this study is descriptive research design. It is defined as a research design which provide an accurate portrayal of characteristics of particular person or group and discover the relationship between selected variables to answer different questions and find hypotheses related with study. Descriptive research design is suitable for this study since the study is quantitative. It can help to know the view and opinions of fashion consumers in the pre and post purchase by describing their attitude toward social media and identifying the relationship between variables those are influencing their purchasing behavior. For validity and reability, first off, demographic characteristics of the university students who participated in the study was revealed from survey distributed to participansts then SPSS program was used for data analysis. In studies in the field of social sciences, 0.70 Cronbach Alpha coefficient is considered sufficient (Işlek, 2012: 107). The validity and reability analysis results are given. For social media usage 9 questions 0.71 cronbach alfa, opinion of fashion consumers in the pre purchase11 question 0.84, in the post purchase 6question 0.92 cronbach alpha, impact of socil media on purchase decision 9 questions 0.74 cronbach alpha.

2.1. Universe and Sample

Even that Social Media platforms attract and surround people of different ages and background, the questionnaire in this study is more focused on a certain category of people those are the ones influenced more by social media. The category targeted in this study is young people. The reason is that young people are the most category influenced by social media and the generation that grew up with technology. Also, their experience is limited and they are the most category spend much time on social media.

The study begins in 2019 and end in 2021. It is regrouping students; male and female aged from 17 years to 40 years old. The participants in the study are Sakarya University Students those are still taking lessons at university. All those students are social media users and fashion consumers. The sampling method used is random and participants were selected carefully. This can avoid a risk to false the results of the questionnaire and

help to get the good answers for the analysis need. Indeed, the limit of this research and main issue is the length of the survey. It is covering all information to remain relevant for the analysis of data. The main mass consists of 675 students. 200 copies of the survey have been distributed for the study. 176 students' responses are considered.

2.2. Data Collection

Since this study investigates on the impact of social media on fashion consumer behavior, the methodology used is quantitative. First off, a survey was distributed to the participants involved in the study to achieve the goal and get good results. A survey was distributed to students from department of communication by hands. This way is providing quantitative data that permit to know the behavior of large students toward social media. Also, this way permits to reach more individuals and precises the idea of the point of view of the targeted persons. Also, the survey maintains the research easily and provides to access to the information about the subject of study.

2.3. Data Collection Techniques

This research has been put forward to describe how demographic characteristics of gender, age, level of study, internet usage and social media usage affects consumer behavior. With integration of social media in marketing and increasement of social media usage between fashion consumers, survey is helpful to understand the view and opinions of participants selected for investigation. In this study, survey questions were prepared to understand student's views and opinions in the pre and post purchase period. The questions were clear, specific and understandable. This makes the answer settable to be given. Students after reading questions can easily respond. The questions are mixed; open, multiple-choice and closed questions. The survey consists of 40 statements divided in three parts. First of all, questions asked were about demographic characteristics; gender, age, level of study, internet and social media usage. In the second part, participants in the study have multiple choices to choose the answer that expressing their opinion regarding their attitude and habit toward social media in the pre and post purchase. In this case, participants have to respond to multiple choices regarding social networks they do use by selecting words "Never", "Rarely", "Sometimes", "Most of time" and "Every time". Also, participants had multiple choices

to choose only one answer in each statement regarding the impact of social media on their purchase in the pre and post purchase by selecting expressions and words “Totally disagree”, “Disagree”, “Neutral”, “Agree” and “totally agree”. In the last part of survey, to know social networks those impacting fashion consumers, the participants had to select expressions (No influence), (Some influence), (Influence), (More influence). In the end, the data collected from study can includes or can be used for all individuals those are respondents in this study or those have the same background or category in the areas. In this case, the result of the study may not reflect another environment but it is useful to achieve the goal and aim of study.



CHAPTER 3: PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter is an analysis of data collected from respondents. Its purpose is to transform the data collected into credible evidence about the development of the study's investigation and performance.

3.1. Demographic Characteristics

Table 1: Participants' Gender

Gender	Frequency	%
Male	82	46.6
Female	94	53.4
Total	176	100

The first demographic factor asked in this study is gender. The table indicates that 53.4% of the participants are female and 46.6 are male. This reveals that participants in the study men and women are almost equal in terms of distribution.

Table 2: Participant's Level of Study

Level of study	Frequency	%
Bachelor	162	92
Master Degree	12	6.8
PHD	2	1.1
Total	176	100

The second demographic characteristic in this study is level of study. The table above shows that study included undergraduate and postgraduate students. 92% of the participants are undergraduate students and 7.9% are postgraduate students.

Table 3: Participants' Age

Age	Frequency	%
18-25	166	94.3
26-30	9	5.1
31-40	1	0.6
Total	176	100

The third and last demographic characteristic in this study is age. In the study, the most participants are aged between 18 to 25 years old with 94.3%, 5.1% are aged between

26-30 years old and 0.6% are aged between 31- 40 years old. It is an expected result since the participants are undergraduate students.

3.2. Internet, Social media Usage and Participant's Favorite Social Networks

3.2.1. Internet Usage

Table 4: Participants' Internet Usage

Internet usage	Frequency	%
0-1 hour	14	8.0
2-3 hours	60	34.1
4-5 hours	54	30.7
More than 5 hours	48	27.3
Total	176	100.0

This question is related to participant's habit to connect to the internet. It indicates how often participant connect to the internet. The study reveals that 34.1% of the students use the internet 2-3 hours per day. 30.7 % use internet 4-5 per day, 27.3% use internet more than 5 hours per day while only 8.0% use internet 0-1 hours per day.

3.2.2. Social Media Usage

Table 5: Participants' Social Media Usage

Social media usage	Frequency	%
0-1 hour	41	23.3
2-3 hours	76	43.2
4-5 hours	32	18.2
More than 5 hours	27	15.3
Total	176	100

The table 5 shows that 43.2% of participants connect to social media 2-3 hours, 23.3% connect 0-1 hour, 18.2% connect 4-5 hours and 15.4% connect more than 5 hours per day.

3.2.3. Participants Favorite Social Networks

This question was asked to know which social media channels consumers use the most. The participants have multiple choices to choose between: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Most of time and every time.

Except “Never” answer, all other answers are considered positive.

Table 6: Facebook and MySpace

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Social networks (Facebook, MySpace)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	88	50.0	40	22.7	22	12.5	14	8.0	12	6.8	176	100.0

The table 6 shows that 50% of participants don’t use Facebook and MySpace, 22.7% said that they use Facebook and MySpace rarely, 12.5% said they said they use sometimes, 8% said most of time while only 6.8% of participants use Facebook and MySpace every time.

Table 7: Forum and Dictionaries

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Forum and dictionaries	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	51	29.0	55	31.3	47	26.7	14	8.0	9	5.1	176	100.0

The table 7 shows that 29% of participants don’t use Forum and dictionaries, 31.3% said that they use Forum and Dictionaries rarely, 26.7% said they use sometimes, 8% said most of time while only 5.1% of participants use them every time.

Table 8: Wikis (Wikipedia)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Wikis (Wikipedia)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	47	26.7	49	27.8	46	26.1	20	11.4	14	8.0	176	100.0

The table 8 shows that 26.7% of participants never use Wikipedia, 27.8% said that they use it rarely, 26.1% said they use sometimes, 11.4% said most of time while only 8% of participants use it every time.

Table 9: Blogs (Webrazzi)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Blogs (Webrazzi)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	99	56.3	38	21.6	23	13.1	9	5.1	7	3.9	176	100.0

The table 9 shows that 56.3% of participants never use Blogs (Webrazzi), 21.6% said that they use it rarely, 13.1% said they use sometimes, 5.1% said most of time while only 3.9% of participants use them every time.

Table 10: Microblogs (Twitter)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Microblogs (Twitter)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	61	34.7	32	18.2	35	19.9	21	11.9	27	15.3	176	100.0

The table 10 shows that 34.7% of participants never use Microblogs(Twitter), 18.2% said that they use it rarely, 19.9% said they use sometimes, 11.9% said most of time while 15.3% of participants use them every time.

Table 11: Social Media Sharing Networks (Youtube, Instagram)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Social media Sharing networks (Youtube, Instagram)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	12	6.8	7	4.0	18	10.2	62	35.2	77	43.8	176	100.0

The table 11 shows that 43.8% of participants use Youtube and Instagram, everytime,35.2% said that they use them most of time , 10.2% said they use sometimes, 6.8% said they never use them while only 4% of participants use them every time.

Table 12: Bookmarketing Networks (Pinterest)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
bookmarketing networks (Pinterest)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	109	61.9	27	15.3	20	11.4	11	6.3	9	5.1	176	100.0

The table 12 shows that 61.9% of participants never use Pinterest, 15.3% said that they use it rarely, 1.4% said they use it sometimes, 6.3% said most of time while only 5.1% of participants use them every time.

Table 13: Daily Opportunity Networks (Groupon)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Daily opportunity networks (Groupon)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	132	75.0	27	15.3	14	8.0	2	1.1	1	0.6	176	100.0

The table 13 shows that 75% of participants never useDaily Opportunity networks (Groupon), 15.3% said that they use it rarely, 8% said they use it sometimes, 1.1% said most of time while only 0.6% of participants use them every time.

Table 14: Advice and Evaluation Networks (IMDB, TripAdvisor)

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Most of time		Every time		Total	
Advice and evaluation networks (IMDB, TripAdvisor)	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
	70	39.8	41	23.3	40	22.7	15	8.5	10	5.7	176	100.0

The table 14 shows that 39.8% of participants never use IMDB and TripAdvisor, 23.3% said that they use them rarely, 22.3% said they use them sometimes, 8.5% said most of time while only 5.7% of participants use them every time.

3.3. Participant's Expressions Regarding Purchase Decision in the Pre- Purchasing

This question was asked to know participants opinion in the pre-purchasing process of products and services. The participants have multiple choices to choose one of the answers: "Totally disagree", "Disagree", "Neutral", "Agree" and "totally agree".

Between all the answer choices, only "Neutral" answer is not considered as participant's opinion.

"Totally disagree", "Disagree" expressions are considered as a negative answer in the analysis of data. "Agree" and "totally agree" are considered as a positive answer in the analysis of data.

Impact of social media on consumer behavior in the pre purchase

Table 15: Search of Product On Social Media

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
I do research about product and service on social media	17	9.7	21	11.9	29	16.5	76	43.2	33	18.8	176	100.0

The table 15 shows that 62% of participants are agreed that they do research about products and services on social media, 31.8 % disagreed and 16.5 stayed neutral.

Table 16: Trustiness

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
The product and service on social media are trusty	16	9.1	40	22.7	69	39.2	43	24.4	8	4.5	176	100.0

The table 16 shows that 39.2% of participants are confused if products on social media are trusty or not and said neutral, 31.8% are disagreed while 28.9 agreed that products on social media are trusty.

Table 17: Social Media Advertisement and Its Impact On Purchase Decision

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase Product	40	22.7	41	23.3	48	27.3	39	22.2	8	4.5	176	100.0

When participants were asked if advertisement on social media encourages them to do shopping, 46% disagreed, 27.3% of participants stayed neutral while 26.7% agreed.

Table 18: Famous People and Their Impact on Purchase Decision

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Famous people impact my decision of purchase on social media	46	26.1	41	23.3	33	18.8	45	25.6	11	6.3	176	100.0

Around half of participants 49.4% disagreed that famous people on social media influence their decision of buy, 31.9% agreed and 18.8% stayed neutral.

Table 19: Family's Impact on Purchase Decision

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
My Family impact my purchase decision on social media	32	18.2	28	15.9	39	22.2	63	35.8	14	8.0	176	100.0

The table above shows that 43.8% of participants agreed that their families' advices on social media influence their decisions of buy, 34.1% disagreed and 22.2% stayed neutral.

Table 20: Non- University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
My non university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	44	25.0	42	23.9	48	27.3	38	21.6	4	2.3	176	100.0

48.9% of participants disagreed that their non-university friends on social media impact their decision of buy, 21.6% stayed neutral and 23.9 % agreed.

Table 21: University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	29	16.5	38	21.6	44	25.0	55	31.3	10	5.7	176	100.0

The table above shows that 38.1 % of participants disagreed that their university friends on social media impact their decision of buy, 36.9% agreed while 25 stayed neutral.

Table 22: Brand's Profile and Its Impact on Purchase Decision

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Brands' profile impact my purchase decision	44	25.0	37	21.0	31	17.6	54	30.7	10	5.7	176	100.0

When participants were asked if the brand's profile on social media impacts their decision of buy, 38.1 agreed, 36.4% disagreed, and 25.6 stayed neutral.

Table 23: Brand's Offer and Its Impact on Purchase Decision

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Brands' offer impressing me	44	25.0	37	21.0	31	17.6	54	30.7	10	5.7	176	100.0

The table 23 shows that 64.2% of participants said that brand's offer don't impressing them on social media. 18.1% agreed that they are impressed while 17.6 stayed neutral.

