

# Comparative Analysis of Perceived Factors in buying Cellphone for On-line Class by College Freshmen in Public and Private Universities in Malolos City, Bulacan

Arch. Dennis L. Estacio\*, Vim Kiester C. Rivera\*\*

\*(College of Architecture and Fine Arts, Bulacan State University, Malolos City, Bulacan  
Email: [dennis.estacio@bulsu.edu.ph](mailto:dennis.estacio@bulsu.edu.ph))

\*\* (College of Architecture and Fine Arts, Bulacan State University, Malolos City, Bulacan  
Email: [vimkiester.rivera@bulsu.edu.ph](mailto:vimkiester.rivera@bulsu.edu.ph))

\*\*\*\*\*

## Abstract:

In this time of pandemic, gadget to be used for online class have become part and parcel of student’s life. The study aimed to compare the perception of two groups of respondents, the freshmen from public and private universities towards factors influencing purchasing intention on buying cellphone they used in an online class in terms of: brand name, product price, social influence, and product features. In the conduct of this study, the researchers utilized descriptive comparative design. To meet the objective, a survey was done through administration of structured survey questionnaires consisting of 4-point Likert scale.

To analyze the data gathered, weighted mean and one way ANOVA were used as statistical tools. The findings revealed that factors influencing purchase intention on buying gadget are influential based on the overall weighted mean of 2.84 for public and 3.12 for private. Comparing the weighted mean of each factor for respondents from public and private universities, product features shows that it is influential with 3.16 weighted mean for public and 3.35 weighted mean for private. On the other hand, social influence with 2.49 weighted mean and 2.81 weighted mean, found to be the least influential. There is a significant difference between the perception of freshmen from public and private on the factors influencing purchase intention on buying gadgets. The findings imply for businesses to produce or innovate cellphones with a lot of good product features suitable in an online class.

*Keywords* —brand name, product price, social influence, product features

\*\*\*\*\*

## I. INTRODUCTION

A mobile communication system as one of the prominent gadgets nowadays is basically designed to communicate conventional voice between two people, send text messages and perform basic functions, but cell phones have undergone various changes, its functionalities exponentially over time as a result of evolving cellphone subscribers' needs (Kushchu, 2011). As technology has great impact on life in the world, online group buying is growing rapidly and became popular in many countries.

That’s why some producers are thinking if factors affecting consumers purchase intention have changed as their way of purchasing did (Liew, 2019).

Mobile phones nowadays have become part and parcel of human’s life (Smura, 2009). This is the device that allows people to express thoughts and opinions, to do their work, help others in their way of life and share joys and hurts with others. Mobile phones are now considered as part of one’s personal communication context (Karjaluo, 2005).

There is a positive response to mobile phone adoption (Coelho, 2013). It contributes to the development of a mobile application economy (MacMillan, Burrows, & Ante, 2009), which is now the focus of various studies. In business perspective and people's preference using smartphones create opportunities for a vibrant economy.

In the absence of face-to-face transactions on shopping websites, potential buyers rely only with provided information on the website. If they are not contented with the details provided by the seller, buyers may choose to turn to traditional channels. Moreover, there are different characteristics of products being sold online. Hence, the factors that can influence one's intention to buy smartphones could therefore differ from those of other products (Walia, 2015). In other words, when the process of possible purchase is performed in an online shopping environment, it is still uncertain which factors are influencing the purchase intention on buying mobile phone of buyers.

In buying gadgets particularly mobile phones, the degree of social influence varies on its effect on purchase intention of different products (Bearden and Etzel, 1982). According to the research study, in the purchasing process for mobile phone of generation Y, social influence took place that might come from peers and society which is one factor influences purchase intention in buying mobile phone (Farzana, 2012). On the other hand, the product feature is an attribute of a product to meet the satisfaction level of consumers' needs and wants (Kotler, 2007). Therefore, a feature of mobile phone will influence the young female consumers' choice towards mobile phone brands. According to Dziwornu Das (2012), the factors that influence consumers purchase decision of mobile phone, special feature and design is one of the main elements that cause the results.

