Research

A COMPARISON OF CONSUMER CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE USE OF ELECTRONIC WORD-OF-MOUTH

SinaBeheshti[1], Sami Fethi[2]

[1]MBA, Department of Business Administration ,Faculty of Business and Economics ,Eastern Mediterranean University Famagusta, North Cyprus
[2] PhD in Economics ,Bussiness and Economics Faculty Member , Eastern Mediterranean University Famagusta, North Cyprus
*Corresponding author: Sina Beheshti

Article History: Received: 14 June 2021; Accepted: 12 October 2021; Published online: 25 October 2021

Abstract: This study examines the impact of word-of-mouth in social media on consumers' decision-making for purchasing a product. One hundred and fifty-four responses from Eastern Mediterranean University, Turkish Cypriot, and Turkish customers were used in the questionnaire. T-test and ANOVA were conducted to examine the relationship between word-of-mouth and its determinants. The results of independent T-test show that both males and females have a significant difference in their consideration of offline word-of-mouth messages for commercial activities. Results also show that Females rely more on word-of-mouth than males for commercial purposes. The results of ANOVA explain that younger respondents were more eager to use online networks for commercial purposes than their older counterparts. There was no significant difference between people's job status in their use of social media for commercial purposes, online and offline word-of-mouth reliance.

Keywords: Word-of-Mouth, Social Media, Customer Satisfaction,T-test, ANOVA, North Cyprus.

Introduction

Arndt (1967) defined the word-of-mouth (WOM) as "Spoken individual-to-individual communication between a receiver and a communicator which the receiver perceives the process as non-commercial about a product, brand or service." The study uses T-test and ANOVA to investigate the differences between impersonal and personal sources of word-of-mouth communication and find the potential differences among different groups of customers. The results of the independent T-test show that male and female groups have a significant difference in their consideration of offline word-of-mouth messages for commercial activities with each other. Results also show that females rely more on word-of-mouth than males for commercial purposes. The results of ANOVA test explain that younger respondents were more eager to use online networks for commercial purposes than their older counterparts. There was no significant difference between people's job status in their use of social media for commercial purposes, online and offline word-of-mouth reliance.

Literature Review

The emergence of the Internet and later social media has changed people's lives to a great extent and power. Word-of-mouth as one of the oldest marketing practices has a huge impact on consumer behaviors. Word-of-mouth influences product adoption likelihood (Arndt, 1967), product judgments (Bone, 1995), brand attitudes (Herr et al., 1991), purchase intentions

(Sundaram et al., 1999), service quality perceptions (Wang, 2011), and product involvement based on its category (Giese et al., 1996). In this study, the impact of off-line and online word-of-mouth related to social media on consumers were examined.

History of Word-of-Mouth

Word-of-mouth is the most tenacious tool for swapping ideas and opinions on goods andservices available in the market. Previously, word-of-mouthwas the only possible advertising practice between neighbors and families in every region in a fashion that they couldn't provide their needs at the next-door local stores (Whyte,1954). More than fifty years ago, when researchers began to work on word-of-mouth, they immediately established it as a powerful marketing force with an enormous impact on the likelihood of consumers getting interested to adopt a product (Arndt, 1967), brand choice (East et al., 2005), product judgments (Bone, 1995), and purchase intentions (Sundaram and Webster, 1999) brand attitudes (Herr et al., 1991). People also give others word-of-mouth to take advice and support them in return (Sundaram et al., 1998) or to get social advantages (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004).

Today, word-of-mouth is also an internet phenomenon, which is quicker, ubiquitous, and powerful (Yeh and Choi, 2011).

Modern Word-of-Mouth

Nowadays, experts started to create a multidimensional word-of-mouth measurement scale for electrical service. A useful scale for measuring great benefits of favorable word-of-mouth (traditional and online) would mitigate manager's effort to figure out their strategies for shepherding customers to share good stuff about their products and services. Also, it could be helpful for providers to forecast consumer's intention for buying a specific commodity (Arndt, 1968; Brown and Reingen, 1987; Ying and Chung, 2007).

Word of Mouth Concept's Features

Word-of-mouth would perform face to face, by phone or smartphone, email, mail, etc. (Silverman, 2001). Receivers must not be conveyed by any marketing intention behind the recommendations, directly or subliminally. Otherwise, those would not be considered as word-of-mouth. A word-of-mouth communication can be personal or impersonal, but both giver and receiver should not be related to the producer.

Electrical Word of Mouth (e-WOM) and Viral Marketing

Viral marketing is related to word-of-mouth through electronic and social media. The internet makes a distinction between word-of-mouth and viral. Godin (2001) claims 'viral' refers to an idea that acts like a virus: "A huge idea that goes amid the target receivers, a popular idea that propagates among selected crowds and teaches and changes and influences everyone it touches".