Table 24: Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
I participate in brands' competition on social media	69	39.2	44	25.0	31	17.6	24	13.6	8	4.6	176	100.0

Table 25: Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	53	30.1	43	24.4	40	22.7	28	15.9	12	6.8	176	100.0

The table 3.10 shows that 54.5% of participants disagreed about doing shopping from the brands they follow on social media, 22.7 stayed neutral while 18.8 agreed.

3.4. Participant's Expressions Regarding Purchase Decision in the Post-Purchasing

Table 26: Purchasing Product Found From Comment

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
The product i purchase i found it from comment on social media	56	31.8	47	26.7	23	3.1	41	23.3	9	5.1	176	100.0

When participants were asked if product they purchase generally they found them from comment on social media, 58.5% said no, 28.4% said yes and 3.1 stayed neutral.

Table 27: Purchasing Product Found From Profile

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	81	46.0	51	29.0	26	14.8	17	9.7	1	0.5	176	100.0

When participants were asked if product they purchase generally they found them from profile on social media, $\frac{3}{4}$ of them disagreed, 14.8 % stayed neutral and only 10.2% agreed.

Table 28: Purchasing Product Found From Page

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	58	33.0	43	24.4	36	20.5	34	19.3	5	2.8	176	100.0

When participants were asked if product they purchase they do find them from page on social media, 57.4 of them disagreed, 22.1 % agreed while 20.5 % stayed neutral.

Table 29: Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friends' profile on social media	81	46.0	42	23.9	34	19.3	16	9.1	3	1.7	176	100.0

When participants were asked if product they purchase they do find them from friend's profile on social media, 69.9% of them disagreed, 19.3% stayed neutral and only 10.8 of participants agreed.

Table 30: Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
The product and service i purchase I found them from my family's profile on social media	84	47.7	46	26.1	31	17.6	12	6.8	3	1.7	176	100.0

When participants were asked if product they purchase they do find them from family's profile on social media, 73.8% of them disagreed, 17.6% stayed neutral and only 8.5 of participants agreed.

Table 31: Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile

	Totally disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Totally agree		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
The product and service I purchase I found them from my university friends' profile	83	47.2	44	25.0	30	17.0	13	7.4	5	3.4	176	100.0

When participants were asked if product they purchase they do find them from page on social media, 72.2% of them disagreed, 17% stayed neutral and only 10.8 of participants agreed.

3.5. The Degree of Influence of Each Social Media Channel on Participants' Purchasing Decisions

Table 32: Social Networks (Facebook, MySpace)

Social networks (Facebook, MySpace)	Frequency	%
No influence	127	72.2
Some influence	33	18.8
Influence	15	8.5
More influence	1	0.6
Total	176	100

To know the degree of influence of social media channel on participants' purchasing decisions, the expression (No influence), (Some influence), (Influence), (More influence) were asked to give the participants an option to choose or mention which answer is suit to them. The table above shows participants' answers. In this study, 72.2 of participants said that social networks (Facebook, MySpace) have no influence on their purchasing behavior, 18.8% said they have some influence, 8.5% said they have influence and only 0.5% think that Facebook and MySpace have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 33: Forum and Dictionaries

Forum and dictionaries	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No influence	73	41.5	
Some influence	51	29	
Influence	39	22.2	
More influence	13	7.3	
Total	176	100	

The table above shows that 41.5 of participants in this study are not influenced by social networks (dictionary and forum) when they purchase their products, 29% said there is some influence on them, 22.2% said there is influence and only 7.3% think that dictionaries and forum social networks have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 34: Wikis (Wikipedia)

	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No influence	86	48.9	
Some influence	42	23.9	
Influence	31	17.6	
More influence	17	9.6	
Total	176	100	

Around half of participants in this study (48.9%) said that social networks wikis have no influence on their purchasing behavior, 23.9% said they have some influence, 17.6% said they have influence and only 9.6% think that wikis have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 35: Blogs

Blogs	Frequency	%
No influence	103	58.5
Some influence	36	20.5
Influence	26	14.8
More influence	11	6.3
Total	176	100

More than half of participants in this study (58.5%) said that social networks blogs have no influence on their purchasing behavior, 14.8% said they have some influence, 8.5% said they have influence and only 6.3% think that blogs have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 36: Micro Blogs (Twitter)

Micro blogs (Twitter)	Frequency	%
No influence	87	49.4
Some influence	41	23.3
Influence	31	18.2
More influence	16	9.1
Total	176	100

Around half % of participants in this study(49.4) answer that social networks micro blogs(Twitter) have no influence on their purchasing behavior, 23.3% said they have

some influence, 18.2% said they have influence and 9.1% think that facebook and MySpace have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 37: Social Media Sharing Networks (Youtube, Instagram, and Flickr)

Media sharing networks (Youtube, Instagram, and Flickr)	Frequency	%
No influence	26	14.8
Some influence	38	21,6
Influence	62	35.2
More influence	50	28.4
Total	176	100

The table 37 shows that 35.2% of participants said that Media sharing networks (Youtube, Instagram, and Flickr) have influence on their purchasing behavior, 28.4% said they have more influence, 21.6% said they have some influence and 14.8% think that they don't have influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 38: (Pinterest)

(Pinterest)	Frequency	%
No influence	118	67
Some influence	35	19.9
Influence	17	9.7
More influence	6	3.4
Total	176	100

The table 38 shows that 67% of participants said that Social meaning networks (Pinterest) have no influence on their purchasing behavior, 19.9 % said they have some influence, 9.7% said they have influence and only 3.4% think that have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 39: Daily Opportunity Networks (Groupon)

Daily opportunity networks (Groupon)	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
No influence	124	70.5	
Some influence	28	15.9	
Influence	19	10.8	
More influence	5	2.8	
Total	176	100	

The table 39 shows that 70.5% of participants said that daily opportunity networks have no influence on their purchasing behavior, 15.9 % said they have some influence, 10.8% said they have influence and only 2.8% think that have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

Table 40: Advice and Evaluate Networks (IMDB, Trip Advisor)

Advice and evaluate networks	Frequency	%
No influence	75	42.6
Some influence	40	22.7
Influence	40	22.7
More influence	21	12
Total	176	100

The table 40 shows that 42.6% of participants said that advices and evaluate social networks have no influence on their purchasing behavior, 22.7 % said they have some influence, same percentage 22.7% said they have influence and 12% think that have much influence on their purchasing behavior.

The study found that 43.2 % of participants who are fashion consumers and social media users spend 2 and 3 hours per day on social media, 23.3% spend 0 to 1 hour, 18% spend 4 to 5 hours and 15.4% spend more than 5 hours per day.

To identify how social media impact fashion consumers, it is also necessary to know which social media channels participants who are fashion consumers and social media users are connect to. The result of study revealed that the most social media channels and networks used by participants are: social sharing channels (Youtube, Instagram and Flickr) 94.2%, 73.3% use Wikipedia, 71% use forum and dictionnaires, 63.3% use microblog (Twitter) and 50% use social networks (Facebook and MySpace). Also, the result found that social sharing channels (Youtube and Instagram) are the most channels influencing fashion consumers. The second most channels influencing them are forum and dictionaries are second and the third channels are; TripAdvisor and IMDB.

According the results the most social networks those have influence on participant's buying decision and behavior are, social sharing channels (Youtube, Instagram and flickr) are the most effective channels on fashion consumers; 28.4 of students said that those channels have influence on them, 28.4% more influence and 21.6 some influence.

The second channels are forum and dictionaries; 22.2% of students said they have influence on them, 7.4% more influence and 29% some influence.

The third channels are; TripAdvisor and IMDB; 22.7% of students said they have influence on them, 12% more influence and 22.7% some influence.

The rest of channels are Wikipedia; 17.6% of students said they have influence on them, 9.7% more influence and 23.9% some influence, Microblogs (Twitter); 18.2% of students said they have influence on them, 9.1% more influence and 23.3% some influence, Webrazzi; 14.8% of students said they have influence on them, 6.3% more influence and 20.5% some influence.

Pinterest; 9.7%% of students said they have influence on them, 3.4% more influence and 19.9% some influence. Daily opportunity channels (Groupon); 10.8% % of students said they have influence on them, 2.8% more influence and 15.9% some influence and Social networks (Facebook and MySpace); 8.5% of students said they have influence on them, 0.6% more influence and 18.8% some influence.

3.6. Independent T test by gender

An independent samples t-test was conducted to do a comparison by gender. A t test is a type of statistical test used to compare the means of two groups (Kim, 2020). In this study, the comparison attends to identify if there is significant difference between male and female regarding social media's impact on purchasing decision. To do the comparison, independent variables; Impact of researching product on purchase decision, Trustiness, impact of social media advertisement, impact of influencer (Famous people, Family none and University Friends), Brand's impact (profile, Brand's offer, Participation to brand's competition on social media and Shopping from brand's followed on social media) are considered as independent variables used for comparison in the pre purchase decision. In the post purchase decision; product i purchase i found them from brand's comment, profile, page, friend's profile, family's profile and university friend's profile are considered as independent variables use for comparison.

The relationship between the impacts of social media on student's purchase decision has been evaluated on the basis of the p values more or less than 0.05. According to researchers, when the p values obtained as a result is less than 0.05 that is means there is

significant effect or difference and the result is accepted but when it is bigger than 0.05 that is mean hypothesis is rejected (Maiti and Saikia, 2019).

3.6.1. For Researching Product on Social Media

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men (M= 3.8780, SD= 1.03507) and women (M= 3.1596, SD= 1.24696) conditions; $t(174) = 4.123$, $p = .000$. This means men and women are different in searching product on social media. These results suggest that men research product on social media more than women.

Table 41: Group Statistics of The Independent T Test Analysis By Gender (Researching Product on Social Media)

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
I do research product and service on social media	Equal variances assumed	10.505	.001	4.123	173.591	.000	.71847	.17425	.37455	1.06240
	Equal variances not assumed			4.176	173.591	.000	.71847	.17207	.37886	1.05809

Table 42: Independent Sample Test If The T Test Analysis By Gender (Researching product on Social Media)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
I do research product and service on social media	Male	82	3.8780	1.03507	0.11430
	Female	94	3.1596	1.24696	0.12861

3.6.2. Trust in product on social media

According to the t-test analysis, there is no significant difference in the scores for men (M=3.0610, SD= 0.89370) and women (M= 2.8085, SD= 1.09030 conditions; $t(174) = 1.665$, $p = 0.98$. This means men and women are not different in trusting in product on social media. These results suggest that men and women are affected by trusting in product on social media.

Table 43: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Trust in Product on Social Media)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
The product and service on social media are trusty	Equal variances assumed	6.959	0.09	1.665	174	.098	.25246	.15165	-.04684	.55177
	Equal variances not assumed			1.687	173.355	.093	.25246	.14962	-.04285	.54778

Table 44: Independent Sample Test If The T Test Analysis by Gender (Trust in Product on Social media)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The product and service on social media are trusty	Male	82	3.0610	0.89370	0.09869
	Female	94	2.8085	1.09030	0.11246

3.6.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women ($M=2.9634$, $SD= 1.18055$) and women ($M= 2.3298$, $SD= 1.12056$ conditions; $t(174) = 3.650$, $p= .000$. This means men and women are different by get encourage to purchase product because of social media advertisement. These results suggest that men are affected by social media advertisement more than women.

Table 45: Group Statistics of The Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	Equal variances assumed	.030	.862	3.650	174	.000	.63363	.17360	.29099	.97627
	Equal variances not assumed			3.637	167.982	.000	.63363	.1423	.28967	.97758

Table 46: Independent Sample Test If The T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	Male	82	2.9634	1.18055	0.13037
	Female	94	2.3298	1.12056	0.11558

3.6.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M=3.0244, SD= 1.19645) and women (M= 2.2766, SD= 1.26495) conditions; $t(174) = 4.012$, $p = .000$. This means men and women are different by get impacting by famous people on social media. These results suggest that men are affected by famous people to purchase product on social media more than women.

Table 47: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Famous people on social media impact my purchase decision	Equal variances assumed	.935	.335	4.012	174	.000	.74779	.18640	.37991	1.11568
	Equal variances not assumed			4.027	172.844	.000	.74779	.18640	.38129	1.11430

Table 48: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Famous People's Impact on Purchase Decision)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Famous people on social media impact my purchase decision	Male	82	3.0244	1.19645	0.13213
	Female	94	2.2766	1.26495	0.13047

3.6.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M=3.4512, SD= 1.02020) and women (M= 2.5957, SD= 1.30606) conditions; $t(174) = 4.791$, $p = .000$. This means men and women are different in term of family's advices on social media. These results suggest that men are affected by family's advices to purchase product on social media more than women.

Table 49: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
My family on social media impact my decision	Equal variances assumed	13.118	.000	4.791	174	.000	.85547	.17855	.50307	1.20788
	Equal variances not assumed			4.871	174	.000	.74779	.18569	.38129	1.11430

Table 50: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
My family on social media impact my decision	Male	82	3.4512	1.02020	0.11266
	Female	94	2.5957	1.30606	0.13471

3.6.6. Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women ($M=2.9146$, $SD= 1.15685$) and women ($M= 2.1809$, $SD= 1.03657$ conditions; $t(174) = 4.438$, $p= .000$. This means men and women are different by get impact by non-university friends on social media. These results suggest that men are affected by non-university friends to purchase product on social media more than women.