The consumers have different tastes and preferences to consume. The buyer's behavior to buy depends on features such as brand name, cost, value, knowledge of recreation and creativity,

combined with other choices as well as impulsiveness (Leo, 2005). It is therefore important to examine factors that lead to the intention of the user to buy a smartphone. Based on the result of one of the research studies, the most influential factor are product quality and brand name, whilst, packaging and price has no significant effect for buyer purchase intention (Vahidreza, 2015). On the other hand, the research study by Owusu Alfred (2013) revealed that consumers were influenced by the price and quality of the product and that both price and quality are being considered by consumers, while, brand name and social influence are not.

The purpose of this study was to describe and compare the perception of the freshmen students from public and private universities in the City of Malolos, Bulacan towards factors influencing purchase intention on buying cellphones. This study has possible contributions to the consumers, business owners, and future researchers. Based on the findings, the consumers can use this as a reference while purchasing gadgets; the business owners can use this as a guide to what mobile phones they will sell in their shops according to what factors customer prioritize; and the future researchers can utilize this study as a reference.

## **II. METHODOLOGY**

This study utilized descriptive-comparative design. According to Richardson (2018), comparative research studies can be used when comparing two groups, analysing the similarities and difference between them to have a better understanding of the respondents. Furthermore, Azarian (2011) said that comparative analysis emphasized on the "explanation of differences, and the explanation of similarities." Moreover, Pickvance (2005) stated that comparative analysis is conducted mainly to explain and gain a better understanding of the causal processes involved in the creation of relationship usually by bringing together variations in the explanatory variables. In relation to the study, the researchers described and

compared the perception of the respondents from public and private on factors that influence the purchase intention on buying gadget specifically cellphones.

### **Respondents and Sampling Method**

The respondents were representative from the total population State University and known Private University Malolos. The researchers utilized the Calmorin's formula in order to describe based on the actual sample size of student respondents from given population of students, setting 1% margin of error. In order to select the participants for this study, the researchers used simple random sampling. As defined by Adi Bhat (2019), simple random sampling is a sampling technique where every item in the population has an even chance and likelihood of being selected in the sample. Using this technique, the researchers can remove bias from the selection procedure and should result in representative samples of 66 students from public and 76 students from private in which students had an equal in being chosen as part of the sample.

### **Instruments**

The researchers prepared a questionnaire consisting of 4-point Likert Scale in order to measure the factors influencing purchased intention on buying mobile phones among freshmen students of public and private universities in the City of Malolos, Bulacan. The questionnaire is composed of 20 items on the following criteria: brand name, product price, social influence, and product feature. The instrument was validated by 5 experts in the different fields. Upon the validators' checking, the resulting content validity index is 1 which means that the instrument is valid for usage. Among the dozens of variations possible on themes of Likert Scale, the researchers utilized the agreement stated highly influential to not influential at all.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

The researchers requested for the approval of the respondents public and private universities to be able to gather data from State University and Private University in Malolos. They were respectively selected because participants from these universities can establish a significant factor to the result of the study. To assure the confidentiality and understanding of the respondents, the researchers asked them to sign a letter of consent prior to the administration of the questionnaires. For the respondents who are below 18 years old were also asked to have their consent forms signed by their parents. After the approval and signing of consent forms, the researchers collected the data through distributing survey questionnaires to the selected respondents. Short information regarding the topic was included in the questionnaires and as well as the purpose was explained to ensure the validity of the data collected. Lastly, data collected was tallied as for the prescribed procedure and the result obtained was basis for data analysis and interpretation.

### **Data Analysis**

In order to present and analyze the data collected in this study, below was the statistical tool utilized:

- a. Table. To present the informative summary on the weighted mean of the perceived factors influencing consumer purchasing intention of mobile phones based on the perception of the respondents from public and private universities in Malolos.
- b. Weighted Mean. To describe the perceived factors influencing purchasing intention of mobile phones based on the perception of respondents.

Interval	Description
1.00-1.49	Not Influential at All
1.50- 2.49	Somewhat Influential
2.50- 3.49	Influential
3.50- 4.00	Highly Influential

Furthermore, weighted mean was interpreted using the interval below:

c. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). To compare the perception of respondents on the factors influencing purchase intention of cellphones.

