International Journal of Latest Trends in Engineering and Technology
Vol.(9)Issue(3), pp.109-118
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21172/1.93.20
e-ISSN:2278-621X

IMPACT OF INTERNET ON ONLINE PURCHASERS OF MOVIE TICKETS IN BUILDING POSITIVE ATTITUDE

Dr. Ravi Kumar Goriparthi[1] & Shajeer Sainudeen[2]

Abstract- This paper tries to go over on online purchases of movie tickets in forming a positive attitude among the consumers, in relation to the topic seven independent factors were selected and their influence was later tested onto two groups. In the first group were the representatives of regular online purchasers who book their tickets online, while the second group consisted of random people that were aware and also could purchase online often. Two questionnaires were handed out – one for the Regular Online Purchasers group one for the Non Regular Online Purchasers group. The collected data was analyzed through SPSS program Version 19.0, did correlation analyses to track the relationship between the different independent variables and the dependent variable – brand attitude. Afterwards in order to test the seven hypotheses used the two- way of variance ANOVA to check which of the two groups elicit more positive brand attitude under the promotional influence. It was found out that regular online purchasers who are using online for a long period of time, have experience with the brand on a regular base, have positive associations and find it important to work and be surrounded by promotional elicit more positive attitude than Non Regular Online Purchasers with the same characteristics. On the other hand often online purchasers that are longer aware with a certain brand and often are engaged in Promotional activities in regards to brands show more positive attitude than regular online purchasers group.
Key words: Regular Online Purchasers, Non Regular Online Purchasers, brand attitude, Internet activities, associations, experience

1. INTRODUCTION

The rise and wide spread of Internet and the fast growing consumers' digital media use led companies occupied in different business sectors to think about a new way of communication with customers (Chenong, 2008). Among the fastest growing online tools for reaching the consumers is the so called "social media" (Trusov, 2009). Internet is becoming an important part in peoples' lives as can be seen from the recent marketing approaches done in that sphere. For marketers this phenomenon is of high interest in promoting the products is becoming an important source of customer information sharing, awareness, support and empowerment (Kaplan, 2010). Consequently Internet allows businesses to effectively and inexpensively engage in direct client contact, reaching levels of efficiency undoubtedly higher than any other traditional marketing communication tools (Berthon, 2008). There are many evidences and examples how companies use Internet for more efficient communication and better results. Many companies and well-known brands were affected by the economic crisis in the recent years, their annual sales were falling down and customer satisfaction was almost diminished, the economic crisis eventually wasn't the only reason for the brands failure. Brands like GAP or MySpace suffered by perception issues which led again to falling sales and need of rebranding. Companies are constantly paying attention to the change of customer's opinions and preferences and are trying to be up to date with the emergence of new technologies and eventually stay aside from problems of that character. Several previous studies confirmed the relevance of brand attitude in various markets and spheres so the actuality of the problem is pretty evident (Jacobson, 2001). Companies and marketers are constantly monitoring the customers' brand attitude change. Each company's aim is to create positive brand attitude or if not positive, then at least an attitude that will lead to profitable results, leading positions on the market and opportunities for future growth. Therefore the analysis of promotional tools and what is the effectiveness of these on customers' attitude toward brands will provide efficient and helpful insights for companies. These include trying to predict their future sales and behavior towards consumers and respectively toward competitors, and therefore improving their marketing communications and optimizing the advertising and persuading campaigns with tools that don't necessarily require the investment of a lot of money.

The main objective is:

"How effective are the promotions for consumers in creating positive attitude towards the brand?