Table 51: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Non- Niversity Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
My non- university friends on social media impact my decision	Equal variances assumed	.425	.515	4.405	164.089	.000	.73378	.16534	.40745	1.06271
	Equal variances not assumed			4.405	164.089	.000	.73378	.16659	.40485	1.06012

Table 52: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
My non-university friends on social media impact my decision	Male	82	2.9146	1.15685	0.12775
	Female	94	2.1809	1.03657	0.10691

3.6.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women ($M=3.2439$, $SD= 1.07222$) and women ($M= 2.8085$, $SD= 1.09030$ conditions; $t(174) = 3.947$ $p= .000$. This means men and women are different by friends on social media. These results suggest that men and women are affected purchase product on recommended by friends on social media.

Table 53: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
My university friends on social media impact my decision	Equal variances assumed	2.320	.130	3.947	174	.000	.68007	.17230	.34253	1.02015
	Equal variances not assumed			3.977	173.866	.000	.68007	.17102	.34253	1.01761

Table 54: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
My university friends on social media impact my decision	Male	82	3.2439	1.07222	0.11841
	Female	94	2.5638	1.19640	0.12340

3.6.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women ($M=3.2195$, $SD= 1.04260$) and women ($M= 2.5745$, $SD= 1.22245$ conditions; $t(174) = 3.737$, $p= .000$. This means men and women are different by getting impact by brand's profile on social media. These results suggest that men are affected by on brand's profile more than women on social media.

Table 55: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Brand's profile on social media impact my decision of purchase	Equal variances assumed	5.642	.019	3.737	174	.000	.64504	.17260	.30438	.98571
	Equal variances not assumed			3.778	173.918	.000	.64504	.17075	.30804	.98205

Table 56: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Brand's profile on social media impact my purchase decision	Male	82	3.2195	1.04260	0.11514
	Female	94	2.5745	1.22245	0.12609

3.6.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women ($M=2.8902$, $SD= 1.21722$) and women ($M= 2.1489$, $SD= 1.19998$ conditions; $t(174) = 1.736$, $p= .084$. This means men and women are not different by get impact by brand's offer. These results suggest that both men and women are affected by purchasing product because of brand's offer on social media.

Table 57: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Brand's offer impressing me	Equal variances assumed	4.030	.046	1.736	174	.084	.33705	.19415	-.04614	.72025
	Equal variances not assumed			1.736	173.715	.82	.33705	.18508	-.04362	.71772

Table 58: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Brands offer impressing me	Male	82	2.8902	1.21722	0.13442
	Female	94	2.5532	1.34098	0.13831

3.6.10. Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M=2.2439, SD= 1.25276) and women (M= 2.1489, SD= 1.19998 conditions; $t(174) = .513$, $p = .609$. This means men and women are not different by get impact participate to the brand's competition. These results suggest that men and women are affected participating in brands competition on social media.

Table 59: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Participation in Brand's Competition on Social Media)

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
I participate in brand's competition on social media	Equal variances assumed	.076	.783	.513	174	.609	.09497	.18508	-.27033	.46026
	Equal variances not assumed			.512	168.523	.610	0.9497	.18508	-.27149	.46142

Table 60: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
I participate to brand's competition on social media	Male	82	2.2439	1.25276	0.13834
	Female	94	2.1489	1.19998	0.12377

3.6.11. For shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media

According to the t-test analysis, there is a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M=2.7805, SD= 1.30549) and women (M= 2.1596, SD= 1.14819 conditions; $t(174) = 3.357$, $p = .001$. This means men and women are different by get impact by do shopping from brand's they follow on social media. These results suggest that men are affected by purchasing product from brand's they follow on social media more than women.

Table 61: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)

		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	Equal variances assumed	1.770	.185	3.328	162.681	.001	.62091	.18495	.25589	.98594
	Equal variances not assumed			3.328	162.681	.001	.62091	.18657	.25250	.98933

Table 62: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	Male	82	2.7805	1.30549	0.14417
	Female	94	2.1596	1.14819	0.11843

3.6.12. For Purchasing Product Found From Comment

According to the t-test analysis, there is no a significant difference in the scores for men and women ($M=2.4268$, $SD= 1.27686$) and women ($M= 2.3936$, $SD= 1.28864$) conditions; $t(174) = .171$, $p= .864$. This means men and women are not different by purchasing product found from comment. These results suggest that men and women are affected by purchasing product found from comment on social media.

Table 63: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	Equal variances assumed	.022	.882	.171	174	.864	0.3321	.19390	-.34948	.41591
	Equal variances not assumed			.171	171.182	.864	0.3321	.19377	-.34928	.41571

Table 64: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	Male	82	2.4268	1.27686	0.14101
	Female	94	2.3936	1.28864	0.13291

3.6.13. For Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media

According to the t-test analysis, there is not a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M=1.7683, SD= 0.90675) and women (M= 2.0106, SD= 1.10224 conditions; $t(174) = -1.579$, $p = .116$. This means men and women are not different by purchasing product found from profile. These results suggest that men and women are affected by purchasing product found from profile on social media.

Table 65: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	Equal variances assumed	2.429	.121	-1.579	174	.116	-.24235	.15351	-.54534	.06064
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.600	173.428	.111	-.24235	.15150	-.54136	.05667

Table 66: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	Male	82	1.7683	0.90675	0.10013
	Female	94	2.0106	1.10224	0.11369

3.6.14. For Purchasing Product Found From Page on Social Media

According to the t-test analysis, there is not a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M=2.3415, SD= 1.16767) and women (M= 2.3415, SD= 1.24181 conditions; $t(174) = -.053$, $p = .958$. This means men and women are not different by purchasing product found from page. These results suggest that men and women are affected by purchasing product found from page on social media.

Table 67: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	Equal variances assumed	1.048	.307	-.053	174	.958	-.00960	.18252	-.36983	.35063
	Equal variances not assumed			-.053	173.004	.958	-.00960	.18175	-.36833	.34913

Table 68: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	Male	82	2.3415	1.16767	0.12895
	Female	94	2.3511	1.24181	0.12808

3.6.15. For Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile ON Social Media

According to the t-test analysis, there is not a significant difference in the scores for men and women ($M=2.0854$, $SD= 1.12438$) and women ($M= 1.8617$, $SD= 1.04317$) conditions; $t(174) = 1.368$, $p = .173$. This means men and women are not different by purchasing product found from friend's profile. These results suggest that men and women are affected by purchasing product found from friend's profile on social media.

Table 69: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
The product and service i purchase i found them from the friend's profile on social media	Equal variances assumed	1.760	.186	1.368	174	.173	.22366	.16346	-.09895	.54628
	Equal variances not assumed			1.361	166.533	.175	.22366	.16430	-.10071	.54804

Table 70: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friend's profile on social media	Male	82	2.0854	1.12438	0.12417
	Female	94	1.8617	1.04317	0.10759

3.6.16. For Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile on Social Media

According to the t-test analysis, there is not a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M= 1.9268, SD=1.05152) and women (M=1.8511, SD= 1.02608 conditions; $t(174) = .482$, $p = .630$. This means men and women are not different by purchasing product found from university family's profile. These results suggest that men and women are affected by purchasing product found from university family's profile on social media.

Table 71: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Family's Profile)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
The product and service i purchase i found them from my family's profile on social media	Equal variances assumed	.554	.458	.482	174	.630	.07577	.15685	-.23381	.38534
	Equal variances not assumed			-.482	169.558	.630	.07577	.15711	-.23438	.38592

Table 72: Independent Sample Test If the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The product and service i purchase i found them from my family's profile on social media	Male	82	1.9268	1.05152	0.11612
	Female	94	1.8511	1.02608	0.10583

3.6.17. For Purchasing Product Found from University Friend's Profile on Social Media

According to the t-test analysis, there is not a significant difference in the scores for men and women (M= 1.9146, SD=1.05645) and women (M=1.9574, SD= 1.13512 conditions; $t(174) = -.258$, $p = .797$. This means men and women are not

different by purchasing product found from university friend's profile. These results suggest that men and women are affected by purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media.

Table 73: Group Statistics of the Independent T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile)

		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (taile)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
The product and service i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	Equal variances assumed	.073	.788	-.258	174	.797	-.04281	.16610	-.37064	.28501
	Equal variances not assumed			-.259	173.255	.796	-.04281	.16528	-.36905	.28341

Table 74: Independent Sample Test if the T Test Analysis by Gender (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	Male	82	1.9146	1.05645	0.11667
	Female	94	1.9574	1.13512	0.11708

3.7. Anova Analysis by Age

One Way Anova analysis is used in this study to describe responses of participants. Anova analysis is a statistical tool used to detect differences between experimental group means (Sawyer, 2009). In this study Anova analysis attends to identify if demographic characteristics of age, level of study, internet usage and social media usage have an effect on fashion consumers' purchase decision. The results were obtained and estimated with degree of freedom (df), F (freedom) and signification (Sig).

3.7.1. Researching Product on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on research of product and service on social media. The result shows that there was not a significant effect of age on research of product on social media at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [F (2.173)

= 2.720 , p= .069. This means that the age really does not have effect on research of product and service on social media.

Table 75: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis for Age (Researching Product on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do search about product and service on social media	18-25	166	3.4940	1.22473	.09506	3.3063	3.6817	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.5556	.88192	.29397	2.8777	4.2335	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	3.4943	1.20474	.09081	3.3151	3.6735	1.00	5.00

Table 76: One Way Anova Analysis for Age (Researching Product on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do search about product and service on social media	Between Groups	7.744	2	3.872	2.720	.069
	Within Groups	246.250	173	1.423		
	Total	253.994	175			

3.7.2. Trust in Product on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on trust in product. The result shows that there was a significant effect for age on trustiness in product at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 3.546$, $p = .031$]. This means that the age really does have an effect on the trust in product on social media

Table 77: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis for Age (Trust in Product on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service on social media are trusty	18-25	166	2.9398	1.00120	.07771	2.7863	3.0932	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.7778	1.20185	.40062	1.8540	3.7016	1.00	5.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.9261	1.00865	.07603	2.7761	3.0762	1.00	5.00

Table 78: One Way Anova Analysis For age (Trust in Product on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service on social media are trustworthy	Between Groups	7.012	2	3.506	3.546	.031
	Within Groups	171.028	173	.989		
	Total	178.040	175			

3.7.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on social media advertisement and its impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was a significant effect for age at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 5.212$, $p = .006$]. This means that the age really does have an effect on social media advertisement and this resumes the effect of social media advertisement on purchase decision.

Table 79: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Social Media on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	18-25	166	2.5843	1.17633	.09130	2.4041	2.7646	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.4444	1.23603	.41201	2.4943	4.3945	1.00	5.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.18864	.08960	2.4482	2.8018	1.00	5.00

Table 80: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	Between Groups	14.052	2	7.026	5.212	.006
	Within Groups	233.198	173	1.348		
	Total	247.250	175			

3.7.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on famous people and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was a significant effect for age

on famous people and their impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 4.527, p = .012$]. This means that the age really does have an effect on famous people's reference and their impact consumer's purchase decision on social media.

Table 81: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by age (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Famous people on social media impact my decision of purchase	18-25	166	2.5964	1.28855	.10001	2.3989	2.7939	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.3333	1.00000	.33333	2.5647	4.1020	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	1.0000	.	.	.	.	1.00	1.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.28563	.09691	2.4337	2.8163	1.00	5.00

Table 82: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Famous people on social media impact my decision	Between Groups	14.386	2	7.193	4.527	.012
	Within Groups	274.864	173	1.589		
	Total	289.250	175			

3.7.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on family's advices and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on family and their impact on fashion consumers at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 1.050, p = .352$]. This means that the age of consumers really do not have an effect on family's impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision.

Table 83: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My family's advices on social media impact my decision of purchase	18-25	166	2.9699	1.25251	.09721	2.7779	3.1618	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.6667	1.00000	.33333	2.8980	4.4353	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	1.0000	.	.	.	.	1.00	1.00
	Total	176	2.9943	1.25355	.09449	2.8078	3.1808	1.00	5.00

Table 84: One Way Anova Analysis by age (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My family on social media impact my decision	Between Groups	3.297	2	1.648	1.050	.352
	Within Groups	271.698	173	1.571		
	Total	274.994	175			

3.7.6. Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on non- university friends and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on non- university friends and their impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision. At the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 2.844$, $p = .061$]. This means that the age of consumers really does not have an effect on non-university friends and their impact on purchase decision.

Table 85: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My non university friends on social media impact my decision of purchase	18-25	166	2.4819	1.15849	.08992	2.3044	2.6595	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.2222	.83333	.27778	2.5817	3.8628	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.5227	1.15117	.08677	2.3515	2.6940	1.00	5.00

Table 86: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My non university friends on social media impact my decision	Between Groups	7.381	2	3.691	2.844	.061
	Within Groups	224.528	173	1.298		
	Total	231.909	175			

3.7.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on university student's friends and their impact on fashion consumer's decision of purchase. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on university friends and their impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 1.637$, $p = .198$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on university friends and their impact on fashion consumers on social media.