Table 1. Interval for Data Interpretation

### III. Results Analysis and Discussion

Table 2. Perception of Freshmen from Public and Private Universities on the Factors

#### Influencing Purchase Intention of Mobile Phones

Statement	State University		Private University	
	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
<b>A. Brand Name</b>				
1. Leading brand	2.78	Influential	3.29	Influential
2. Brand image	2.79	Influential	3.17	Influential
3. Brand awareness	2.93	Influential	3.21	Influential
4. Creative brand name	2.73	Influential	2.95	Influential
5. Loyalty brand	2.75	Influential	2.99	Influential
<b>Weighted Mean on Brand Name</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>Influential</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>Influential</b>
<b>B. Product Price</b>				
1. Reasonable price in terms of quality	2.93	Influential	3.31	Influential
2. Comparison of prices of different cellphones	2.69	Influential	3.04	Influential
3. Maximized budget when purchasing cellphones	2.91	Influential	3	Influential
4. Student-friendly	3.05	Influential	3.22	Influential
5. Affordability of mobile phones through discounts and sales	2.89	Influential	3.32	Influential
<b>Weighted Mean on Product Price</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>Influential</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>Influential</b>
<b>C. Social Influence</b>				
1. Consider others' opinion	2.58	Influential	2.95	Influential
2. Brand used by family members	2.52	Influential	2.83	Influential

3. Advertisement found in mails	2.25	Somewhat Influential	2.64	Influential
4. Brand of your friends' choice to find belongingness	2.47	Somewhat Influential	2.67	Influential
5. Brands review from social media influencer	2.65	Influential	2.94	Influential
<b>Weighted Mean on Social Influence</b>	<b>2.49</b>	<b>Somewhat Influential</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>Influential</b>
<b>D. Product Feature</b>				
1. Data coverage if it is 2G, 3G, 4G, and 5G	3.05	Influential	3.37	Influential
2. Video playing capabilities	3.14	Influential	3.28	Influential
3. Game facilities	3.12	Influential	3.28	Influential
4. Camera and photo management	3.15	Influential	3.36	Influential
5. Responsiveness of the phone (RAM)	3.32	Influential	3.45	Influential
<b>Weighted Mean on Product Feature</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>Influential</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>Influential</b>
<b>Overall Weighted Mean</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>Influential</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>Influential</b>

Based on the results, it is clearly stated that the brand name, product price, social influence and product feature are influential in purchase intention as perceived by the student from public with an overall mean of 2.84. Furthermore, among the four criteria, product feature was found to be the most influential in purchasing cellphones with the weighted mean of 3.16. Moreover, among all indicators, responsiveness of the phone (RAM) was found to be the most influential with a weighted mean of 3.32. This implies that responsiveness of the cellphone is a one of factors that the consumer considered most in purchasing cellphones. On the other hand, advertisement found in mails was found to be least influential on the third criterion having the weighted mean of 2.25.

Brand names are considered to be an influential in purchasing intention of cellphones, particularly with the brand awareness was proven to be influential in the respondents of public with a mean 2.93. Subsequently, the study conducted found out that creative brand names are considered to be

influential by the respondents with the lowest calculated mean of 2.73 on the said criterion. For the result of the second criterion, the students from public considered product price as an influential with a weighted mean of 2.89. This means that product price is an influential factor in purchasing mobile phones. According to the results, student-friendly is the influential indicator in the said criterion with the weighted mean of 3.05. This suggests that consumer is looking for a student friendly price in purchasing mobile phones which eventually make them influenced about the product. On the other hand, although found to be influential, comparison of prices of different mobile phones had the lowest weighted mean of 2.69.

Respondents from public agreed that social influence is an influential factor in buying cellphones with a calculated weighted mean of 2.49. Among the five indicators of the criteria, brands review from social media influencer has the highest weighted mean for the respondents from the public school, being found to be influential with 2.65. The data gathered also revealed that respondents from public school found advertisement found in mails to be somewhat influential regarding their intention to purchase cellphones and considered to be the least with an average of 2.25.