Word-of-Mouth's Disadvantages

Word-of-mouth might limit improvement and expansion, and it is not under control. The nature of word-of-mouth and its extent of activities arebased on its context. (Zeithaml, 1992).

Relying on word-of-mouth might limit growth. The informal nature of these communications can put the companies and producers into a networking channel cage. We perceive it as an uncontrollable phenomenon.

Word-of-Mouth Motives

Satisfaction, perceived quality, perceived value, trust, and commitment have been studied largely as antecedents of word-of-mouth (de Matos and Rossi, 2008).

Electronic Word-of-Mouth and Social Media

Electronic word-of-mouth has many differences from traditional one because of its asynchronous nature (Berger and Iyengar, 2013). Many companies have an option on their website in form of a forum that let consumers discuss the product and services but what happens in these forums could be considered as word-of-mouth if people who comment and share ideas there feel that the communications are independent and informal and also company doesn't fund or subsidize them, also the advertisement in there are not sponsored by the producers (Sénécal and Nantel, 2004).

Negative Word-of-Mouth (NWOM)

NWOMcommunication is described as a customer's effort to spread negative reflections as feedback with personal and impersonal groups such as family and friends. NWOM has a greater volume than positive word-of-mouth (Fornell and Wernerfelt, 1988). When dissatisfied consumers apply complaining behavior then NWOM communications would immediately degrade the efforts to take care of positive word-of-mouth (Richins, 1983).

Hypotheses

- H1: There is a difference among the age groups in contemplating offline WOM communications to use for commercial activities.
- H2: There is a difference between younger respondents and their older counterparts using online networks to pursue their commercial purposes.
- H3: There is a difference among part-time, full-time, and unemployed individuals in their use of social media for commercial purposes.
- H4: There is a difference among monthly income groups in their level of confidence in using social networking for commercial activities.

METHODOLOGY

Sample and Data Collection

The study was performed in Famagusta, North Cyprus. The questionnaires were administered to students of Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), local people, and travelers. Turkish Cypriots and other respondents were also included for the sake of having various respondents.

Primary data were gathered by questionnaires. 180 respondents were selected and were assured that they will remain anonymous.

154 questionnaires were filled.

Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire contained 37 questions, which used the 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. It had 2 sections: demographic information and the main information.

Data Analysis

SPSS software was used to analyze data. One-way ANOVA and T-tests were used to examine the hypotheses.

Results and Discussion

Demographic Profile

As shown in Table 1, among the final samples (n=154), male outweighed female by 55.2% (n=85); nearly half aged 16-27 years (n=76, 49.4%), followed by those aged 28-37 years (n=38, 24.7%) and the remaining groups (38-47 and ≥48) (12.3% and 13.6%), respectively. Most respondents were full-time employed (n=66, 42.9%) or jobless (n=61, 39.6%), and the remaining consisted of part-time job holders.

The respondents' monthly income (in Turkish Lira) levels ranked from 1,001-1,999 TL (43.2%) to ≤1,000TL (7.1%). The educational level was as follow: 47.4% were undertaking a university degree program or had Bachelor's degree, 25.3% were post-graduate students or held a post-graduate degree, 22.7% had a Secondary/High school level, and the remaining 4.5% had at most a primary school level of education.

Table 1. Respondents' demographic profile

Variables	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	85	55.2
Female	69	44.8
Age		
16-27	76	49.4
28-37	38	24.7
38-47	19	12.3
48 and above	21	13.6
Job-status		
Full-Time	66	42.9
Part-Time	27	17.5
Unemployed	61	39.6
Income(TL)		
1000	11	7.1
1001-1999	65	43.2
2000-2999	46	29.9
≥3000	32	20.8
Education level		
Primary school	7	4.5
Secondary/High School	35	22.7
University	73	47.4
Post-graduate	39	25.3

Ethnic origin		
Turkish Cypriot	36	23.4
Turkish	25	16.2
Iranian	36	23.4
African	20	13.0
Middle East	21	13.6
Former USSR		
European	9	5.8
	7	4.5
Occupation		
Student	84	54.5
Civil servant	16	10.4
Self-employed	24	15.6
Private Sector	30	19.5
N	154	

Most of the respondents were Iranians or Turkish Cypriots (n=36, 23.4%), followed by Turkish citizens (n=25, 16.2%), Middle-Easterners (n=21, 13.6%) and Africans (n=20, 13%). A majority were students (n=84, 54.5%), meanwhile, private sector employees, self-employed people, and civil servants were respectively 19.5%, 15.6%, and 10.4%.