The main hypothesis of the study is:

Hypothesis1: Regular Online Purchasers that have been aware with a certain brand for a longer period of time are holding more positive attitude toward that brand than Non Regular Online Purchasers

[1] Assistant Professor, College of Finance, Management and Development, Department Of Public Management , Ethiopian Civil Services University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
[2] Is a lecturer in villa college, Republic of Maldives

Hypothesis2: Regular Online Purchasers that have been using Internet for a longer period of time hold more positive brand attitude than Non Regular Online Purchasers
Hypothesis3: Regular Online Purchasers that often engage in Internet activities are more positive toward brands than Non Regular Online Purchasers that engage in the same activities
Hypothesis4: Regular Online Purchasers that engage often in Internet activities in regards to any brand are more positive than Non Regular Online Purchasers
Hypothesis5: Regular Online Purchasers that more often have personal experience with a brand hold more positive attitude than Non Regular Online Purchasers
Hypothesis6: Regular Online Purchasers that find Internet important in their everyday life are with more positive brand attitude than Non Regular Online Purchasers who find it equally important
Hypothesis7: Regular Online Purchasers that have more positive associations to certain brand hold also more positive attitude toward it than Non Regular Online Purchasers

2. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine how effective are promotional tools for consumers in the creation of positive brand attitude, quota sampling is used the respondents are divided into two groups: Regular Online Purchasers of the movie tickets that are subscribed and Non- Regular Online Purchasers. The data needed for the first survey was collected through e-mail then questionnaire was sent out to all the mutual friends. It is hypothesized that the longer awareness -brand attitude is a factor that would positively influence so it is taken as a dependent variable, next independent variable is Longer internet usage-brand associations of the users, Internet usage, engagement of the people in Internet activities in general, engagement in regards to any brand, brand awareness of the users, personal experience they have with the brand, and the importance of Internet in their everyday life The statements were composed in line with the (Keller, 2001) about brand attitude and his separation of this attitude on judgments and feelings and respectively their derivatives. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was .88, which indicated high reliability of the scale. The model below explains the procedure that was followed, the number of the respondents that took part in the survey was 256, but only 191 of them fully completed all the questions and gave answers even to the most complicated ones. In a sequential order, the frequencies for the internet usage, experience and associations were derived with the help of SPSS Statistics program.

3. LIMITATIONS

The present research was carried out using a sample of respondents consisting of personal friends, family, fellow students and social network. The sample consists of people that are rather same age as mine or younger, mostly already highly educated, who use Facebook on a regular basis. Therefore that sample does not fully represent the majority and the results could be not applicable to a large extent of people. Some of the questions are too complicated and require quite a long amount of time to be answered, which lowered the response rate of the present study. Another disadvantage is the length of the survey in general. It is also much longer than the average survey and doesn't meet the standards and expectations of all people.

4. CORRELATIONS

Correlations among all variables are displayed in Table 1: from the table below, the direction of the relationship between the variables is mostly negative, which means that there is a negative correlation – high scores on one variable are associated with low scores on the other. The relationship between brand attitude and awareness is the first negative correlation ($r = -.156$, $p=<0.05$). These numbers mean that the longer time people are aware of a certain brand, the more negative they are toward it. This result is overall for the both groups (Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers). Going further a negative correlation between brand attitude and associations ($r = -0.205$, $p = <0.05$), so the more negative associations people hold about, the more negative they are toward it, which sounds logical, but now was also proven through numbers. There is a positive relation between the variable Internet importance and brand attitude ($r = .065$, $p = <0.05$), which signify the more important people find Internet in their everyday life; the more positive they are toward it.

Table 1-Correlations

		Awareness	Internet Importance	Association	Longer internet usage	Engagement in internet activities	internet and brands	Experience	Brand Attitude
Awareness	Pearson Correlation	1	-.021	-.079	-.090	.096	.065	...033	**-.156***
	Sig. (2-		.271	.797	.335	.242	.425	.684	.056