Based on the weighted mean of 3.16 for the fourth criterion, product feature was found to be influential in consumers. Among the statements, the respondents from public agreed that the responsiveness of the phone (RAM) was the most influential regarding their plan on buying mobile phones with the highest weighted mean of 3.32. Respondents from public had the response towards data coverage to be influential although being the least with a weighted mean of 3.05.

The results also stated that brand name, product price, social influence and product feature are influential in purchase intention as perceived by the student from private school with an overall mean of 3.12. Furthermore, among the four criteria, product feature was found to be the most influential in purchasing mobile phones with the weighted mean

of and 3.35. Moreover, among all indicators, responsiveness of the phone (RAM) was found to be the most influential with a weighted mean of 3.45 for the respondents in private university. This implies that responsiveness of the phone is a factor that the consumer considered most in purchasing mobile phones. On the other hand, advertisement found in mails was found to be least influential on the third criterion having the weighted mean of 2.64.

Brand names are considered to be an influential in purchasing intention of cellphones, particularly leading brand which found to be influential in the students of private with a mean 3.29. Subsequently, the study conducted found out that creative brand name is considered to be influential by the respondents in orienting them about the presence of the product even with the lowest calculated mean of 2.95 for private on the said criterion. It shows that affordability of mobile phones through discounts and sales were found to be influential in the respondents of private university with an average of 3.32. Then different to the responses of the students from the public university, maximized budget when purchasing mobile phones were influential yet received the lowest average of 3. It is inferred maximized budget are not considered that much by the respondents compared to other indicators of the said criterion. Overall, it is determined that product price is one of the factors that is influential for the students with a weighted mean of 3.18.

The respondents from private university agreed that social influence is an influential factor in buying cellphones with a calculated weighted mean of 2.81 for the respondents from private. Among the five indicators of the criterion, consider other opinion is influential and has the highest weighted mean for the students from private with 2.95. The data gathered also revealed that the respondents from private universities considered advertisement found in mails to be influential although considered to be least on the same item with a weighted mean of 2.64. Based on the weighted mean of 3.35 for the respondents from private for the fourth criterion,



product feature was found to be influential in consumers. Among the statements, the students from private agreed that the responsiveness of the phone (RAM) was the most influential regarding their plan on buying mobile phones with the highest weighted mean of 3.45. Respondents from private, video playing capabilities and game facilities was found to be influential and least from the said criterion with the weighted mean of 3.28.

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of the Perception of the Freshmen from Public and Private Universities on the Factors Influencing Purchase Intention on Buying Cellphone.

Descriptives								
Mean of Purchase Intention								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Public	77	2.8232	.50016	.05700	2.7097	2.9368	1.50	3.60
Private	77	3.1169	.50852	.05795	3.0015	3.2323	1.50	4.00
Total	154	2.9701	.52384	.04221	2.8867	3.0535	1.50	4.00

With a 99% retrieval rate for sets of respondents in public and 88.5% retrieval rate for the sets of respondents in private, the over-all weighted mean is 2.8232 and 3.1169 respectively. These results indicate that the over-all perception of the respondents towards the factors is influential, having a weighted mean of 2.9701. Factors would be considered influential by respondents from private more than respondents from public, the results imply the same.

Table 4. Analysis of Variance between the Perception of the Freshmen from

Public and Private Universities on the Factors Influencing Purchase Intention on Buying Cellphone Gadget

Mean of Purchase Intention

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.320	1	3.320	13.050	.000
Within Groups	38.665	152	.254		
Total	41.985	153			

#### ANOVA

The results confirm that the significance value (Sig= .000) is less than the significance level ( $\alpha= 0.05$ ). There is a significant difference between the perception of respondents from public and private on the factors influencing purchase intention on buying gadgets.