Table 87: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Niversity Friends on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My university students friends on social media impact my decision of purchase	18-25	166	2.8434	1.19069	.09242	2.6609	3.0258	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.4444	1.01379	.33793	2.6652	4.2237	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	4.0000	.	.	.	.	4.00	4.00
	Total	176	2.8807	1.18682	.08946	2.7041	3.0572	1.00	5.00

Table 88: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My university friends on social media impact my decision	Between Groups	4.578	2	2.289	1.637	.198
	Within Groups	241.917	173	1.398		
	Total	246.494	175			

3.7.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = .690, p = .503$]. This means that the age really does not have an impact on purchase decision on social media.

Table 89: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's profile impact my decision of purchase	18-25	166	2.8554	1.19222	.09253	2.6727	3.0381	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.3333	1.00000	.33333	2.5647	4.1020	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.8750	1.18382	.08923	2.6989	3.0511	1.00	5.00

Table 90: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brand's profile on social media impact my decision of purchase	Between Groups	1.941	2	.971	.690	.503
	Within Groups	243.309	173	1.406		
	Total	245.250	175			

3.7.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on brand's offer and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age brand's offer and its impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision. At the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = .354, p = .702$]. This means that the age does not have effect on brand's offer and its impact on purchase decision.

Table 91: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's offer impressing me	18-25	166	2.7048	1.29460	.10048	2.5064	2.9032	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.7778	1.39443	.46481	1.7059	3.8496	1.00	5.00
	31-40	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.7102	1.29222	.09740	2.5180	2.9025	1.00	5.00

Table 92: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's offer impressing me	18-25	166	2.7048	1.29460	.10048	2.5064	2.9032	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.7778	1.39443	.46481	1.7059	3.8496	1.00	5.00
	31-40	1	3.0000	.	.	.	.	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.7102	1.29222	.09740	2.5180	2.9025	1.00	5.00

3.7.10. Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media

A one way anova is used in this study to compare the effect of age on participation on brand's competition, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on brand's competition at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions $[F(2,173) = 2.358, p = .098]$. This means that the age does not have effect on brand's competition.

Table 93: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Participation to Brand's Competition)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I participate to brands competition on social media	18-25	166	2.1446	1.20738	.09371	1.9596	2.3296	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.1111	1.26930	.42310	2.1354	4.0868	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.1932	1.22225	.09213	2.0114	2.3750	1.00	5.00

Table 94: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Participation to Brand's Competition)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I participate in brand's competition on social media	Between Groups	6.938	2	3.469	2.358	.098
	Within Groups	254.494	173	1.471		
	Total	261.432	175			

3.7.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on brand's competition and its impact on on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media. At the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions $[F(2,173) = .133, p = .876]$. This means that the age does not have an effect on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media.

Table 95: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	18-25	166	2.4699	1.27766	.09917	2.2741	2.6657	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.2222	.83333	.27778	1.5817	2.8628	1.00	3.00
	31-40	1	1.0000	.	.	.	.	1.00	1.00
	Total	176	2.4489	1.25934	.09493	2.2615	2.6362	1.00	5.00

Table 96: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do shopping from brands' i follow on social media	Between Groups	.426	2	.213	.133	.876
	Within Groups	277.114	173	1.602		
	Total	277.540	175			

3.7.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age and finding product from comment, the result shows that there was not a significant effect of age on purchasing product found from comment at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,371) = .841, p = .433$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from comment on social media

Table 97: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	18-25	166	2.4398	1.29075	.10018	2.2420	2.6376	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	1.8889	1.05409	.35136	1.0786	2.6991	1.00	4.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.4091	1.27961	.09645	2.2187	2.5995	1.00	5.00

Table 98: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	Between Groups	2.759	2	1.379	.841	.433
	Within Groups	283.786	173	1.640		
	Total	286.545	175			

3.7.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on purchasing product found from profile, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on purchasing product found from profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = .871, p = .420$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from profile on social media.

Table 99: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service I purchase I found them from profile on social media	18-25	166	1.8735	1.01008	.07840	1.7187	2.0283	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.3333	1.22474	.40825	1.3919	3.2748	1.00	4.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	1.8977	1.02025	.07690	1.7459	2.0495	1.00	5.00

Table 100: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	Between Groups	1.816	2	.908	.871	.420
	Within Groups	180.343	173	1.042		
	Total	182.159	175			

3.7.14. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on purchasing product found from page on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on purchasing product found from page on social media at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = .370$, $p = .691$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from page on social media.

Table 101: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	18-25	166	2.3313	1.21300	.09415	2.1454	2.5172	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.6667	1.11803	.37268	1.8073	3.5261	1.00	4.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.3466	1.20442	.09079	2.1674	2.5258	1.00	5.00

Table 102: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	Between Groups	1.081	2	.540	.370	.691
	Within Groups	252.777	173	1.461		
	Total	253.858	175			

3.7.15. Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on purchasing product found from friend's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on purchasing product from friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = .264, p = .769$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from friend's profile on social media.

Table 103: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from friend's profile on social media	18-25	166	1.9518	1.09990	.08537	1.7833	2.1204	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.2222	.83333	.27778	1.5817	2.8628	1.00	3.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	1.9659	1.08442	.08174	1.8046	2.1272	1.00	5.00

Table 104: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from friend's profile on social media	Between Groups	.625	2	.313	.264	.769
	Within Groups	205.170	173	1.186		
	Total	205.795	175			

3.7.16. Purchasing Product Found From Families' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on purchasing product from family's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect

for age on purchasing product found from family's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = .504$, $p = .605$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from family's profile on social media.

Table 105: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my family's profile comment on social media	18-25	166	1.8675	1.04181	.08086	1.7078	2.0271	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.2222	.97183	.32394	1.4752	2.9692	1.00	4.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	1.8864	1.03573	.07807	1.7323	2.0404	1.00	5.00

Table 106: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from family's family on social media	Between Groups	1.087	2	.544	.504	.605
	Within Groups	186.640	173	1.079		
	Total	187.727	175			

3.7.17. Purchasing Product Found From University Friends' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of age on purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media, one way anova analysis was done and the result shows that there was not a significant effect for age on purchasing product found from university friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = .320$, $p = .727$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media.

Table 107: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	18-25	166	1.9217	1.10091	.08545	1.7530	2.0904	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	2.2222	1.09291	.36430	1.3821	3.0623	1.00	4.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	1.9375	1.09626	.08263	1.7744	2.1006	1.00	5.00

Table 108: One Way Anova Analysis by Age (Purchasing Product Found From University Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	Between Groups	.775	2	.388	.320	.727
	Within Groups	209.537	173	1.211		
	Total	210.313	175			

3.8. Anova by Level of Study

3.8.1. Researching product on social media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on research of product on social media. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on research of product on social media at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 2.720, p = .069$]. This means that the level of study of consumers really does not have an effect on their research of product on social media.

Table 109: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Researching Product on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do search product on social media	Bachelor	162	3.4444	1.22094	.09593	3.2550	3.6339	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	4.2500	.75378	.21760	3.7711	4.7289	3.00	5.00
	PHD	2	3.0000	.00000	.00000	3.0000	3.0000	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	3.4943	1.20474	.09081	3.3151	3.6735	1.00	5.00

Table 110: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Researching Product on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do research product on social media	Between Groups	7.744	2	3.872	2.720	.069
	Within Groups	246.250	173	1.423		
	Total	253.994	175			

3.8.2. For Trust in Product on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on trust in product. The result shows that there was a significant effect for level of study on trust in product at the $p < 0.5$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 3.546, p = .031$]. This means that the level of study of consumers really does have an effect on their trust in product on social media.

Table 111: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Trust in Product on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service on social media are trusty	Bachelor	162	2.9074	1.00190	.07872	2.7520	3.0629	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	3.4167	.90034	.25990	2.8446	3.9887	2.00	5.00
	PHD	2	1.5000	.70711	.50000	-4.8531	7.8531	1.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.9261	1.00865	.07603	2.7761	3.0762	1.00	5.00

Table 112: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Trust in Product on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service on social media are trusty	Between Groups	7.012	2	3.506	3.546	.031
	Within Groups	171.028	173	.989		
	Total	178.040	175			

3.8.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on impact of social media advertisement on consumer's purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study at the $p < 0.5$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 5.212, p = .006$]. This means that the level of study really does have an effect

on impact of social media advertisement on consumer's purchase decision on social media.

Table 113: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Social Media Advertisement and its Impact on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	Bachelor	162	2.5432	1.15344	.09062	2.3642	2.7222	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	3.5000	1.31426	.37939	2.6650	4.3350	1.00	5.00
	PHD	2	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.18864	.08960	2.4482	2.8018	1.00	5.00

Table 114: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Social Media Advertisement and Its Impact on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	Between Groups	14.052	2	7.026	5.212	.006
	Within Groups	233.198	173	1.348		
	Total	247.250	175			

3.8.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on famous people and their impact on consumer's purchase decision. The result shows that there was a significant effect for level of study on famous people and their impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 4.527$, $p = .012$]. This means that the level of study of consumers really does have an effect on famous people's purchase decision on social media.

Table 115: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	Bachelor	162	2.5432	1.15344	.09062	2.3642	2.7222	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	3.5000	1.31426	.37939	2.6650	4.3350	1.00	5.00
	PHD	2	4.0000	.00000	.00000	4.0000	4.0000	4.00	4.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.18864	.08960	2.4482	2.8018	1.00	5.00

Table 116: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Famous people on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	14.386	2	7.193	4.527	.012
	Within Groups	274.864	173	1.589		
	Total	289.250	175			

3.8.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on family and their impact on consumer's purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on family and their impact purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 1.050$, $p = .352$]. This means that the level of study of consumers really does not have an effect on family impact on consumers' purchase decision on social media.

Table 117: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Family and Impact on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My family on social media impact my purchase decision	Bachelor	162	2.9568	1.26269	.09921	2.7609	3.1527	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	3.5000	1.16775	.33710	2.7580	4.2420	1.00	5.00
	PHD	2	3.0000	.00000	.00000	3.0000	3.0000	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.9943	1.25355	.09449	2.8078	3.1808	1.00	5.00

Table118: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My family on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	3.297	2	1.648	1.050	.352
	Within Groups	271.698	173	1.571		
	Total	274.994	175			

3.8.6. Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on non- university friends and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on non-university friends and their impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 2.844$, $p = .061$]. This means that the level of study of consumers really does not have an effect on non-university friends impact on consumers' purchase decision on social media.

Table 119: Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My non university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	Bachelor	162	2.4630	1.14284	.08979	2.2856	2.6403	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	3.2500	1.13818	.32856	2.5268	3.9732	1.00	5.00
	PHD	2	3.0000	.00000	.00000	3.0000	3.0000	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.5227	1.15117	.08677	2.3515	2.6940	1.00	5.00

Table 120: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My non university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	7.381	2	3.691	2.844	.061
	Within Groups	224.528	173	1.298		
	Total	231.909	175			

3.8.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used in to compare the effect of level of study on university friends and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on university student's friends and their impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 1.637$, $p = .198$]. This means that the level of study of consumers really does not have an effect on university friends and their impact on consumers' purchase decision on social media.

Table 121: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	Bachelor	162	2.8333	1.20686	.09482	2.6461	3.0206	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	3.4167	.79296	.22891	2.9128	3.9205	2.00	5.00
	PHD	2	3.5000	.70711	.50000	-2.8531	9.8531	3.00	4.00
	Total	176	2.8807	1.18682	.08946	2.7041	3.0572	1.00	5.00

Table 122: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	4.578	2	2.289	1.637	.198
	Within Groups	241.917	173	1.398		
	Total	246.494	175			

3.8.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study and brand's impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on brand's profile and its impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = .690$, $p = .503$]. This means that the level of study brand's impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision on social media.

Table 123: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's profile on social media impact my purchase decision	18-25	166	2.8554	1.19222	.09253	2.6727	3.0381	1.00	5.00
	26-30	9	3.3333	1.00000	.33333	2.5647	4.1020	2.00	5.00
	31-40	1	2.0000	.	.	.	.	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.8750	1.18382	.08923	2.6989	3.0511	1.00	5.00

Table 124: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of study (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brand's profile on social media impact my decision of purchase	Between Groups	1.941	2	.971	.690	.503
	Within Groups	243.309	173	1.406		
	Total	245.250	175			

3.8.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on brand's offer and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on brand's offer and its impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = .354$, $p = .702$]. This means that the level of study does not have an effect on brand's offer and its impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision on social media.

Table 125: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's offer impressing me	Bachelor	162	2.7099	1.29347	.10162	2.5092	2.9106	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	2.8333	1.40346	.40514	1.9416	3.7250	1.00	5.00
	PHD	2	2.0000	.00000	.00000	2.0000	2.0000	2.00	2.00
	Total	176	2.7102	1.29222	.09740	2.5180	2.9025	1.00	5.00

Table 126: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brand's offer impressing me	Between Groups	1.191	2	.595	.354	.702
	Within Groups	291.031	173	1.682		
	Total	292.222	175			

3.8.10. Participation to Brands Competition

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on participation on brand's competition and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on brand's competition and its impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2.173) = 2.358, p = .098$]. This means that the level of study does not have an effect on brand's competition and its impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision on social media.