Descriptive Statistics

The questionnaire items

The study questionnaire consists of 25 items as follows:

1. I search for information online (Internet)
2. I search for information offline (TV, magazine, billboard, etc.)
3. I used Facebook for commercial activities
4. I used Twitter for commercial activities
5. I used YouTube for commercial activities
6. I used Viber for commercial activities
7. I used Tango for commercial activities
8. I used WhatsApp for commercial activities
9. I used Google for commercial activities
10. I pay attention to special offers and advertisements for commercial activities
11. I have confidence to use social networking for commercial activities
12. I can read lots of information for commercial activities via social networks

13. I consider recommendations of friends to use social networks for commercial activities more carefully than strangers or advertisements
14. I consider recommendations of relatives to use social networks for commercial activities more carefully than friends or others
15. I consider online word-of-mouth messages through people's interaction on the net for commercial activities
16. I consider Offline word-of-mouth messages to use for commercial activities
17. I am willing to listen to online word-of-mouth regarding commercial activities
18. I acknowledge the influences of the new release technologies for buying commercial products on internet
19. Significant discount for the customers using social networks for commercial products should be applied
20. Persuasive information I receive online can influence my purchase decision for commercial products
21. I observe the information of volume of sales for the relevant commercial products
22. There is a tight competition to promote the products on internet
23. Buying products online makes it easier to purchase things from any point of the World
24. Even mixed or opposite ideas about a product on the web do not change my purchase decision for commercial products
25. Social networking has improved the purchasing ability and decision making on buying products by let people consider their options and needs clearly

As shown in Table 2, the respondents nearly fully agree with statements number 19 (M=4.45, SD=.71), 2 (M=4.44, SD =.64), 1 (M=4.28, SD=1.05), 10 (M=4.23, SD =.77), and 16 (M=4.23, SD =.74), respectively.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics summary

Questionnaire item	N	Min	Max	Mean	*SD*
1	154	1.00	5.00	4.28	1.05
2	154	2.00	5.00	4.44	.64
3	154	1.00	5.00	3.73	1.36
4	154	1.00	5.00	2.36	1.52
5	154	1.00	5.00	3.77	1.26
6	154	1.00	5.00	2.38	1.38
7	154	1.00	5.00	2.12	1.37
8	154	1.00	5.00	2.66	1.35
9	154	1.00	5.00	4.09	1.12
10	154	1.00	5.00	4.23	.77
11	154	1.00	5.00	3.90	1.08

12	154	1.00	5.00	3.71	1.13
13	154	1.00	5.00	3.98	.99
14	154	1.00	5.00	4.09	.99
15	154	1.00	5.00	3.65	1.12
16	154	2.00	5.00	4.23	.74
17	154	1.00	5.00	3.89	.96
18	154	1.00	5.00	4.09	.74
19	154	2.00	5.00	4.45	.71
20	154	1.00	5.00	3.82	.93
21	154	1.00	5.00	3.73	.94
22	154	2.00	5.00	4.17	.71
23	154	2.00	5.00	4.01	.71
24	154	1.00	5.00	3.21	.97
25	154	1.00	5.00	4.06	.77

Independent T-test

As shown in Table 3, Females used Facebook significantly more than males for commercial purposes, both genders also had a statistically significant difference in their average consideration of offline word-of-mouth messages for commercial activities. Men tend to be more resilient to the influence of online information mixture and/or contradiction on their buying decisions than women are.

Table 3. T-test table

Questionnaire item	Gender	N	Mean	T	Sig.
1	Male Femal	85	4.28	-.044	.965

	e	69	4.29			
2	Male	85	4.40	-.899	.370	
	Female	69	4.49			
3	Male	85	3.53	-2.125	**.035**	
	Female	69	3.98			
4	Male	85	2.26	.888	.376	
	Female	69	2.48			
5	Male	85	3.78	.041	.968	
	Female	69	3.77			
6	Male	85	2.28	-1.007	.315	
	Female	69	2.51			
7	Male	85	1.96	-1.540	.126	
	Female	69	2.30			
8	Male	85	2.59	-.756	.451	
	Female	69	2.75			
9	Male	85	4.09	.039	.969	
	Female	69	4.09			
10	Male	85	4.14	-1.658	.099	
	Female	69	4.35			
11	Male	85	3.86	-.558	.577	
	Female	69	3.96			