	tailed)								
Internet Importance	Pearson Correlation	-.090	1	-.076	.512**	.011	.091	.049	.065
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.271		.355	.000	.891	.265	.551	.427
Association	Pearson Correlation	-.021	-.076	1	-.249**	-.422**	-.398**	.118	-.205
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.797	.355		.002	.000	.000	.149	. 497
Longer social media usage	Pearson Correlation	-.079	.512**	-.249**	1	.055	.021	-.147	.148
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.335	.000	.002		.503	.799	.071	.069
Engagement in social media activities	Pearson Correlation	.096	.011	-.422**	.055	1	.696**	.152	-.199
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.242	.891	.000	.503		.000	.063	.014
Social Media and brands	Pearson Correlation	.065	.091	-.398**	.021	.696**	1	.181*	-.307**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.425	.265	.000	.799	.000		.026	.000
Experience	Pearson Correlation	.033	.049	.118	-.147	.152	.181*	1	-.338**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.684	.551	.149	.071	.063	.026		.000
Brand Attitude	Pearson Correlation	-.156*	.065	-.205*	.148	-.199*	-.307**	-.338**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.056	.427	.497	.069	.014	.000	.000	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive correlation between brand attitude and the frequency of Internet usage ($r =. 148$, $p= < 0.05$), which the program translates as a very weak correlation between these two variables. The engagement in Internet activities in general ($r = -.199$, $p =< 0.05$) and the engagement in regards to brand ($r=-.307$, $p= < 0.05$) have negative correlation with brand attitude.

It means that the more often people engage in Internet activities in general and in relation to a certain brand the more positive they are toward it. The personal experience people have with the brand (r=-.338, p=<0.01) is also positively correlated to brand attitude. These numbers say that the more time and less money people spend the more positive they are toward the brand.

5. HYPOTHESES TESTING

To address the seven hypotheses Two way of variance ANOVA is used that we have two independent variables, in our case one of the independent variables is actually a control variable – Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers, representing different people in each group. To test the first hypothesis a two-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers and level of awareness on brand attitude (Table 6).

Table 2-ANOVA, Dependent Variable: Brand Attitude

Awareness	Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers	Mean	SD
3-5 Years ago	Regular Online Purchasers	29.7	6.9
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	35.4	5.7
	Total	31.9	7.0
More than 5 years ago	Regular Online Purchasers	27.9	8.4
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	32.9	5.4
	Total	29.7	7.8
I don't know for sure	Regular Online Purchasers	28.7	5.6
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	30.5	6.0
	Total	29.0	5.6
Total	Regular Online Purchasers	28.7	7.3
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.8	5.8
	Total	30.4	7.3
Longer internet usage			
10h/ > 1 year usage	Regular Online Purchasers	30.3	7.35
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	42.5	6.36
	Total	33.4	8.53
10-20h/ 1 year usage	Regular Online Purchasers	32.2	7.56
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	30.5	8.12
	Total	31.3	1.20
20-30h/ 2-4 year usage	Regular Online Purchasers	29	7.3
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	31.5	10.6

	Total	29.7	8.1
30-40h/< 4 year usage	Regular Online Purchasers	29.6	9.6
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	35.3	1.6
	Total	31.1	8.6
40-50h	Regular Online Purchasers	33.6	1.1
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	31.7	6.1
	Total	28.9	7.7
Total	Regular Online Purchasers	28.6	7.3
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.7	5.7
	Total	.0.3	7.2

Subjects were divided into 2 groups according to the Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers belongingness and into 3 groups according to the level of awareness (Group1: people that are aware with brand between 3-5 years, group 2: people with awareness for more than 5 years, and group 3: people that don't know for sure). There was a statistically significant main effect for Regular Online Purchasers / Non Regular Online Purchasers [F (1.145) = 8.65, p=0.04], however the effect size was small (eta squared = 0.56). This effect reaches statistical significance but the actual difference in the main values is small. The results indicated that the mean score for Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers that lay in the first group awareness (3-5 years) M = 31.93, SD = 7.03 significantly differ from the other groups (M= 29.70, SD 7.85 and M = 29.03, SD 5.62).However we are more interested in the second group (Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers with awareness more than 5 years). It is noticed that the indicators for non-Regular Online Purchasers are as follows: M= 32.97, SD = 5.49 and the one for Regular Online Purchasers are M= 27.35. SD 8.4 which shows that non Regular Online Purchasers with longer awareness have more positive attitude toward the brand than actual Online Purchasers, considering also the positive correlation brought out earlier. All this facts lead to the rejection of the Hypothesis 1.