Table 127: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I participate in brand's competition on social media	Bachelor	162	2.1605	1.20513	.09468	1.9735	2.3475	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	2.3333	1.30268	.37605	1.5057	3.1610	1.00	5.00
	PHD	2	4.0000	1.41421	1.00000	-8.7062	16.7062	3.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.1932	1.22225	.09213	2.0114	2.3750	1.00	5.00

Table 128: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I participate in brand's competition on social media	Between Groups	6.938	2	3.469	2.358	.098
	Within Groups	254.494	173	1.471		
	Total	261.432	175			

3.8.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on shopping from followed brands on social media. At the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions $[F(2,173) = .133, p = .876]$. This means that the level of study does not have an effect on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumers on social media.

Table 129: Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	Bachelor	162	2.4568	1.27615	.10026	2.2588	2.6548	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	2.4167	1.08362	.31282	1.7282	3.1052	1.00	4.00
	PHD	2	2.0000	1.41421	1.00000	-10.7062	14.7062	1.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.4489	1.25934	.09493	2.2615	2.6362	1.00	5.00

Table 130: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	Between Groups	.426	2	.213	.133	.876
	Within Groups	277.114	173	1.602		
	Total	277.540	175			

3.8.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study purchasing product found from comment, the result shows that there was a not significant effect for level of study on purchasing product found from comment at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions $[F(2,173) = .102, p = .903]$. This means that the level of study age really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from comment on social media.

Table 131: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	Bachelor	162	2.4198	1.29369	.10164	2.2190	2.6205	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	2.2500	1.21543	.35086	1.4778	3.0222	1.00	4.00
	PHD	2	2.5000	.70711	.50000	-3.8531	8.8531	2.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.4091	1.27961	.09645	2.2187	2.5995	1.00	5.00

Table 132: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	Between Groups	.339	2	.169	.102	.903
	Within Groups	286.207	173	1.654		
	Total	286.545	175			

3.8.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on purchasing product found from profile, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on purchasing product found from profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = 2.633$, $p = .075$]. This means that the level of study really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from profile on social media.

Table 133: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	Bachelor	162	1.8704	1.00396	.07888	1.7146	2.0261	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	2.0000	1.12815	.32567	1.2832	2.7168	1.00	4.00
	PHD	2	3.5000	.70711	.50000	-2.8531	9.8531	3.00	4.00
	Total	176	1.8977	1.02025	.07690	1.7459	2.0495	1.00	5.00

Table 134: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	Between Groups	5.381	2	2.691	2.633	.075
	Within Groups	176.778	173	1.022		
	Total	182.159	175			

3.8.14. Purchasing Product Found From Page

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on purchasing product found from page on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on purchasing product found from page at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions $[F(2,173) = .330, p = .719]$. This means that the level of study really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from page on social media.

Table 135: Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service I purchase I found them from page on social media	Bachelor	162	2.3457	1.20723	.09485	2.1584	2.5330	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	2.2500	1.28806	.37183	1.4316	3.0684	1.00	4.00
	PHD	2	3.0000	.00000	.00000	3.0000	3.0000	3.00	3.00
	Total	176	2.3466	1.20442	.09079	2.1674	2.5258	1.00	5.00

Table 136: One Way Anova Analysis By Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	Between Groups	.966	2	.483	.330	.719
	Within Groups	252.892	173	1.462		
	Total	253.858	175			

3.8.15. Purchasing Product Found From Friends' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used in this study to compare the effect of level of study on purchasing product found from friend's profile on social media, the result shows that

there was not a significant effect for level of study on purchasing product found from friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2.173) = .253$, $p = .776$]. This means that the level of study really does not have an effect on purchasing product from friend's profile on social media.

Table 137: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friend's profile on social media	Bachelor	162	1.9630	1.10835	.08708	1.7910	2.1349	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	1.9167	.79296	.22891	1.4128	2.4205	1.00	3.00
	PHD	2	2.5000	.70711	.50000	-3.8531	8.8531	2.00	3.00
	Total	176	1.9659	1.08442	.08174	1.8046	2.1272	1.00	5.00

Table 138: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friend's profile on social media	Between Groups	.601	2	.301	.253	.776
	Within Groups	205.194	173	1.186		
	Total	205.795	175			

3.8.16. Purchasing Product Found From Families' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on purchasing product found from family's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on purchasing product found from family's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2.173) = .453$, $p = .637$]. This means that the level of study really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from family's profile on social media.

Table 139: Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis By Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my family's profile on social media	Bachelor	162	1.8889	1.04555	.08215	1.7267	2.0511	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	1.7500	.96531	.27866	1.1367	2.3633	1.00	4.00
	PHD	2	2.5000	.70711	.50000	-3.8531	8.8531	2.00	3.00
	Total	176	1.8864	1.03573	.07807	1.7323	2.0404	1.00	5.00

Table 140: One Way Anova Analysis By Level Of Study (Purchasing Product Found From Family's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from my family's profile on social media	Between Groups	.977	2	.489	.453	.637
	Within Groups	186.750	173	1.079		
	Total	187.727	175			

3.8.17. Purchasing Product Found From University Friends' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of level of study on purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for level of study on purchasing product found from university friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2,173) = .914$, $p = .403$]. This means that the level of study really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media.

Table 141: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	Bachelor	162	1.9568	1.11650	.08772	1.7836	2.1300	1.00	5.00
	Master Degree	12	1.5833	.79296	.22891	1.0795	2.0872	1.00	3.00
	PHD	2	2.5000	.70711	.50000	-3.8531	8.8531	2.00	3.00
	Total	176	1.9375	1.09626	.08263	1.7744	2.1006	1.00	5.00

Table 142: One Way Anova Analysis by Level of Study (Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service I purchase I found them from my university friend's on social media	Between Groups	2.198	2	1.099	.914	.403
	Within Groups	208.114	173	1.203		
	Total	210.312	175			

3.9. Anova by Internet Usage

3.9.1. Research of Product on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on researching product on social media. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on research of product on social media at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.380, p = .251$]. This means that the internet usage of consumers really does not have an effect on their research of product on social media.

Table 143: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Researching Product on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do research product and service on social media	0-1 hour	14	3.0000	1.10940	.29650	2.3595	3.6405	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hour	60	3.4500	1.11119	.14345	3.1629	3.7371	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	3.7037	1.14314	.15556	3.3917	4.0157	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	3.4583	1.38316	.19964	3.0567	3.8600	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	3.4943	1.20474	.09081	3.3151	3.6735	1.00	5.00

Table 144: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Researching Product on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do research product and service on social media	Between Groups	5.968	3	1.989	1.380	.251
	Within Groups	248.026	172	1.442		
	Total	253.994	175			

3.9.2. Trust in Product on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on trustiness. The result shows that there was a significant effect for internet usage on trust in product at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 2.146$, $p = .096$]. This means that the internet usage of consumers really does not have an effect on their trust in product on social media.

Table 145: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Trust In Product on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service on social media are trusty	0-1 hour	14	3.0000	1.03775	.27735	2.4008	3.5992	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.7000	.88872	.11473	2.4704	2.9296	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.9259	1.02519	.13951	2.6461	3.2057	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	3.1875	1.08483	.15658	2.8725	3.5025	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.9261	1.00865	.07603	2.7761	3.0762	1.00	5.00

Table 146: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Trust In Product On Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service on social media are trusty	Between Groups	6.424	3	2.141	2.146	.096
	Within Groups	171.616	172	.998		
	Total	178.040	175			

3.9.3. Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used in this study to compare the effect of internet usage on impact of social media advertisement on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on impact of social media advertisement on consumer's purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.634$, $p = .183$]. This means that internet usage really does not have an effect on social media advertisement on consumer's purchase decision.

Table 147: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Social Media Advertisement And Its Impact on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	0-1 hour	14	2.5714	1.01635	.27163	1.9846	3.1583	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.3667	1.05713	.13647	2.0936	2.6398	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.7407	1.21601	.16548	2.4088	3.0726	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.8333	1.32622	.19142	2.4482	3.2184	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.18864	.08960	2.4482	2.8018	1.00	5.00

Table 148: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Social Media Advertisement and Its Impact On Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social media advertisement about product and service encourage me to purchase	Between Groups	6.851	3	2.284	1.634	.183
	Within Groups	240.399	172	1.398		
	Total	247.250	175			

3.9.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on famous people and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was a significant effect for internet usage on famous people and their impact on fashion consumers at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions $[F(3,172) = 1.724, p = .164]$. This means that the internet usage of consumers really does not have an effect on famous people and their impact on purchase decision.

Table 149: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Famous people on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	14	2.7857	1.25137	.33444	2.0632	3.5082	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.4667	1.17122	.15120	2.1641	2.7692	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.9259	1.31539	.17900	2.5669	3.2850	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.4375	1.36688	.19729	2.0406	2.8344	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.28563	.09691	2.4337	2.8163	1.00	5.00

Table 150: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Famous people on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	8.443	3	2.814	1.724	.164
	Within Groups	280.807	172	1.633		
	Total	289.250	175			

3.9.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on family and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was a significant effect for internet usage on family and their impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions $[F(3,172) = 3.471, p = .01]$. This means that the internet usage of consumers really does have an effect on family and their impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision on social media.

Table 151: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My family on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	14	3.0000	1.41421	.37796	2.1835	3.8165	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.6000	1.15274	.14882	2.3022	2.8978	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	3.3148	1.21040	.16471	2.9844	3.6452	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	3.1250	1.28204	.18505	2.7527	3.4973	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.9943	1.25355	.09449	2.8078	3.1808	1.00	5.00

Table 152: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My Family on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	15.696	3	5.232	3.471	.017
	Within Groups	259.298	172	1.508		
	Total	274.994	175			

3.9.6. Impact of Non-University Friends on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on non- university friends and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on influencers and their impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.652, p = .179$]. This means that the internet usage of consumers really does not have an effect on non- university friends and their impact on consumers' purchase decision on social media.

Table 153: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My non university friends on social media impact my decision	0-1 hour	14	2.5000	.85485	.22847	2.0064	2.9936	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.3000	1.09390	.14122	2.0174	2.5826	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.7778	1.22346	.16649	2.4438	3.1117	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.5208	1.18483	.17101	2.1768	2.8649	1.00	4.00
	Total	176	2.5227	1.15117	.08677	2.3515	2.6940	1.00	5.00

Table 154: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My non university friends on social media impact my decision of purchase	Between Groups	6.497	3	2.166	1.652	.179
	Within Groups	225.413	172	1.311		
	Total	231.909	175			

3.9.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on university friends and their impact on fashion purchase decision. The result shows that there was a significant effect for internet usage on university friends and their impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = .699$, $p = .554$]. This means that the internet usage of consumers really does not have an effect on university friends and their impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision on social media.

Table 155: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	14	2.7857	1.05090	.28087	2.1789	3.3925	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.6167	1.13633	.14670	2.3231	2.9102	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	3.0185	1.10728	.15068	2.7163	3.3207	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	3.0833	1.33422	.19258	2.6959	3.4708	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.8807	1.18682	.08946	2.7041	3.0572	1.00	5.00

Table 156: One Way Anova Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	2.955	3	.985	.699	.554
	Within Groups	242.295	172	1.409		
	Total	245.250	175			

3.9.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(3,172) = .699$, $p = .554$]. This means that the internet usage does not have an effect on brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision on social media.

Table 157: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's profile on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	14	2.5714	1.08941	.29116	1.9424	3.2004	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.7833	1.16578	.15050	2.4822	3.0845	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.9259	1.17925	.16048	2.6041	3.2478	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	3.0208	1.24609	.17986	2.6590	3.3827	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.8750	1.18382	.08923	2.6989	3.0511	1.00	5.00

Table 158: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brands profile impact on purchase decision	Between Groups	2.955	3	.985	.699	.554
	Within Groups	242.295	172	1.409		
	Total	245.250	175			

3.9.9. Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used in this study to compare the effect of internet usage on brand's offer and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on brand's offer and its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(3,172) = 2.398$, $p = .070$]. This means that the internet usage does not have an effect on brand's offer and its impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision on social media.

Table 159: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's offer impressing me	0-1 hour	14	2.4286	1.22250	.32673	1.7227	3.1344	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.4167	1.16868	.15088	2.1148	2.7186	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.8333	1.31393	.17880	2.4747	3.1920	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	3.0208	1.37593	.19860	2.6213	3.4204	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.7102	1.29222	.09740	2.5180	2.9025	1.00	5.00

Table 160: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brands' offer impressing me	Between Groups	11.731	3	3.910	2.398	.070
	Within Groups	280.491	172	1.631		
	Total	292.222	175			

3.9.10. For Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on participation on brand's competition and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on brand's competition and its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = .029$, $p = .993$]. This means that the internet usage does not have an effect on brand's competition and its impact on fashion consumers' purchase decision.