			9	6			
12		Male	85	3.61	-1.170	.244	
		Female	69	3.82			
13		Male	85	3.95	-.379	.705	
		Female	69	4.01			
14		Male	85	4.09	.044	.965	
		Female	69	4.09			
15		Male	85	3.55	-1.184	.238	
		Female	69	3.77			
16		Male	85	4.09	-2.533	**.012**	
		Female	69	4.39			
17		Male	85	3.81	-1.215	.226	
		Female	69	4.00			
18		Male	85	4.02	-1.342	.182	
		Female	69	4.19			
19		Male	85	4.42	-.604	.547	
		Female	69	4.49			
20		Male	85	3.75	-.964	.337	
		Female	69	3.81			
21		Male	85	3.73	.030	976	
		Female					

	e	69	3.72			
22	Male	85	4.13	-.880	.381	
	Female	69	4.23			
23	Male	85	3.96	-.912	.364	
	Female	69	4.07			
24	Male	85	3.41	2.895	**.004**	
	Female	69	2.96			
25	Male	85	4.01	-.801	.425	
	Female	69	4.12			

p significant at *.05*, N=154

ANOVA for age groups

As shown in Table 4, there was no significant difference between the age groups in their attention paid to special offers and advertisements for commercial activities, consideration of offline word-of-mouth messages to use for commercial activities, and the resilience for changing their purchasing decision for commercial products despite the mixed or opposite ideas about them on the web. Younger respondents were more eager to use online networks to pursue their commercial purposes than their older counterparts.

Table 4. ANOVA table for age

Questionnaire item	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
1	16-27	76	4.67	12.823	**.000**
	28-37		4.53		
	38-47	38	3.95		
	≥48	19	2.76		
		21			

2	16-27	76	4.55	2.826	**.041**
	28-37		4.47		
	38-47	38	4.21		
	≥48	19	4.19		
		21			
3	16-27	76	4.00	26.155	**.000**
	28-37		4.24		
	38-47	38	3.84		
	≥48	19	1.76		
		21			
4	16-27	76	2.66	19.754	**.000**
	28-37		2.50		
	38-47	38	2.16		
	≥48	19	1.19		
		21			
5	16-27	76	4.30	21.848	**.000**
	28-37		3.76		
	38-47	38	3.37		
	≥48	19	2.24		
		21			
6	16-27	76	2.55	11.599	**.000**
	28-37		2.32		
	38-47	38	2.89		
	≥48	19	1.43		
		21			

7	16-27	76	2.30	13.715	**.000**
	28-37		2.16		
	38-47	38	2.32		
	≥48	19	1.19		
		21			
8	16-27	76	2.95	6.308	**.000**
	28-37		2.68		
	38-47	38	2.68		
	≥48	19	1.57		
		21			
9	16-27	76	4.49	17.612	**.000**
	28-37		4.34		
	38-47	38	3.89		
	≥48	19	2.38		
		21			
10	16-27	76	2.95	.791	.501
	28-37		2.68		
	38-47	38	2.68		
	≥48	19	1.57		
		21			
11	16-27	76	4.33	21.507	**.000**
	28-37		4.05		
	38-47	38	3.79		
	≥48	19	2.19		
		21			

12	16-27	76	4.05	15.466	**.000**
	28-37		3.89		
	38-47	38	3.74		
	≥48	19	2.09		
		21			
13	16-27	76	4.30	12.425	**.000**
	28-37		4.21		
	38-47	38	3.84		
	≥48	19	2.52		
		21			
14	16-27	76	4.38	10.819	**.000**
	28-37		4.37		
	38-47	38	3.95		
	≥48	19	2.67		
		21			
15	16-27	76	3.97	8.743	**.000**
	28-37		3.74		
	38-47	38	3.74		
	≥48	19	2.24		
		21			
16	16-27	76	2.95	.282	.839
	28-37		2.68		
	38-47	38	2.68		
	≥48	19	1.57		
		21			

17	16-27	76	4.29	14.983	**.000**
	28-37		4.26		
	38-47	38	4.21		
	≥48	19	4.00		
		21			
18	16-27	76	4.24	4.401	**.005**
	28-37		4.29		
	38-47	38	4.11		
	≥48	19	4.19		
		21			
19	16-27	76	4.14	3.685	**.013**
	28-37		4.03		
	38-47	38	3.89		
	≥48	19	2.76		
		21			
20	16-27	76	3.97	9.460	**.000**
	28-37		4.03		
	38-47	38	4.11		
	≥48	19	2.62		
		21			
21	16-27	76	3.8816	4.074	**.012**
	28-37		3.8421		
	38-47	38	3.6316		
	≥48	19	3.0476		
		21			