To test the second hypothesis a two-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers and level of Internet usage on brand attitude Subjects were divided again into 2 groups according to the Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers belongingness and into 5 groups according to the time they spend on Internet per week and respectively the continuity of Internet usage (Group 1: people spend 10h/less than 1 year of usage, Group 2: 10-20h/1 year usage, Group 3:20-30/2-4years usage, Group 4:30-40h/more than 4years, Group 5: 40-50h.). It was found out again a statistically significant main effect for Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers [F (1.128) =8.72, p = 0.04], however the effect size was more on the small side (eta squared = 0.65). This effect reaches again a statistical significance but the values are small. The results showed that the group is interested the most i.e. the last group of people that spend the most hours on Internet significantly differ from the rest of the groups, where the indicators are: Regular Online Purchasers (M= 33.68, SD=1.12) and Non Regular Online Purchasers (M=31.72, SD=6.09). All these numbers show that Regular Online Purchasers that are spending more hours on Internet and are longer using it are more positive toward the brand than non-Regular Online Purchasers that are using it for the same time period. These facts prove Hypothesis 2. The same measures and procedures were applied for testing the rest of the variables. All the indicators that we are interested in were summarized in the following table 3

Table 3-Indicators

Variable	**P**	**Eta square**	**Means for the interested group Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers**	**Standard deviations for the interested group Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers**

EIA	.206	.032	28.67/30.39	7.36/7.2
IAB	.006	.076	28.67/33.76	7.36/5.76
II	.031	.015	35.93/30.34	6.65/6.96
Experience	.014	.163	33.76/28.67	7.36/5.76
Associations	.000	.014	-	-

EIA – Engagement in Internet activities, IAB – Engagement in Internet activities in regards to any brand, II – Internet Importance

The engagement of the people in social media activities is the variable that has the weakest Correlation with brand attitude.

Table 4-Mean and Standard Deviation of Engagement in Internet activities and Engagement in Internet activities in regards to any brand- Dependent Variable: Brand Attitude

	Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers	EIA		IAB	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Every day	Regular Online Purchasers	28.7	7.4	28.7	7.4
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	30.3	7.2	33.8	5.7
	Total	35.4	7.4	31.4	5.4
Every Few Days	Regular Online Purchasers	30.2	7.0	33.2	5.3
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	32.5	6.6	36.7	7.5
	Total	31.4	9.2	33.4	8.9
Every week	Regular Online Purchasers	30	5.2	32.0	6.3
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.7	10.6	35.6	10
	Total	28.7	6.8	37.7	7.8
Every Few Weeks	Regular Online Purchasers	27.5	9.6	25.6	8.6
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	36.3	3.2	34.4	5.2
	Total	32.2	8.6	33.2	7.5
Less often	Regular Online Purchasers	36.9	3.1	38.6	5.9
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.7	7.2	34.7	6.2
	Total	26.9	8.1	26	8.3
Never	Regular Online Purchasers	36.9	2.2	36.5	4.2

	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.5	8.9	36.4	7.8
	Total	36.2	6.9	32.2	5.9
Total	Regular Online Purchasers	34.2	2.3	36.2	5.2
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	36.6	8.2	37.5	6.2
	Total	25.9	9.5	23.9	7.5

It was found a statistically not significant main effect for Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers [F (1.2324) =1.64, p = .206], and the effect size was also too small (eta squared = 0.32). The means and deviations we derived from SPSS were signalizing for a slight advantage of Regular Online Purchasers in comparison with Non Regular Online Purchasers (28.67/30.39), but still from these numbers it cannot conclude that Regular Online Purchasers that are using Internet on a regular base are more positive toward the presence of a certain brand there than Non Regular Online Purchasers. So Hypotheses 3 leaves a gap for future thinking and research, the question with the engagement of the people in Internet activities in regards to brand is clearer.