Table 161: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I participate to brand's competition on social media	0-1 hour	14	2.1429	.94926	.25370	1.5948	2.6909	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.1667	1.25099	.16150	1.8435	2.4898	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.2222	1.14376	.15565	1.9100	2.5344	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.2083	1.36769	.19741	1.8112	2.6055	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.1932	1.22225	.09213	2.0114	2.3750	1.00	5.00

Table 162: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition And Its Impact on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I participate on brands competition on social media	Between Groups	.134	3	.045	.029	.993
	Within Groups	261.298	172	1.519		
	Total	261.432	175			

3.9.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.730$, $p = .163$]. This means that internet usage does not have an effect on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media.

Table 163: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Shopping From Brand Followed on Social Media)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do shopping from brands I follow on social media	0-1 hour	14	2.1429	1.09945	.29384	1.5081	2.7777	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.2333	1.12546	.14530	1.9426	2.5241	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.5185	1.23991	.16873	2.1801	2.8569	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.7292	1.44015	.20787	2.3110	3.1473	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.4489	1.25934	.09493	2.2615	2.6362	1.00	5.00

Table 164: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Shopping From Brand Followed)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	Between Groups	8.132	3	2.711	1.730	.163
	Within Groups	269.408	172	1.566		
	Total	277.540	175			

3.9.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage and purchasing product found from comment, one way anova analysis was done and the result shows that there was a not significant effect for internet usage on purchasing product found from comment. At the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2.173) = .945$, $p = .420$]. This means that the internet usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from comment on social media.

Table 165: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service I purchase I found them from comment on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.8571	1.02711	.27451	1.2641	2.4502	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.4667	1.28177	.16548	2.1356	2.7978	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.4444	1.23879	.16858	2.1063	2.7826	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.4583	1.38316	.19964	2.0567	2.8600	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.4091	1.27961	.09645	2.2187	2.5995	1.00	5.00

Table 166: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service I purchase I found them from comment on social media	Between Groups	4.648	3	1.549	.945	.420
	Within Groups	281.898	172	1.639		
	Total	286.545	175			

3.9.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on purchasing product found from profile, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on purchasing product found from profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3.172) = 1.398$, $p = .245$]. This means that the internet usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from profile on social media.

Table 167: Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.5714	.51355	.13725	1.2749	1.8679	1.00	2.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.0833	1.10916	.14319	1.7968	2.3699	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.8889	.96479	.13129	1.6256	2.1522	1.00	4.00
	more than 5 hours	48	1.7708	1.05668	.15252	1.4640	2.0777	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.8977	1.02025	.07690	1.7459	2.0495	1.00	5.00

Table 168: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	Between Groups	4.335	3	1.445	1.398	.245
	Within Groups	177.824	172	1.034		
	Total	182.159	175			

3.9.14. Purchasing Product Found From Profile From Page

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on purchasing product found from page on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on purchasing product found from page on social media at the p (0.5 level for the five conditions $[F(2.173) = .108, p = .955]$. This means that the internet usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product from page on social media.

Table 169: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	0-1 hour	14	2.5000	1.28602	.34370	1.7575	3.2425	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.3500	1.13234	.14619	2.0575	2.6425	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.3519	1.18413	.16114	2.0286	2.6751	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.2917	1.32019	.19055	1.9083	2.6750	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.3466	1.20442	.09079	2.1674	2.5258	1.00	5.00

Table 170: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	Between Groups	.476	3	.159	.108	.955
	Within Groups	253.381	172	1.473		
	Total	253.858	175			

3.9.15. Purchasing Product Found From Friends' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on purchasing product found from friend's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on purchasing product found from friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = .610$, $p = .610$]. This means that the internet usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from friend's profile on social media.

Table 171: Descriptive Results For Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friend's profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.8571	1.02711	.27451	1.2641	2.4502	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	1.9000	.98635	.12734	1.6452	2.1548	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.9074	.99562	.13549	1.6357	2.1792	1.00	4.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.1458	1.30449	.18829	1.7671	2.5246	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.9659	1.08442	.08174	1.8046	2.1272	1.00	5.00

Table 172: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friend's profile on social media	Between Groups	2.165	3	.722	.610	.610
	Within Groups	203.630	172	1.184		
	Total	205.795	175			

3.9.16. Purchasing Product Found From Families' Profile on Social Media)

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on purchasing product found from family's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on purchasing product found from family's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.333$, $p = .265$]. This means that the internet usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from family's profile on social media.

Table 173: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service I purchase I found them from my family's profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.5714	.85163	.22761	1.0797	2.0631	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.0500	1.04840	.13535	1.7792	2.3208	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.7407	.85086	.11579	1.5085	1.9730	1.00	4.00
	more than 5 hours	48	1.9375	1.22746	.17717	1.5811	2.2939	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.8864	1.03573	.07807	1.7323	2.0404	1.00	5.00

Table 174: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service I purchase I found them from my family's profile on social media	Between Groups	4.266	3	1.422	1.333	.265
	Within Groups	183.461	172	1.067		
	Total	187.727	175			

3.9.17. Purchasing Product Found From University Friends' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of internet usage on purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for internet usage on purchasing product found from university friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 2.044$, $p = .110$]. This means that the internet usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media.

Table 175: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from University Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.4286	.64621	.17271	1.0555	1.8017	1.00	3.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.1667	1.06033	.13689	1.8928	2.4406	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.8889	1.14376	.15565	1.5767	2.2011	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	1.8542	1.14835	.16575	1.5207	2.1876	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.9375	1.09626	.08263	1.7744	2.1006	1.00	5.00

Table 176: One Way Anova Analysis by Internet Usage (Purchasing Product Found from University Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	Between Groups	7.238	3	2.413	2.044	.110
	Within Groups	203.074	172	1.181		
	Total	210.313	175			

3.10. Anova by Social Media Usage

3.10.1. Researching Product on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on research of product and service on social media. The result shows that there was a significant effect for social media usage on research of product on social media at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 3.034$, $p = .031$]. This means social media usage really does have an effect on research of product on social media.

Table 177: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Researching Product on Social Media)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do research about product and service on social media	0-1 hour	41	3.0732	1.10432	.17247	2.7246	3.4217	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	3.6184	1.14271	.13108	3.3573	3.8795	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	3.8438	1.16700	.20630	3.4230	4.2645	1.00	5.00
	more than 5hours	27	3.3704	1.41824	.27294	2.8093	3.9314	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	3.4943	1.20474	.09081	3.3151	3.6735	1.00	5.00

Table 178: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Researching Product on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do research about product and service on social media	Between Groups	12.765	3	4.255	3.034	.031
	Within Groups	241.230	172	1.402		
	Total	253.994	175			

3.10.2. Trust in Product on Social Media

A one way anova is used in this study to compare the effect of social media usage on trust in product. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on trust of product at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 2.612$, $p = .053$]. This means that the social media usage of really does not have an effect on trust in product on social media.

Table 179: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Social Media Usage (Trust In Product on Social Media)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service on social media are trusty	0-1 hour	41	2.5854	.92129	.14388	2.2946	2.8762	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.9474	.89286	.10242	2.7433	3.1514	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	3.0625	1.18967	.21031	2.6336	3.4914	1.00	5.00
	more than 5hours	27	3.2222	1.12090	.21572	2.7788	3.6656	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.9261	1.00865	.07603	2.7761	3.0762	1.00	5.00

Table 180: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Trust in Product on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service on social media are trusty	Between Groups	7.757	3	2.586	2.612	.053
	Within Groups	170.282	172	.990		
	Total	178.040	175			

3.10.3. For Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on social media advertisement and its impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on social media advertisement and its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 2.132$, $p = .098$]. This means that the social media usage really does not have an effect on impact of social media advertisement and its impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision.

Table 181: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Social Media Usage (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	0-1 hour	41	2.3415	1.13159	.17672	1.9843	2.6986	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.5526	1.06326	.12196	2.3097	2.7956	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.9688	1.37921	.24381	2.4715	3.4660	1.00	5.00
	more than 5hours	27	2.8519	1.29210	.24866	2.3407	3.3630	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.18864	.08960	2.4482	2.8018	1.00	5.00

Table 182: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Social Media Advertisement on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social media advertisement encourage me to purchase	Between Groups	8.865	3	2.955	2.132	.098
	Within Groups	238.385	172	1.386		
	Total	247.250	175			

3.10.4. Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on famous people and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on famous people's reference and their impact on purchase

decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(2.173) = 1.566$, $p = .199$]. This means that the social media usage of consumers really do not have an effect on famous people and their impact on purchase decision.

Table 183: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Famous people on social media impact my decision	0-1 hour	41	2.3902	1.24254	.19405	1.9981	2.7824	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.7105	1.24167	.14243	2.4268	2.9943	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.9375	1.38977	.24568	2.4364	3.4386	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	27	2.3704	1.30526	.25120	1.8540	2.8867	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.6250	1.28563	.09691	2.4337	2.8163	1.00	5.00

Table 184: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Famous People on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Famous people on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	7.691	3	2.564	1.566	.199
	Within Groups	281.559	172	1.637		
	Total	289.250	175			

3.10.5. Impact of Family on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on family and their impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision. The result shows that there was a significant effect for social media usage on family and their impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3.172) = .2.968$, $p = .033$]. This means that the social media usage of consumers really does have an effect on family and their impact on purchase decision.

Table 185: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My family on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	41	2.5122	1.24744	.19482	2.1185	2.9059	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	3.0658	1.17002	.13421	2.7984	3.3332	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	3.2813	1.34966	.23859	2.7946	3.7679	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	27	3.1852	1.24150	.23893	2.6941	3.6763	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.9943	1.25355	.09449	2.8078	3.1808	1.00	5.00

Table 186: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Family on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My family on social media impact my decision	Between Groups	13.537	3	4.512	2.968	.033
	Within Groups	261.458	172	1.520		
	Total	274.994	175			

3.10.6. Impact of Non-University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on non- university friends and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on influencers and their impact on consumers at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.298$, $p = .277$]. This means that the social media usage age of consumers really does not have an effect on non- university friends and their impact on purchase decision.

Table 187: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My non university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	41	2.2195	1.03712	.16197	1.8922	2.5469	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.5921	1.09761	.12590	2.3413	2.8429	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.6875	1.35450	.23944	2.1991	3.1759	1.00	5.00
	more than 5hours	27	2.5926	1.18514	.22808	2.1238	3.0614	1.00	4.00
	Total	176	2.5227	1.15117	.08677	2.3515	2.6940	1.00	5.00

Table 188: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Non- University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My non university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	5.136	3	1.712	1.298	.277
	Within Groups	226.773	172	1.318		
	Total	231.909	175			

3.10.7. Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on university friends and their impact on purchase decision. The result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on university friends and their impact on consumers at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.539$, $p = .206$]. This means that the social media usage of consumers really does not have an effect on university friends and their impact on purchase decision.

Table 189: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of University Friends and Their Impact on Purchase Decision)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	41	2.5610	1.14124	.17823	2.2008	2.9212	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.9342	1.11158	.12751	2.6802	3.1882	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.9375	1.31830	.23304	2.4622	3.4128	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	27	3.1481	1.26198	.24287	2.6489	3.6474	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.8807	1.18682	.08946	2.7041	3.0572	1.00	5.00

Table 190: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of University Friends on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	6.443	3	2.148	1.539	.206
	Within Groups	240.051	172	1.396		
	Total	246.494	175			

3.10.8. Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage and brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = 1.270$, $p = .286$]. This means that the social media usage brand's profile and its impact on purchase decision.

Table 191: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brand's profile on social media impact my purchase decision	0-1 hour	41	2.6829	1.17130	.18293	2.3132	3.0526	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.8158	1.16288	.13339	2.5501	3.0815	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.9688	1.28225	.22667	2.5065	3.4310	1.00	5.00
	more than 5hours	27	3.2222	1.12090	.21572	2.7788	3.6656	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.8750	1.18382	.08923	2.6989	3.0511	1.00	5.00

Table 192: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Profile on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brand's profile on social media impact my purchase decision	Between Groups	5.315	3	1.772	1.270	.286
	Within Groups	239.935	172	1.395		
	Total	245.250	175			

3.10.9. Impact of Brands Offer on Purchase Decision

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on brand's offer ant its impact on fashion consumer's purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage brand's offer ant its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = 2.320$, $p = .077$]. This means that the social media usage does not have an effect on brand's offer and its impact on purchase decision.

Table 193: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Brands offer impressing me	0-1 hour	41	2.4390	1.24597	.19459	2.0457	2.8323	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.6579	1.26019	.14455	2.3699	2.9459	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.7188	1.32554	.23432	2.2408	3.1967	1.00	5.00
	more than 5hours	27	3.2593	1.31829	.25371	2.7378	3.7808	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.7102	1.29222	.09740	2.5180	2.9025	1.00	5.00

Table 194: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Impact of Brand's Offer on Purchase Decision)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brands offer impressing me	Between Groups	11.365	3	3.788	2.320	.077
	Within Groups	280.857	172	1.633		
	Total	292.222	175			

3.10.10. Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on participation on brand's competition and its impact on purchase decision, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on brand's competition and its impact on purchase decision at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions $[F(2,173) = 738, p = .531]$. This means that the social media usage does not have an effect on brand's competition and its impact on purchase decision on social media.