22	16-27	76	4.3421	5.524	**.002**
	28-37		4.2105		
	38-47	38	4.1579		
	≥48	19	3.5238		
		21			
23	16-27	76	4.2237	7.388	**.000**
	28-37		3.9737		
	38-47	38	3.8421		
	≥48	19	3.4762		
		21			
24	16-27	76	3.2237	1.615	.188
	28-37		3.1053		
	38-47	38	2.9474		
	≥48	19	3.5714		
		21			
25	16-27	76	4.2632	10.874	**.000**
	28-37		4.1316		
	38-47	38	3.9474		
	≥48	19	3.2857		
		21			

p significant at *.05* level, N=154

ANOVA for Job Status

As shown in Table 5, there was no significant difference among the full-time, part-time, and unemployed groups in their use of social media or virtual networking for commercial purposes, their online and offline word-of-mouth reliance, or recommendation to friends or relatives through networking regarding purchasing or commercial intentions. The job position seemed not to affect any of their attitudes or behaviors regarding the study items.

Table 5. ANOVA table for job status

Questionnaire item	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
1	Full-Time	66	4.1364	1.529	.220
	Part-Time	27	4.2593		
	Unemployed	61	4.4590		
2	Full-Time	66	4.3485	1.241	.292
	Part-Time	27	4.5185		
	Unemployed	61	4.5082		
3	Full-Time	66	3.6364	.303	.739
	Part-Time	27	3.7778		
	Unemployed	61	3.8197		
4	Full-Time	66	2.0455	2.771	.066
	Part-Time	27	2.7778		
	Unemployed	61	2.5082		
5	Full-Time	66	3.6364	1.951	.146
	Part-Time	27	3.5556		
	Unemployed	61	4.0164		
6	Full-Time	66	2.2879	.664	.516
	Part-Time	27	2.2593		
	Unemployed	61	2.5410		

7	Full-Time	6	1.8333	2.764	.066
	Part-Time	27	2.1852		
	Unemployed	11	2.3934		
8	Full-Time	6	2.4697	1.395	.251
	Part-Time	27	2.6667		
	Unemployed	11	2.8689		
9	Full-Time	6	4.0000	1.879	.156
	Part-Time	27	3.8519		
	Unemployed	11	4.2951		
10	Full-Time	6	4.3333	2.244	.110
	Part-Time	27	3.9630		
	Unemployed	11	4.2459		
11	Full-Time	6	3.7273	2.118	.124
	Part-Time	27	3.8519		
	Unemployed	11	4.1148		
12	Full-Time	6	3.5909	1.246	.290
	Part-Time	27	3.5926		
	Unemployed	11	3.8852		

13		Full-Time	6	3.8939	2.280	.106
		Part-Time	27	3.7407		
		Unemployed	61	4.1803		
14	Full-Time	6627		3.9697	1.803	.168
	Part-Time	61		3.9630		
	Unemployed			4.2787		
15	Full-Time	6627		3.4697	2.620	.076
	Part-Time	61		3.5185		
	Unemployed			3.9016		
16	Full-Time	6627		4.1515	.961	.385
	Part-Time	61		4.1852		
	Unemployed			4.3279		
17	Full-Time	6627		3.8333	.595	.553
	Part-Time	61		3.8148		
	Unemployed			4.0000		
18	Full-Time	6627		4.1212	.541	.583
	Part-Time	61		3.9630		
	Unemployed			4.1311		

19	Full-Time	6627	4.4091	.239	.788
	Part-Time	61	4.4815		
	Unemployed		4.4918		
20	Full-Time	6627	3.7424	1.040	.356
	Part-Time	61	3.7037		
	Unemployed		3.9508		
21	Full-Time	6627	3.8333	.804	.449
	Part-Time	61	3.5926		
	Unemployed		3.6721		
22	Full-Time	6627	4.1667	.202	.817
	Part-Time	61	4.1111		
	Unemployed		4.2131		
23	Full-Time	6627	3.9848	.534	.588
	Part-Time	61	3.9259		
	Unemployed		4.0820		
24	Full-Time	6627	3.3182	2.945	.056
	Part-Time	61	3.4444		
	Unemployed		2.9836		

25	Full-Time	66 27	4.01 52	.72 0	.4 89
	Part-Time	61	3.96 30		
	Unemployed		4.14 75		

p significant at *.05* level, N=154

ANOVA for Monthly Income

There was a statistically significant difference between monthly income and the level of searching for information online [F(3,150)=4.26, p<.01], using Facebook for commercial activities [F(3,150)=4.61, p<.01], using YouTube for commercial activities [F(3,150)=4.29, p<.01], using Google for commercial activities [F(3,150)=3.52, p=.017] confidence in using social networking for commercial activities [F(3,150)=5.69, p<.01], reading a large amount of information for commercial activities via social networks [F(3,150)=3.59, p=.015], and relatives recommendations' consideration to use social networks for commercial activities more carefully than friends or others [F(3,150)= 2.84, p=.04] **(Table 5).**