It was found out statistically more significant main effect for Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers [F (1.439) =18.01, p = .006], and the size effect was bigger this time (eta squared = 0.76). The means and deviations show value for Regular Online Purchasers group (M=28.7, SD=7.4) and for the non-Regular Online Purchasers group (M=33.7, SD=5.7). From those numbers we can conclude that non Regular Online Purchasers that are spending more time on Internet in regards to any brand are more positive toward it. This makes hypothesis 4 irrelevant and it can be rejected. The main effect for the next variable – Internet importance didn't have that much statistical significance as the engagement in Internet activities in regards to brands, but the results were also of great importance. Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers independent variable had indicators as follow [F (1.141) =14.7, p = .031], where the size of the effect, represented by the eta squared was equal to 0.15.

Table 5-Mean and Standard Deviation of Internet Importance and Experience,Dependent Variable: Brand Attitude

Regular Online Purchasers		II			Experience	
Non- Regular Online Purchasers		Mean	SD		Mean	SD
Regular Online Purchasers	Not important at all	27.3	9.3	Every day/More than 1h/regular coffee	33.7	7.3
Non- Regular Online Purchasers		32.0	14.8		28.6	5.7
Total		30.4	10.8		31.9	7.0
Regular Online Purchasers	Not important	30.8	9.1	Once a week/30m-1h/exclusive coffee	29.9	6.1
Non- Regular Online Purchasers		30.9	7.2		33.8	4.8
Total		30.8	8.1		26.7	9.4
Regular Online Purchasers	Not that important	27.7	7.2	Once a month/15m-30m/coffee +	27.6	9.6
Non- Regular Online Purchasers		34.6	5.3		35.5	8.0
Total		29.7	7.4		30.0	7.6
Regular Online Purchasers	Important	28.2	7.4	Less often/less than 15min/1-2 products + takeaway	26.3	9.3
Non- Regular Online Purchasers		33.2	4.4		31.2	8.5

Total		29.8	6.9		29.3	7.8
Regular Online Purchasers	Very important	30.3	6.9	Never/Coffee to go	27.2	5.1
Non- Regular Online Purchasers		35.9	6.6		28.2	6.9
Total		32.4	7.2		34.2	8.2
Regular Online Purchasers	Total	28.6	7.3	Total	27.6	6.3
Non- Regular Online Purchasers		33.7	5.7		34.7	6.1
Total		30.3	7.2		31.3	8.2

Table 5 shows quite a difference between the values for the two groups, Investigating the above numbers, the results for the 2 groups, where Regular Online Purchasers reached values (M=35.9, SD=6.6), and Non Regular Online Purchasers (M=30.3, SD=6.9). It means that the Regular Online Purchasers group reported more positive attitude as influenced by the Internet than the Non-Regular Online Purchasers group. Hence hypothesis 6 is supported. The independent variable "Experience" was transformed and then computed, where new categories were created. For our analyses we are interested in the first category, which describes people that spend more time and go more often. It was found out relatively high main effect [F (1.484) =16.23, p = .014], but eta squared show little difference between the independent groups. For supporting our hypothesis there need , again for the two groups the indicators for means and standard deviations were taken into account, respectively Regular Online Purchasers (M=33.7, SD=7.3) and Non Regular Online Purchasers (M=28.6, SD 5.7). The more often Regular Online Purchasers have experience with a certain brand and the more time they spent at any location; the more positive they are toward that brand. In comparison with Non Regular Online Purchasers that also are more positive, experiencing the pleasures of using and interacting with certain brand, Regular Online Purchasers show greater positivity. Hence Hypothesis 5 is supported.