Table 195: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I participate in brand's competition on social media	0-1 hour	41	1.9512	1.16084	.18129	1.5848	2.3176	1.00	5.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.2368	1.16469	.13360	1.9707	2.5030	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.2813	1.32554	.23432	1.8033	2.7592	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	27	2.3333	1.35873	.26149	1.7958	2.8708	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.1932	1.22225	.09213	2.0114	2.3750	1.00	5.00

Table 196: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Participation to Brand's Competition on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I participate in brand's competition on social media	Between Groups	3.324	3	1.108	.738	.531
	Within Groups	258.108	172	1.501		
	Total	261.432	175			

3.10.11. For Shopping From Followed Brands on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(2,173) = 2.491$, $p = .062$]. This means that the social media usage does not have an effect on shopping from brands followed by fashion consumer on social media.

Table 197: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	0-1 hour	41	2.0244	1.06037	.16560	1.6897	2.3591	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hours	76	2.4737	1.10120	.12632	2.2221	2.7253	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	32	2.6875	1.51205	.26729	2.1423	3.2327	1.00	5.00
	more than 5hours	27	2.7407	1.50876	.29036	2.1439	3.3376	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.4489	1.25934	.09493	2.2615	2.6362	1.00	5.00

Table 198: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Shopping From Brands Followed on Social Media)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I do shopping from brands i follow on social media	Between Groups	11.557	3	3.852	2.491	.062
	Within Groups	265.983	172	1.546		
	Total	277.540	175			

3.10.12. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media

A one way anova is used in this study to compare the effect of social media usage on purchasing product found from comment, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on purchasing product found from comment at the $p < .05$ level for the four conditions [$F(3,172) = .945$, $p = .420$]. This means that the social media usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from comment on social media.

Table 199: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.8571	1.02711	.27451	1.2641	2.4502	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.4667	1.28177	.16548	2.1356	2.7978	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.4444	1.23879	.16858	2.1063	2.7826	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.4583	1.38316	.19964	2.0567	2.8600	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.4091	1.27961	.09645	2.2187	2.5995	1.00	5.00

Table 200: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Comment)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	Between Groups	4.648	3	1.549	.945	.420
	Within Groups	281.898	172	1.639		
	Total	286.545	175			

3.10.13. Purchasing Product Found From Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on purchasing product found from profile, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on purchasing product found from profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 1.398$, $p = .245$]. This means that the social media usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product found from profile on social media.

Table 201: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.5714	.51355	.13725	1.2749	1.8679	1.00	2.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.0833	1.10916	.14319	1.7968	2.3699	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.8889	.96479	.13129	1.6256	2.1522	1.00	4.00
	more than 5 hours	48	1.7708	1.05668	.15252	1.4640	2.0777	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.8977	1.02025	.07690	1.7459	2.0495	1.00	5.00

Table 202: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media	Between Groups	4.335	3	1.445	1.398	.245
	Within Groups	177.824	172	1.034		
	Total	182.159	175			

3.10.14. Purchasing Product Found From Page on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on finding product from page on social media, one way anova analysis was done and the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on finding product from page. At the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions $[F(3,172) = .108, p = .955]$. This means that the social media usage really does not have an effect on finding product from page on social media.

Table 203: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis By Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	0-1 hour	14	2.5000	1.28602	.34370	1.7575	3.2425	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.3500	1.13234	.14619	2.0575	2.6425	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	2.3519	1.18413	.16114	2.0286	2.6751	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.2917	1.32019	.19055	1.9083	2.6750	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	2.3466	1.20442	.09079	2.1674	2.5258	1.00	5.00

Table 204: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From Page)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media	Between Groups	.476	3	.159	.108	.955
	Within Groups	253.381	172	1.473		
	Total	253.858	175			

3.10.15. Purchasing Product Found From Comment Friends' Profile on Social Media)

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on purchasing product found from friend's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on purchasing product found from friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3.172) = .610$, $p = .610$]. This means that the age really does not have an effect on purchasing product from friend's profile on social media.

Table 205: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friend's profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.8571	1.02711	.27451	1.2641	2.4502	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	1.9000	.98635	.12734	1.6452	2.1548	1.00	4.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.9074	.99562	.13549	1.6357	2.1792	1.00	4.00
	more than 5 hours	48	2.1458	1.30449	.18829	1.7671	2.5246	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.9659	1.08442	.08174	1.8046	2.1272	1.00	5.00

Table 206: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from my friend's pprofile on social media	Between Groups	2.165	3	.722	.610	.610
	Within Groups	203.630	172	1.184		
	Total	205.795	175			

3.10.16. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media Family's Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on purchasing product from family's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on purchasing product from family's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3.172) = 1.333$, $p = .265$]. This means that the

social media usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product from family's profile on social media.

Table 207: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my family's profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.5714	.85163	.22761	1.0797	2.0631	1.00	4.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.0500	1.04840	.13535	1.7792	2.3208	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.7407	.85086	.11579	1.5085	1.9730	1.00	4.00
	more than 5 hours	48	1.9375	1.22746	.17717	1.5811	2.2939	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.8864	1.03573	.07807	1.7323	2.0404	1.00	5.00

Table 208: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from Family's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from family's profile on social media	Between Groups	4.266	3	1.422	1.333	.265
	Within Groups	183.461	172	1.067		
	Total	187.727	175			

3.10.17. Purchasing Product Found From Comment on Social Media University Friends' Profile on Social Media

A one way anova is used to compare the effect of social media usage on purchasing product found from university friend's profile on social media, the result shows that there was not a significant effect for social media usage on purchasing product from university friend's profile at the $p < .05$ level for the five conditions [$F(3,172) = 2.044$, $p = .110$]. This means that the social media usage really does not have an effect on purchasing product from university friend's profile on social media.

Table 209: Descriptive Results for Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found from My University Friend's Profile)

Descriptives									
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	0-1 hour	14	1.4286	.64621	.17271	1.0555	1.8017	1.00	3.00
	2-3 hour	60	2.1667	1.06033	.13689	1.8928	2.4406	1.00	5.00
	4-5 hours	54	1.8889	1.14376	.15565	1.5767	2.2011	1.00	5.00
	more than 5 hours	48	1.8542	1.14835	.16575	1.5207	2.1876	1.00	5.00
	Total	176	1.9375	1.09626	.08263	1.7744	2.1006	1.00	5.00

Table 210: One Way Anova Analysis by Social Media Usage (Purchasing Product Found From My University Friend's Profile)

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friend's profile on social media	Between Groups	7.238	3	2.413	2.044	.110
	Within Groups	203.074	172	1.181		
	Total	210.313	175			

DISCUSSIONS

This study investigates the impact of social media on consumer's behavior in the pre and post purchase process. The findings indicate a significant difference between men and women buying behavior in the pre purchase according to gender in part of variables which means men are affected more than women and rejected in part of variables which means both men and women are affected by the same degree. Contrary, in the post purchase, the study found that there is no significant difference at all between men and women buying behavior according to gender which means both men and women are affected by the same degree of influence which is against the findings of Ýr Hallgrímsdóttir (2018). On the other hand, The study found that the demographic characteristics of age, level of study, internet usage and social media usage have no effect on fashion consumer buying behavior in the pre purchase decision except for trust in product, impact of social media advertisement and famous people for demographic characteristics of age and level of study, family's impact for internet usage and research of product and family's impact for social media usage which is in line with the some findings of (Íslek, 2012) whom found that the demographic characteristics of age, level of study have no effect on fashion consumer buying behavior in the pre purchase decision . Also, the study found that all the demographic characteristics of age, level of study, internet usage and social media usage don't have an effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the post purchase process which are against of findings of (Íslek,2012) . To determine the research findings and hypotheses and to know the relationship between social media effect and consumer buying behavior according to demographic characteristics analyzed in the study it is necessary to answer to research questions.

Research question 1: Do fashion consumers search product on social media?

Answer: Yes, 62% of participants are agreed that they do research about products and services on social media, 31.8 % disagreed and 16.5% stayed neutral

Research question 2: Are products on social media trusty?

Answer: Around 39.2% disagreed that products on social media are trusty, 28.9 % of participants agreed and 31.8% are neutral.

Research question 3: Is social media advertisement has an effect on purchase decision?

Answer: Most of participants 46% disagreed that social media advertisement has effect on purchase decision, 27.3% of participants are neutral while 26% of participants agreed that social media advertisement has effect on purchase decision.

Research question 4: Do influencers have an impact on purchase decision?

- Famous people

Answer: Most of participants (49.4%) said that famous people on social media are not influencing their purchase decision, 31.9% said they do and 18.8% stayed neutral.

- Family

Answer: Yes, 43.8% of participants said that their families on social media influence their purchase decision, 34.1% disagreed and 22.2% stayed neutral.

- Non- university friends

Answer: Most of participants (48.9%) disagreed that their non-university friends on social media impact their purchase decision, 21.6% stayed neutral and 23.9 % agreed.

- University friends

Answer: Most of participants (38.1%) disagreed that their university friends on social media impact their decision of buy, 36.9% agreed while 25% stayed neutral.

Research question 5: Does brand on social media has an impact on consumer's purchase decision?

- Brand's profile

Answer: Yes, 38.1% agreed that brand's profile on social media impact their purchase decision, 36.4% disagreed, and 25.6% stayed neutral

- Brand's offer

Answer: Yes, most of participants said that brand's offer on social media impacts their purchase decision (38.1%), 36.4% disagreed, and 25.6% stayed neutral.

Research question 6: Do fashion consumers participate to brand's competition on social media?

Answer: Most of participants (64.2%) don't participate to brand's competition on social media. 18.1% agreed that they participate to brand's competition on social media while 17.6 stayed neutral

Research question 7: Do fashion consumers shop from brand's followed on social media

Answer: More than half of participants (54.5%) disagreed about doing shopping from brands they follow on social media, 22.7 stayed neutral while 18.8% agreed.

Research question 8: Do participants purchase product found from comment on social media?

Answer: More than half of participants (58.5%) don't purchase product found from comment on social media, 28.4% do and 3.1% are neutral.

Research question 9: Do participants purchase product found from profile on social media?

Answer: seventy five percent of participants disagreed that they purchase products found from profile on social media, 14.8 % are neutral and only 10.2% agreed that they do purchase product found from profile on social media.

Research question 10: Do participants purchase product found from page on social media?

Answer: More than half of participants in this study (57.4%) disagreed that they purchase products found from page on social media, 22.1 % agreed while 20.5 % are neutral.

Research question 11: Do participants purchase product found from friend's profile on social media?

Answer: Around seventy percent (69.9%) of participants disagreed that they purchase products found from their friend's profile on social media, 19.3% are neutral and only 10.8 of participants agreed.

Research question 12: Do participants purchase product found from family's profile on social media?

Answer: Around eighty percent (73.8%) disagreed that products they purchase they do find them from family's profile on social media, 17.6% are neutral and only 8.5% of participants agreed.

Research question 13: Do participants purchase product found from university friend's profile on social media?

Answer: Around seventy two percent (72.2%) of participants disagreed that they purchase products they found from their friend's profile on social media, 17% are neutral and only 10.8% of participants agreed

Based on research questions, the following hypotheses are developed and regarding t test and anova analysis, hypotheses are accepted or rejected.

H1: There is significant difference between men and women buying behavior in the pre purchase decision on social media.

According to t test results, H1 is accepted in variables (researching product on social media, social media advertisement, famous people, family, non-university friends, university friends, , brand's profile, brand's offer, shopping from brand followed by fashion consumers and rejected in (trustiness, brand's offer and participation to brand's competition)

H2: There is significant difference between men and women buying behavior in the post purchase decision on social media.

According to t test results, H2 is rejected in all variables (purchasing product found from comment, profile, page, friend's profile, and family's profile and university friend's profile).

H3: Age has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

According to the results, H3 is rejected in variables (searching product on social media, family, non university and university friends impact, brand's profile impact , brand's offer impact, participation to brand's competition, shopping from brand's followed on

social media) and accepted in trust in product, social media advertisement, and famous people's impact on purchase decision

H4: Age has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the post purchase decision.

According to t test results, H4 is rejected in all variables (purchasing product found from comment, profile, page, friend's page, and family's profile and university friend's profile).

H5: Level of study has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

According to the results, H4 is rejected in variables (searching product on social media, family's impact, non university and university friend's impact, brand's profile impact , brand's offer impact, participation to brand's competition, shopping from brand's followed on social media) and accepted in trust in product, Social media advertisement, and Famous people's impact on purchase decision.

H6: Level of study has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

According to t test results, H6 is rejected in all variables (purchasing product found from comment, profile, page, friend's profile, and family's profile and university friend's profile).

H7: Internet Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

According to the results, H7 is rejected in variables (researching product on social media, trust, social media advertisement, famous people's impact, non university and university friends, brand's profile, brand's offer impact , participation to brand's competition, shopping from brand's followed on social media) and accepted only in family's impact on purchase decision.

H8: Internet Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the post purchase decision.

According to t test results, H8 is rejected in all variables (purchasing product found from comment, profile, page, friend's profile, family's profile and university friend's profile).

H9: Social Media Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the pre purchase decision.

According to the results, H9 is rejected in variables (famous people's reference, uon university and university friends, brand's profile, brand's offer, participation to brand's competition, shopping from brand's followed on social media) and accepted only in (searching product on social media, family's impact).