Table 5. ANOVA for Monthly income level

Questionnaire item	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
1	1000	1	4.7273	4.266	**.006**
	1001-1999	16	4.4923		
	2000-2999	5	4.2391		
	3000+	46	3.7813		
		32			
2	1000	1	4.7273	1.044	.375
	1001-1999	16	4.4615		
	2000-2999	5	4.4130		
	3000+	46	4.3438		
		32			
3	1000	1	4.0000	4.607	**.004**
	1001-1999	16	3.9538		
	2000-2999	5	3.8913		
	3000+	4	2.9688		

		6			
		2	3		
4	1000	1	2.0909	2.203	.090
	1001-1999	1	2.6769		
	2000-2999	5	6	2.3043	
	3000+	6	4	1.8750	
		2	3		
5	1000	1	4.7273	4.291	**.006**
	1001-1999	1	3.9077		
	2000-2999	5	6	3.6957	
	3000+	6	4	3.2813	
		2	3		
6	1000	1	2.6364	.657	.580
	1001-1999	1	2.4462		
	2000-2999	5	6	2.4348	
	3000+	6	4	2.0938	
		2	3		
7	1000	1	2.2727	1.606	.190
	1001-1999	1	2.3692		
	2000-2999	5	6	1.9348	
	3000+	6	4	1.8125	
		2	3		
8	1000	1	3.0000	.391	.760
	1001-1999	1	2.6923		
	2000-2999	5	6	2.6522	
	3000+		4	2.5000	

			6			
			2	3		
9		1000	1	4.5455	3.516	**.017**
		1001-1999	1	4.2154		
		2000-2999	6	4.1739		
		3000+	5	3.5625		
			4			
			6			
			2	3		
10		1000	1	4.1818	.320	.811
		1001-1999	1	4.2308		
		2000-2999	6	4.1739		
		3000+	5	4.3438		
			4			
			6			
			2	3		
11		1000	1	4.6364	5.696	**.001**
		1001-1999	1	3.9846		
		2000-2999	6	4.0217		
		3000+	5	3.3125		
			4			
			6			
			2	3		
12	1000	11	4.0909	3.597	**.015**	
	1001-1999	65	3.8615			
		46	3.7826			
	2000-2999	32	3.1563			
	3000+					
13	1000	11	4.2727	2.602	.054	
	1001-1999	65	4.0462			
		46	4.1087			
	2000-2999	32	3.5625			
	3000+					

14	1000	11	4.3636	2.839	**.040**
	1001-1999	65	4.2308		
	2000-2999	46	4.1304		
	3000+	32	3.6563		
15	1000	11	3.9091	1.488	.220
	1001-1999	65	3.7846		
	2000-2999	46	3.6304		
	3000+	32	3.3125		
16	1000	11	4.1818	.163	.921
	1001-1999	65	4.2462		
	2000-2999	46	4.1739		
	3000+	32	4.2813		
17	1000	11	4.1818	1.875	.136
	1001-1999	65	3.9385		
	2000-2999	46	4.0000		
	3000+	32	3.5625		
18	1000	11	4.2727	.260	.854
	1001-1999	65	4.1077		
	2000-2999	46	4.0652		
	3000+	32	4.0625		
19	1000	11	4.4545	.373	.773
	1001-1999	65	4.5231		
	2000-2999	46	4.3913		
	3000+	32	4.4063		

20		1000	11	3.9091	1.018	.386
		1001-1999	65	3.8769		
		2000-2999	46	3.8913		
		3000+	32	3.5625		
21		1000	11	3.8182	.154	.927
		1001-1999	65	3.7538		
		2000-2999	46	3.6522		
		3000+	32	3.7500		
22		1000	11	4.4545	.801	.495
		1001-1999	65	4.2000		
		2000-2999	46	4.1304		
		3000+	32	4.0938		
	23	1000	11	4.2727	1.978	.120
		1001-1999	65	4.1231		
		2000-2999	46	3.8478		
		3000+	32	3.9375		
	24	1000	11	2.9091	.914	.436
		1001-1999	65	3.3231		
		2000-2999	46	3.0870		
		3000+	32	3.2500		
	25	1000	11	4.3636	2.320	.078
		1001-1999	65	4.1846		
		2000-2999	46	3.9565		
		3000+	32	3.8438		

p significant at *.05* level, N=154

ANOVA for Occupation

Preliminary analyses showed that any of the groups did not differ from the other in terms of items 6 [F(3,150)=.809, p=.491], 10 [F(3,150)=.427, p=.734], 16 [F(3,150)=.449, p=.518], 18 [F(3,150)=2.14, p=.098], and 19 [F(3,150)=2.203, p=.09]. Furthermore, the post hoc analysis for the significant differences showed that students' mean scores were higher than other groups of occupation and thus, were significantly different (Table 6).