Table 6-Association Groups Mean and Standard Deviation

	Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers	Mean	SD
Convenient Ambience	Regular Online Purchasers	32.8	2.9
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	29.2	7.8
Quality Food	Regular Online Purchasers	33.3	7.1
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	29.1	5.9
Prestige	Regular Online Purchasers	38.7	5.1
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	28.2	7.5

For the indicators of variable associations three groups were taken into account the first three groups of associations, where Group 1: Convenient Ambience, Group 2: Quality Food, Group3: Prestige represented the positive associations made by the respondents. This step was made for the seventh hypothesis.

Table 7-Mean and Standard Deviation of Associations, Dependent Variable: Brand Attitude

Associations	Regular Online Purchasers / Non- Regular Online Purchasers	Mean	SD
Convenient Ambience	Regular Online Purchasers	29.2	7.8
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	32.8	2.9
	Total	30.5	6.6
Quality Food	Regular Online Purchasers	29.1	5.9
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.3	7.1
	Total	30.7	6.6
Prestige	Regular Online Purchasers	28.2	7.5
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	38.1	5.1
	Total	31.2	8.1
Expensiveness	Regular Online Purchasers	28.3	6.3
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.7	5.2
	Total	30.0	6.4
Commercialized /Overestimated brand	Regular Online Purchasers	27.8	9.8
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	35.0	7.2
	Total	29.4	9.7
Total	Regular Online Purchasers	28.6	7.3
	Non- Regular Online Purchasers	33.7	5.7
	Total	30.3	7.2

It was found out a statistically significant main effect for Regular Online Purchasers /Non Regular Online Purchasers [F (1.141) =17.64, p = 0.00], the effect size was also of a great relevance (eta squared = 0.14). This effect reaches again a statistical significance with high values and from the correlations analyses it was found out that associations and brand attitude correlate in negative direction. That means positive associations – positive attitude, because of the fact that all the positive attitudes were coded as the highest numbers, respectively (1 –strongly disagree, 5- strongly agree), and the associations were coded as follows, for all the positive associations mentioned above means of the Regular Online Purchasers are higher than the means of the Non Regular Online Purchasers (from table 7), which proves Hypothesis 7.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this paper is to investigate how effective can be internet in the creation of brand attitude, analyzed through the online booking of movie tickets and its influence on the different users and brand supporters. The results expectantly showed that people can have positive as well as negative attitude toward a certain brand and even sometimes no attitude at all. The analyses show that brand attitude is to a very high degree related with 5 of the independent variables – awareness, associations, engagement in Internet activities in general, in regard to any brands and last but not least experience people get when interacting with the brand. All the correlations were negative but that fact is logic consequence, where the values for all independent variables were the other way around. The assumption that Regular Online Purchasers that are longer aware with a certain brand hold more positive attitude toward it is rejected by the results. Actually it was found out that non Regular Online Purchasers that are also aware of the brand hold more positive attitude than the Regular Online Purchasers in general, it means that Internet is more effective for those who are less interested in a certain brand than those who constantly trace its development. The results also show that the longer Regular Online Purchasers use, interact and render great importance on Internet the more positive they are toward that brand. An important part of the brand attitude formation takes the brand associations, it was hypothesized that the more positive associations the more positive attitude and this hypothesis is supported by the results. Regular Online Purchasers are more positive in their associations than Non Regular Online Purchasers. Unfortunately, the engagement in Internet activities in general and in regards to any brand, in our case hasn't been supported well enough. The results were unclear and the values too small in order to be considered as significant. Experience is a factor that plays an important and key role for the brand attitude formation and when people visit given location more often and spend more time there, then they will be way more positive toward the brand which location they visited wherein the results supported. Overall the present paper demonstrates that Internet is gaining popularity in contemporary society. People and especially companies become more successful in their attempts to influence the different users via Internet and social networks in particular. The usage, engagement, experience, associations and awareness lead to positive brand attitude – for some users in a high degree for some in not that high degree.

7. WORKS CITED

Berthon, P. P. (2008). When customers vreate adds. California Mangement Review, 6-30.