Table 5. Analysis of Variance between the Perception of the Freshmen from Public and Private Universities on the Factors Influencing Purchase Intention on Buying Cellphones

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
BRAND NAME	Between Groups	3.866	1	3.866	10.456	.001
	Within Groups	56.198	152	.370		
	Total	60.064	153			
PRODUCT PRICE	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.000	.988
	Within Groups	422.775	152	2.781		
	Total	422.775	153			
SOCIAL INFLUENCE	Between Groups	3.601	1	3.601	11.867	.001
	Within Groups	46.126	152	.303		
	Total	49.727	153			
PRODUCT FEATURE	Between Groups	1.346	1	1.346	1.874	.173
	Within Groups	109.238	152	.719		
	Total	110.585	153			

The table shows the analysis of data of the criterion on the perceived factors influencing purchasing intention on buying phone gadget of respondents. The result confirms that there is a significant difference between the perception of public and private freshmen students among the two criteria, brand name and social influence. For brand name and social influence, the significant value show Sig= .001 on both factors which is less than the significant level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). On the other hand, with the significant values of Sig= .988 for product price and Sig=.173 for product feature, it is clearly stated that there is no significant difference between among these two criteria on the perception of the respondents of public and private universities

regarding on purchasing mobile phones gadget, which is relatively higher than the significant level ( $\alpha=0.05$ ).

Therefore, the researchers found out that brand name, product price, social influence and product features are influential among respondents in purchase intention on buying mobile phones.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Freshmen students have product features as their top preference in buying cellphones, the result of the study showed that product features were found to be the most influential factor. The study revealed that social influence was the least influential factor in buying the cellphones for the online class use. Brand names appeared to be priority of the respondents from the Private University than respondents from the State University. On the other hand, although found to be influential, comparison of prices of different mobile phones had the lowest rating.

The results from the data gathered agrees with the findings of Coelho in 2013 wherein it is said that there is a positive response to smartphone adoption and it contributes to the development of a mobile application economy. The findings of the study conducted by Amron (2018) indicating that product feature is the most influential factor in purchase intention of consumer and it also confirmed by the outcome from the data gathered. The study also approves the findings of Owusu in 2013 implying that product price positively influenced the purchase intention in buying mobile phones. Also, the results tied well with the findings of Albari and Indah Safitri in 2018 wherein it is stated that brand name influenced the purchase intention of a consumers. Yet, contrary to the findings of Dziwornu (2013) stating that negative perception of consumers towards social influence, it was revealed in the study that social influence is being the least considered among respondents and having the lowest weighted mean under its factors.

#### **V. Recommendations**

- Cellphone stores may sell products with more product features and manufacturer may produce or innovate a mobile phone fitted in the online class needs of the students.
- The businesses may consider the feedback of their customers as these serve as an influence for the intention and decision of others.
- With the advertisement found in mails result indicated that people nowadays are not using emails most of the time as their way of communication, It is advise company to decide on avoidance of the endorsement found in mails.

#### **References**

- (1) Albari and Safitri, I. (2018). The influence of product price on consumers purchasing decisions. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*. Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 328-337. Retrieved from <http://buscompress.com/journal-home.html>
- (2) Akar, E. and Aslihan, V. (2015). A review of literature on consumers' online purchase intentions. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*. Vol. 14, No. 3, pp.215-233
- (3) Amron (2018). The Influence of Brand Image, Design, Feature, and Price on Purchasing Decision of Apple iOS Smartphone in Surakarta, Indonesia. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*.
- (4) Arif et al. (2016). Students' dependence on smartphones and its effect on purchasing behaviour. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 285-302. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJGBR-05-2014-0031>
- (5) Armstrong, J. and Kumarc, V. (2000). Sales forecasts for existing consumer products and services: Do purchase intentions contribute to accuracy? Retrieved from [https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=tl&as\\_sdt=0%2C](https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=tl&as_sdt=0%2C)

5&q=studies+about+purc  
hase+intentions+of+consumers&oq=studies+about+purc  
hase+intentions#d=gs\_qa  
bs&u=%23p%3DKOOJ8B4G6EkJ

(6) Azarian, R. (2011). Potentials and limitations of comparative method in social science. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 1, No. 4. pp. 113125

(7) Bearden, W.O. and Etzel, M.J. (1982). Reference group influence on product and brand purchase decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 183-194.

(8) Bhat, A. (2019). Simple Random Sampling: Definition and Examples. Retrieved from <https://www.questionpro.com/blog/simple-random-sampling/amp/>

(9) Chang, T. Z., & Wildt, A. R. (1994). Price, Product information, and purchase intention: an empirical study. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol 22, No. 1. pp 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070394221002>

(10) Coelho, Meneses, & Moreira (2013). Factors influencing online purchase intention of smartphones: A hierarchical regression analysis. *Journal of Cogent Business and Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1.