Table 6. ANOVA for occupation

Questionnaire item	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
1	Student	84	4.6548	12.131	.000
	Civil servant	16	3.8750		
	Self-employed	24	3.4167		
	Private Sector	30	4.1667		
2	Student	84	4.5714	3.010	.032
	Civil servant	16	4.3750		
	Self-employed	24	4.3333		
	Private Sector	30	4.2000		
3	Student	84	4.0357	4.337	.006
	Civil servant	16	3.1250		
	Self-employed	24	3.1250		
	Private Sector	30	3.7000		
4	Student	84	2.7024	5.121	.002
	Civil servant	16	1.6250		
	Self-employed	24	1.5833		
	Private Sector	30	2.4000		
5	Student	84	4.2024	8.824	.000
	Civil servant	16	3.0625		
	Self-employed	24	3.1250		
	Private Sector	30	3.4667		
6	Student	84	2.5119	.809	.491
	Civil servant	16	2.1250		
	Self-employed	24	2.0833		
	Private Sector	30	2.4000		
7	Student	84	2.3452	3.191	.025
	Civil servant	16	1.7500		
	Self-employed	24	1.4583		
	Private Sector	30	2.2000		
8	Student	84	2.9286	3.205	.025
	Civil servant	16	2.0625		
	Self-employed	24	2.2083		
	Private Sector	30	2.6000		

9	Student	84	4.4286	7.983	.000
	Civil servant	16	3.4375		
	Self-employed	24	3.4583		
	Private Sector	30	4.0000		
10	Student	84	4.2619	.427	.734
	Civil servant	16	4.0625		
	Self-employed	24	4.1667		
	Private Sector	30	4.3000		
11	Student	84	4.2857	9.665	.000
	Civil servant	16	3.4375		
	Self-employed	24	3.2500		
	Private Sector	30	3.6000		
12	Student	84	4.0357	6.273	.000
	Civil servant	16	3.2500		
	Self-employed	24	3.1250		
	Private Sector	30	3.5000		
13	Student	84	4.2619	5.896	.001
	Civil servant	16	3.4375		
	Self-employed	24	3.5833		
	Private Sector	30	3.8000		
14	Student	84	4.3571	5.358	.002
	Civil servant	16	3.5000		
	Self-employed	24	3.7917		
	Private Sector	30	3.9000		
15	Student	84	3.9762	6.053	.001
	Civil servant	16	3.1875		
	Self-employed	24	3.1250		
	Private Sector	30	3.4000		
16	Student	84	4.2738	.449	.718
	Civil servant	16	4.0625		
	Self-employed	24	4.2500		
	Private Sector	30	4.1667		
17	Student	84	4.1190	3.998	.009
	Civil servant	16	3.4375		

	Self-employed	24	3.5833		
	Private Sector	30	3.7667		
18	Student	84	4.2143	2.140	.098
	Civil servant	16	3.7500		
	Self-employed	24	4.0000		
	Private Sector	30	4.0333		
19	Student	84	4.5833	2.203	.090
	Civil servant	16	4.3750		
	Self-employed	24	4.2500		
	Private Sector	30	4.3000		
20	Student	84	3.9524	2.042	.110
	Civil servant	16	3.3750		
	Self-employed	24	3.6667		
	Private Sector	30	3.8000		
21	Student	84	3.8571	3.557	.016
	Civil servant	16	3.2500		
	Self-employed	24	3.3750		
	Private Sector	30	3.9000		
22	Student	84	4.2976	3.560	.016
	Civil servant	16	3.9375		
	Self-employed	24	3.8333		
	Private Sector	30	4.2333		
23	Student	84	4.1905	4.147	.007
	Civil servant	16	3.8750		
	Self-employed	24	3.7500		
	Private Sector	30	3.8000		
24	Student	84	3.2024	.170	.916
	Civil servant	16	3.0625		
	Self-employed	24	3.2500		
	Private Sector	30	3.2667		
25	Student	84	4.2262	3.242	.024
	Civil servant	16	3.8125		
	Self-employed	24	3.7917		

Private Sector	30	3.9333

p significant at .*05* level, N=154

Based on our research our hypothesis acceptance is as follow:

	ACCEPTED	DENIED
H1:		*
H2:	*	
H3:		*
H4:	*	

Conclusion

A feeling of participationand getting involved with a business could also encourage the customers to be more loyal and increase their recommendations. Informal business methods of collecting market information are not much effective in figuring out the sloppy and non-commercial processes of word-of-mouth recommendations.