H10: Social Media Usage has effect on fashion consumer's buying behavior in the post purchase decision

According to the results, H8 is rejected in variables (purchasing product found from comment, brand's profile, page, friend's profile, family's profile and university friend's profile).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Social media is playing an important role in fashion business and facilitating the interconnectivity between fashion consumers. It permits to fashion consumers to search products, read others' reviews and opinions before making any purchase. Also, fashion consumers on social media are able to communicate with brands via comment or direct message for any recommendation and suggestion. The research has shown a big impact of social media on Sakarya University students buying behavior in the pre and post purchase process. The study has prove that Sakarya University students those are fashion consumers are actively using social media as tool to search products and get information. It indicates that brands and influencers have an influence on Sakarya University students' purchase decision. Contrary, the study indicates that it is not necessary for consumers to purchase products found from brands and influencers' accounts they do follow on social media. Based on these conclusions, it should be agree that researching product on social media, trustiness of product, brands and influencers' advertisement and activities on social media affect consumers' purchase decision but does not fully indicate the fashion consumer purchasing. However, according to results, there is some significant difference found between men and women purchasing behavior in the pre purchase decision and no difference in the post purchase decision. Also, the demographic characterisitcs of age, level of study, internet usage and social media usage has no effect on fashion consumer purchasing in the pre purchasing process exept in part of variables and no effect was found in the post purchasing process. From this case, it will be necessaire for fashion business marketers and influencers to focus on both gender men and women in their online business since both are affected in part of variables cited in the study. To conclude, since Turkey is ranked as one of the most countries which consumers are using social media for shopping online, it will be important for researchers to investigate on fashion consumers' evaluation and views regarding brands' advertisements, promotions and campaigns which can develop the performace and quality of fashion business and online marketing.

Recommendations for the Future Study

Even that the study cover many theories regarding consumer behavior, it may not be applicable in other areas or countries because of some characteristic differences like income, culture, economy and access to internet. If future research could be conducted,

- It is necessary for the survey to contain depth questions such as fashion consumer income and degree of satisfaction.
- It is important for future studies to choose one of the fashion brands as case of study.
- Since there are a lot of social networks those have an impact on fashion consumer behaviors, it is necessary in the future study to choose one of those platforms to be case of study.
- Today, Instagram and Pinterest are considered ones of the most successful platforms used for marketing. In the future study, it would be necessary to do an analysis on fashion consumers' views and evaluation on Instagram and Pinterest.
- In the end, researchers can use the results obtained from the study and collaborate with fashion brands for a new study related with fashion consumers so that both can help to best understanding of consumer buying behavior.

REFERENCES

- Abu Hashesh, M.Y. (2014). "Integration of Social Media in Businesses". *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(8), 202- 209.
- Ahmad, N. Salman, A & Ashiq, R. (2015). "The Impact of Social Media on Fashion Industry: Empirical' Investigation from Karachites".. *Journal of Ressources Development and Management*, 7, 1-7
- Akram, W & Kumar, R. (2017). "A study of Positive Effects of Social Media on Society". *International Journal of Computer Sciences and Engineering*, 5 (10), 347- 354
- Al MAshhadani, T.T. (2019). "The Impact of Trust on Social Media's Influencers and the Effect of Influencers Discount Codes on the Consumer Purchase Involvement". Master's Thesis. KAdir Has University. Istanbul
- Ananda, A.Hernandez-Garcia , A & Lamberti, L. (2015). "Fashion in Actions on Social Media – Spanish SME Fashion Brands Case Studies". 2nd European Conference on Social Media (ECSM) 2015. Porto. Portugal.
- Baltes, L.P. (2016). "The Impact of Digitalization on business Communication". *SEA.Practical Application of Science*. IV 2(11), 319- 325
- Cakir, F. (2013). "The Effect of The Social Media on Young Consumers' Consumption Expenditure".. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*. 5(2), 86-96
- Camela de Cunha, G.J & Do Monte, S. (2014). *Brazilian Journal of Marketing, Opinion, and Media Research* (ISSN 2317-0123 Online), São Paulo, Brasil, 16, 28-44,
- Chopra. C & Gupta, S. (2020). "Impact of social media on consumer behavior". *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*. 8(6), 2320-2882
- Dehghani, M. (2013). "The Role of Social Media on Advertising: A Research on Effectiveness of Facebook Advertising on Enhancing Brand Image" Master Thesis. Eastern Mediteranian Universty. Gazimagusa, North Cyprus 2013.
- E. Michaela & S. Orna. (2015). "Fashion Conscious Consumers, Fast Fashion and the Impact of Social Media on Purchase Intension" *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy*. 4(3), 173-178
- Ertemel, A & Ammoura, A. (2016). "The Role of Social Media Advertising in Consumer Buying Behavior". *International Journal of Commerce and Finance*. 2(1), 81-89.
- Farhud, A. (2016). "Social media, its positive and negative Implications on society". *University Saints Malaysia. Journal of Anthropology and Sociology*. 5(2), 71-75

- Gluckman, M. (2017). "The Rise of Social Media Influencer Marketing on Lifestyle Branding: A Case Study of Lucie Fink". *Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communication*. 8(1), 77-87
- Gros, C.H. (2012). "The influence of Social Media on consumers during their purchase decision-making" Master Thesis. September 2012. Dublin Business School.
- Gul, M. Shahzad, H & Khan, M. (2014). "The relationship of social media with fashion consciousness and consumer buying behavior" *Journal of Management Info*, 1(2), 12-20.
- Hajli, M.N. (2014). "A Study of the Impact of Social media on consumers". *International Journal of Market Research*, 56(3), 387-404
- Islek, M. S. (2012). *Sosyal Medyanın Tüketici Davranışlarına Etkileri: Türkiye'deki Sosyal Medya Kullanıcıları Üzerine Bir Arastırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Karaman MehmetBey University. Karaman
- Kavoura, N. (2014). "Social Media, Online Imagined Communities and Communication Research". *Emerald Group Publishing*, 63. (6/7), 490-504
- Khan, S. (2018). "Instagram as a Marketing Tool for Luxury Brands" *International Journal of Management*, 8 (2), 120-126.
- Khatib, F. (2016). "The impact of Social Media Characteristics on Purchase Decision Empirical Study of Saudi Customers in Aseer Region". *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 7(4), 41-50
- Kim, K. (2015). "T test as a parametric statistic" *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*. 68(6), 540-546.
- Kyriakopoulou, E. & Kitsios, F. (2017). "The Influence of Social Media on Consumer's Behavior". *International Symposium and 28th National Conference on Operational Research*. Greece.
- Labib, E. Nasruddin, E. & Ali, N.N.K. (2018). "The Impact of Social Media on SME's Customer Equity: A Conceptual Model". *International Business Management*, 12 (1), 32-45.
- Lipsman, A. Graham, M. Mike, R. Sean, B. (2014). "The Power of "Like" How Brands Reach (and Influence) Fans Through Social- Media Marketing". *Journal of Advertising Research*, 52 (1), 40-52
- Maiti, S.I. & Saikia, K. (2019). "P<0.05 is not Enough" *Advances in Zoology and Botany*. 7(2), 24-27.
- Manyan, S. Swamalatha, M & ² Padma, A. (2018). "Impact of Social Media on Current Fashion Trends Among Youth". *International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR)* 8(3). 127-134

- McCarthy, S. (2013). "The Effects of Social Media on Fashion Consumption". Thesis. University of Mississippi. Oxford
- McFarland, M. (2016). "Social Media and Fashion Brands". Master of Professional communication. Southern Utah University
- Mohr, I. (2013). "The Impact of social media on fashion Industry". Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 15(2), 17- 22.
- Mroz-Gorgon, B. (2014). "Marketing Aspects of Using Social Media by Fashion Brands in Poland". Human Capital without Borders: Knowledge and Learning for Quality of Life; Proceedings of the Management, Knowledge and Learning International Conference 2014. Toknowpress.
- Ohajionu, U.C & Mathews, S. (2015). "Advertising on Social Media and Benefits to Brands". Journal of social science and humanities, 10(2), 335-351
- Rathnayaka, U. (2018). "Role of Digital Marketing in Retail Fashion Industry: A Synthesis of the Theory and the Practice". Journal of Accounting and Marketing, 7(2), 2-7.
- Sakas, D. Dunitrius, N.K. & Kavoura, A. (2015). "The Development of Facebook's Competitive Advantage for Brand Awareness". Procedia Economics and Finance Elsevier, 24. 589-597
- Sawyer, S. (2009). "Analysis of Variance: The Fundamental Concepts". The Journal of manual and manipulative therapy. 17(2), 27E-38E
- Sellesberg, A-M. & Patrik, A. (2015). "Fashion, Sociology of" International Encyclopedia of the Social Behavioral Sciences Elsevier, 8, 835- 839.
- Siddiqui, S & Singh, T. (2014). "Social Media its Impact with Positive and Negative Aspects" International Journal of Computer Applications Technology and Research, 5(2), 71 – 75.
- Stankevich, A. (2017). "Explaining the Consumer Decision- Making Process: Critical Literature Review". Journal of International Business Research and Marketing. 2 (6), 7- 14.
- Suelin, C. (2010). "Understanding Consumer Purchase Buying Behavior in the Japanese Personal Grooming Sector" Journal of Yasar Universit. 17(5) 2821-2831
- Terkan., R (2014). "Importance of Creative Advertising and Marketing According to University Students' Perspective". International Review of Management and Marketing. Ecojournals, 4(3), 239-246.
- Tiago, T. & Verisimo, J.M. C. (2013). Marketing and Social Media: Benefits, and Ways Forward". International Network of Business and Management Journals (INBM).

Voramontri, D & Klieb, L. (2018). “Impact of Social Media on Consumer Behavior”.
International Journal of Information and Decision Sciences. 5(10), 1- 25

Yasmin, M.N. Farooq, M & Zreen, A. (2018). “Role of Social media in Success of
Fashion Products: A Malaysian Consumers Perspective”. International Journal
of Humanities and Social Sciences Invention, 7(7). 16-21



ATTACHMENTS

ANNEX 1: Questionnaire

*This questionnaire is about fashion consumption

Gender: Male ()

Female ()

Education Level: Undergraduate () Master Student () Doctoral student ()

Age: 18-25 () 26-30 () 31-35 ()

How many hours a day do you spend on the internet

() 0-1 hour () 2-3 hours () 4-5 hours () More than 5hours

How many hours a day do you spend on social media

() 0-1 hour () 2-3 hours () 4-5 hours () More than 5hours

How often do you use those social networks?

	1	2	3	4	5
Social networks (Facebook, My Space)					
Forum and dictionaries(forumnews, sourness)					
Wikis (Wikipedia)					
Blog (Webrazzi)					
Microblogs (Twitter)					
Social media sharings (Youtube, Instagram Flickr)					
Social networks (Pinterest)					
Daily opportunity networks (Groupon)					
Advice and evaluate social networks (IMDB, Tripadvisor)					

1- Never 2- Rarely 3- Sometimes 4- Most of time 5- Ever time

Question about consumer behavior on social media in the pre-purchase process

1	I do research about product on social media	Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally agree
2	The product and service on social media are trusty					
3	Social media advertisement about product encourage me to purchase					
4	Famous people on social media impact my purchase decision					
5	My Family on social media impact my purchase decision					
6	My non- university friends on social media impact my purchase decision					
7	My university friends on social media impact my purchase decision					
8	Brands' profile on social media impact my purchase decision					
9	Brands' offer impressing me					
10	I participate in brands' competition on social media					
11	I do shopping from brands i follow on social media					

How degree social media affect your purchasing decision?

	1	2	3	4
Social networks (Facebook, My Space)				
Forum and dictionaries(forumnews, sourness)				
Wikis (Wikipedia)				
Blog (Webrazzi)				
Microblogs (Twitter)				
Social media sharings (Youtube, Instagram Flickr)				
Social networks (Pinterest)				
Daily opportunity networks (Groupon)				
Advice and evaluate social networks (IMDB, Tripadvisor)				

1- Never 2- Rarely 3- Sometimes 4- Most of time 5- Ever time

Question about consumer behavior on social media in the post-purchase process

1	The product and service i purchase i found them from comment on social media	Totally disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Totally agree
2	The product and service i purchase i found them from profile on social media					
3	The product and service i purchase i found them from page on social media					
4	The product and service i purchase i found them from my friends' profile					
5	The product and service i purchase i found them from my family's profile					
6	The product and service i purchase i found them from my university friends' profile					

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name and Surname: Chamssoudine Bahari Tamoude	
Education Information	
Bachelor	
University	Kuwait University
College	Media and Communication
Major	Media and Communication
Master Degree	
University	Sakarya University
Name of Institute	Social Sciences
Branch	Media and Communication
Program	Public Relations and Advertising
Article	
1. Title ‘‘The Impact of Social Media on Sakarya University Students: Instagram as a Case Study’’ 2. Publication ‘‘ Akademik Sosyal Arařtırmalar Dergisi, Yıl: 8, Sayı: 103, Nisan 2020, s. 260-273 ISSN: 2148-2489 Doi Number: http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/ASOS.41889’’	