(11) Das, D. (2012). An empirical study of factors influencing buying behaviour of youth consumers towards mobile handsets: A case study in coastal districts of Odisha. *Asian Journal of Research in Business Economics and Management*, Vol. 2, No. 4. pp. 68-82

(12) Ericsson.(2014).Ericsson mobility report - SoSuth East Asia and Oceania. Retrieved from <https://www.ericsson.com/res/docs/2014/regional-appendices-seafinalscreen.pdf>

(13) Farzana (2012). Factors affecting consumers' intention to purchase counterfeit product: Empirical study in the Malaysian market. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*. Vol. 29, No. 3

(14) Hustic, I. and Gregurec, I. (2015). The influence of price on customer's purchase decision. *Central European Conference on Information and Intelligent System* Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url>

(15) Karjaluoto et al. (2005). Factors Affecting Consumer Choice of Mobile Phones: Two Studies from Finland. *Journal of Euromarketing*. Vol. 14, No. 3. pp. 59-60

(16) Kotler, P., Armstrong, G., Agnihotri, P. Y., & Haque, E. U. (2010). *Principles of Marketing: A South Asian Perspective* (13th ed.). New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley (India) Pvt. Ltd.

(17) Kushchu, Hakoama, and Hakoyama (2011). Consumer Choice Criteria in Mobile Phone Selection: An Investigation of Malaysian University Students. *International Review of Social Sciences and Humanities*. Vol. 2. pp. 203-212

(18) Leo, C., Bennet, R., & Hartel, C. (2005). Cross-cultural differences in consumer decision-making styles. *Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 12, No. 3. pp. 32-61.

(19) Liew and Falahat (2019). Factors influencing consumers' purchase intention towards online group buying in Malaysia. *International Journal of Electronic Marketing and Retailing*. Vol 10, No. 1. pp 60-77

(20) MacMillan, Burrows, & Ante (2009). Service recovery's influence on consumer satisfaction, positive word-of-mouth, and purchase intentions. *Journal of business research*. Vol. 54, No.1. pp. 11-24.

(21) Monroe, K.B. (2003). *Pricing: Making Profitable Decisions. Satisfaction: A Behavioural Perspective on the Consumer* (3rd ed). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Nordquist, R. (2019). What is Brand Name? Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-brand-name-1689036>

(22) Nurliyana Abas et al. (2016). Factors Influencing Purchasing Intention of Smartphone among University Students. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Vol. 37 pp. 245253. DOI: 10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30121-6



- (23) Owusu, A. (2013). Influences of Price And Quality On Consumer Purchase Of Mobile Phone In The Kumasi Metropolis In Ghana A Comparative Study. *European Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 5, No. 1. pp. 179-198.
- (24) Rahim, A. (2015). Factors Influencing Purchasing Intention of Smartphone among University Students. *Procedia Economics and Finance*. Vol. 37. pp. 245-253
- (25) Richardson, H. (2018). Characteristics of a Comparative Research Design. Retrieved from <https://classroom.synonym.com/characteristics-comparative-researchdesign8274567.html>
- (26) Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2000). *Consumer Behavior* (7th ed.). Wisconsin: Prentice Hall.
- (27) Smura, Kivi, & Toyli (2009). Cultural influence on consumers' usage of social networks and its' impact on online purchase intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. Vol. 18, No. 4 pp. 348-354.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2011.03.003>
- (28) Trivedi, R., & Raval, R. D., (2016). Consumer buying intentions towards Smartphones: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Applied Research*, Vol. 2, No. 12. pp. 736-742
- (29) VahidrezaMirabi et al. (2015). Key factors influencing the purchase intention of activewear: an empirical study of US consumers. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17543266.2018.1477995>
- (30) Walia, N., Strite, M., & Huddleston, W. (2015). Eyeing the web interface: The influence of price, product, and personal involvement. *Electronic Commerce Research*. pp. 1-37
- (31) Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 52, No. 3. pp. 2-22.