Companies looking for obtaining positive word-of-mouth should put harder effort for higher rates of perceived quality and satisfaction assessments (de Matos and Rossi, 2008).

Many consumers spread word-of-mouth when they see it as an occasion for self-enhancement and improve or refine their self-image. In this fashion, companies can satisfy these consumers' need for self-enhancement. Companies could apply this insight, for instance, when they strive to improve online content they hope their material goes "viral" through social media platforms (Golan and Zaidner, 2008). They could also benefit from this insight of producing word-of-mouth related to the boosting of the new products.

Companies nowadays allocate resources to monitor online communications for being able to reply to reproaches that may occur. However, other consumers send their feedback to these complaints before their support for the criticized company occurs. This defensive act by consumers is rarely enough to stop the spread of NWOM and mitigate it. Therefore, companies need not act too much against word-of-mouth when negative word-of-mouth arguments arise in online channels, and they should keep themselves away from entering these arguments very quickly (Balaji, Wei Khong, 2015).

5.3 Limitations

We found females use Facebook more than men for commercial purposes but we don't know to what extent Facebook itself affects the process and word-of-mouth communication and what is the difference, for instance, between word-of-mouth on Facebook and Twitter. Another important point is that we cannot be assured the word-of-mouth communication on social media and other practices are completely independent or whether or not people care about them. In this research, most of the respondents care about special offers and incentives by the producers, which can manipulate their genuine intentions to spread word-of-mouth.

References

Arndt, J. (1968). Selective processes in Word of Mouth. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 8(3), 19-22.

Arndt, J. (1967). "Role of product-related conversations in the diffusion of a new product, *"Journal of Marketing Research*, 4(3), 291-295.

Berger, J. & Iyengar, R. (2013). "Communication channels and word of mouth: How the medium shapes the message," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 40(3), 567-579.

Bone, P.F. (1995). "Word-of-mouth effects on short-term and long-term product judgments," *Journal of Business Research*, 32(3), 213-223.

Brown, J.J., &Reingen, P.H. (1987). Social ties and Word-of-Mouth referral behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *14*(3), 350-362.

De Matos, Celso A., & Carlos Rossi. (2008). Word-of-mouth communications in marketing: A meta-analytic review of the antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 36(4), 578-96.

East, R., Hammond, K., Lomax, W. & Robinson, H. (2005). "What is the effect of a recommendation?" *The Marketing Review*, 5(2), 145-157.

Fornell, C. &Wernerfelt, B. (1988). 'A Model of Customer Complaint Management', *Marketing Science*, 7(3), 287-298.

Herr, P.M., Kardes, F.R. & Kim, J. (1991). "Effects of word-of-mouth and product-attribute information on persuasion: An accessibility-diagnosticity perspective," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(4), 454-462.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K.P., Walsh, G. &Gremler, D.D. (2004), "Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet?" *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp.18(1), 38-52.

Richins, M.L. (1983). "Negative word-of-mouth by dissatisfied consumers: A pilot study," *Journal of Marketing*, 47(1), 68-78.

Sénécal, S., &Nantel, J. (2004). The Influence of online product recommendations on consumer's online choices. *Journal of Retailing*, 80(2), 159-169.

Silverman, G. (2001). The Power of Word of Mouth. *Direct Marketing*, 64(5), 47.

Sundaram, D.S. and Webster, C. (1999). "The role of brand familiarity on the impact of word-of- mouth communication on brand evaluations," in Arnould, E.J. and Scott, L.M. (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 26, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT, 664-670.

Sundaram, D.S., Mitra, K. and Webster, C. (1998). "Word-of-mouth communications: A motivational analysis," in Alba, J.W. and Hutchinson, J.W. (Eds.), *Advances inConsumer Research*, Association for Consumer Research, Provo, UT, 25, 527-531.

Whyte, W.H. Jr. (1954). The web of Word of Mouth. *Fortune, 50*(5), 140-143.

Yeh, Y.-H. & Choi, S.M. (2011). "Mini-lovers, maxi-mouths: An investigation ofantecedents to eWOM intention among brand community members," *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 17(3), 145-162.

Ying H.L., & Chung C.M. (2007). The effects of single-message single-source mixed Word-of-Mouth on product attitude and purchase intention. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 19(1), 75-93.

Zeithaml V.A. (1992). 'How Consumer Evaluation Processes Differ Between Goods and Services' in Donelly and George (Eds) *Marketing Services*, Chicago, American Marketing Association, pp.