Chenong, H. &. (2008). Consumer reliance on product information and recommendations found in UGC. Journal of Inetractive advertising , 1-29.

Jacobson, A. D. (2001). The value relevance of brand attitude in high technology markets . Journal of marketing research, 485-493.

Kaplan, A. a. (2010). Users of the world unite! the challenges and opportunities of social media. Business Horizons , 59-68.

Keller, K. (2001). Building Customer- Based brand Equity . Marketing Management, 14-19.

Trusov, M. B. (2009). Effects of word of mouth versus traditional marketing: findings from an internet social networking site . Journal of marketing , 90-102.

8. REFERENCES:

[1] Aaker David A. and Robert Jacobson (2001), "The Value Relevance of Brand Attitude in High Technology Markets," Journal of Marketing Research, 38(4), 485-493

[2] Auriat, N., & Saniscalco, M. (2005). Quantitative research methods in educational planning. International Institute for Educational Planning.

[3] Barwise, P., & Meehan, S. (2010). The One Thing You Must Get Right When Building a Brand December, Harvard Business Review.

[4] Bertilsson, J. (2009). The way brands work – consumers' understanding of the creation and usage of brands. Lund Business Press, Lund

[5] Blackshaw, P., and M. Nazzaro. 2006. Consumer-generated media (CGM) 101 word-of mouth in the age of the Web-fortified consumer. 2nd ed. New York

[6] Blakeman, K., & Brown, S. (2010). Social Media: Essential for Research, Marketing and Branding (October/November ed., Vol. 37). Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science and Technology

[7] Buzz Metrics, Inc. Carlsson, J. (2010). An Assessment of Social Media Business Models and Strategic Implications for Future Implementation. University of Oxford Business School.

[8] Chen, Y., & Wang, Q. (2011). The Role of Marketing in Social Media: How Online Consumer Reviews Evolve, Journal of Interactive Marketing 25 (2011) 85–94

[9] Dew, L., & Kwon, W.-S. (2009). Exploration of apparel brand knowledge: Brand awareness, brand association, and brand category structure. Clothing and Textiles Research Journal

[10] Edelman, D. C. (2010). Branding in The Digital Age You're Spending Your Money In All the Wrong Places December, Harvard Business Review.

[11] Erkan Akar & Birol Topçu (2011): An Examination of the Factors Influencing Consumers' Attitudes Toward Social Media Marketing, Journal of Internet Commerce, 10:1, 35-67

[12] Flagler, R. (2011). Are you social? Marketing your business with Facebook and Twitter; July, The New York Amsterdam News.

[13] Guosong Shao, (2008) "Understanding the appeal of user-generated media: a uses and gratification perspective", Internet Research, Vol. 19 Iss: 1, pp.7 - 25

[14] Homburg, C., Klarman, M., & Schmitt, J. (2009). Brand awareness in business markets: When is it related to firm's performance? Mannheim: Institute for market oriented management.

[15] Kotler, P., Keller K. (2006) "Marketing Management"; Pearson Prentice Hall, 12th edition Lake, Laura (2009). Why Word – of- Mouth Marketing?

[16] McDonald, E., & Sharp, B. (2003). Management Perceptions of the Importance of Brand Awareness as an Indication of Advertising Effectiveness, Marketing Bulletin, 14th edition

[17] Percy, L. (2008). Strategic Integrated Marketing Communication. Oxford: Elsevier.

[18] Raman, N. K. (2009). Building a bank's brand equity through social media

[19] Rust, R. T., Zeithaml, V. A., & Lemon, K. N. (2000). Driving customer equity. New York, NY: Free Press.

[20] Saunders, M., Lewis, P and Thornhill, A.(2009). Research methods for business students 5th edition. Prentice Hall: Edinburgh Gate

[21] Wang, Xuehua and Yang, Zhilin(2010) The Effect of Brand Credibility on Consumers Brand Purchase Intention in Emerging Economies: The Moderating Role of Brand Awareness and Brand Image, Journal of Global Marketing, 177 — 188