Customer style inventory, the usage of Facebook, and purchase intention: are they connected?
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Abstract

This study investigates the influence of price, brand, and novelty consciousness of customer style inventory (CSI) on purchase intention of shoes using Facebook. The involvement of opinion seeking using electronic word of mouth (eWOM) and attitude towards social online shopping as mediators of relationship between CSI and purchase intention is also tested. Purposive sampling method was employed, and respondents mainly are residents of the city of Jakarta and Bekasi. The study reveals that brand, price and novelty consciousness influence the opinions seeking through eWOM and attitudes towards online social shopping, which ultimately influence purchase intention of shoes product via Facebook. However, brand consciousness of shoes only plays small role on opinions seeking. Individual with brand consciousness of shoes reduces opinion seeking through eWOM in Facebook. While, price and novelty of shoes might become point of attention while consumers using Facebook.
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Introduction

The study of the Indonesian Internet Service Providers Association (APJII) in cooperation with the University of Indonesia (UI) shows an increase in the internet use in Indonesia from 24.23% in 2012 to 34.4% in 2014 (Central Bureau of Statistics & Creative Economy Agency of Indonesia, 2017). In addition, the growth of social media users in Indonesia is ranked third in the world with the growth rate of 23% (Creative Economy Agency of Indonesia, 2018; Hootsuite, 2018). The use of social media drives people to perform online social shopping that constitutes a combination of shopping activities and social networking through social media (Wang, 2009). Within the context of online social shopping, consumers can find the most appropriate products, obtain suggestions from consumers/other people, buy products, recommend products, give comments and photos, and create an
online social shopping community (Shen, 2008). Shopping activities through social media put an emphasis on the networking and social interactions with fellow members and online social shopping communities (Kang et al., 2014). As an example, Facebook provides a space for the third parties to reach a greater number of potential consumers (Cha, 2009). The number and size of the online social shopping communities are increasing rapidly (Kang et al., 2014; Nanehkaran, 2013). As the social media adoption continues to increase, retailers and consumers make the social media as a marketing medium (Cha, 2009).

Social media function has advanced from previously used as tools to build social interaction among people with similar interests to become powerful tool for marketing and promotion (Jarvenpaa & Todd, 1996; Jarvenpaa et al., 2000). Social Networking Sites (SNS) or generally known as social media are sites that enables users to make personal account with personal profile and contact list that can be shared in a social network. Account holders could access other accounts and its list of contacts to share information (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). These features then accommodate interactions not only for social networking but also for social trading. The activities include promotion, sharing on product description, information gathering and posting, chatting and marketing closing transactions between retailers and consumers (Cha, 2009; Stephen & Toubia, 2010; Vinerean et al., 2013). Social media give access to retailers and direct consumers, whether it is business-to-consumer or consumer-to-consumer, to create two-way interaction directly (Bashar et al., 2012; Devendra & Farooqi, 2012; Nambisan, 2002). This method has been proven effective and efficient in accommodating individuals in meeting what they need.

In the era of social commerce, individual shares their knowledge, experience, and information about products and services among people in their immediate surrounding or their close peers (Chen et al., 2009; Rachbini, 2017; 2018). From the shopping activities in social media, some people came up with a new term, Social Commerce (S-Commerce) that is a part of the E-Commerce. Yahoo initially popularized s-Commerce in the year 2005 for online shopping through social media, in which the users could share advice and information about a particular product (Barnes, 2014).

Kang et al., (2014) reveal that social media also has a function as the place to share information and opinion about products/brands among fellow consumers. This in turn can affect the purchase behavior toward a particular product. S-Commerce makes consumers easier to get information from their friends or from unknown individuals. This affects the consumer purchase intention for particular product or service (Goldsmith & Horowitz, 2006; Hajli, 2015; Laroche et al., 1996). Therefore, another new term came up, namely electronic words of mouth (eWOM). It means positive or negative statements from potential consumer or previous customers in relation to a particular product or company. And those statements are open to be accessed by anybody via internet (Hennig-Thurau, et al., 2004).

In Indonesia context, currently, there is a few studies that investigates CSI and link it to online social shopping using SNS. Most studies tend to investigate the usage of social media as marketing and the usage impact on brand equity and purchase intention. Extending Kang et al., (2014) study, this study investigates the intention of Indonesian consumers to social shop online for apparel (i.e. shoes product) using SNS (i.e. Facebook) and its relationship to decision making style as measured by the SCI. The dimensions of the CSI consist of price consciousness, novelty consciousness, and brand consciousness. In previous study conducted by Kang et al., (2014), these dimensions empirically tested and shows significant influence on opinion seeking through eWOM and on the behavior of social online shopping. This ultimately will affect the consumer purchase intention via social network/social media. Furthermore, this study also investigates whether opinion seeking using eWOM and attitudes playing roles as mediators in the linkage between decision-making styles and intention to shop online for shoes product using Facebook.
Literature Review

Consumer Style Inventory (CSI)

Basic foundation in this study is concept of consumers’ decision process, that commonly consists of four stages that the consumers should go through (Blackwell et al., 2006; Hafstrom et al., 1992; Kotler & Armstrong, 2018). The buying process begins with the identification of need and it can be triggered by internal or external stimuli. Second stage is searching for information. Consumers who are interested might searching for further information, or do the opposite, they might not need further information. If the consumers have strong desire and the product is reachable, hence it is possible that the consumers will buy the product. In the third stage, the consumers make alternative evaluation using collected information to evaluate various alternative brands prior purchasing stage. Fourth stage is the purchase decision in which the consumers finally buy their most desired products.

Following Kang’s et al., (2014) work, this study implements the four states of consumers decision making to the context of online social shopping for shoes products using Facebook. The study conducted by Kang et al., (2014) reveals that of eight CIS’ dimensions, only price consciousness, novelty consciousness, and brand consciousness that significantly affect eWOM and the behavior of social online shopping, which ultimately also affect the consumer purchase intention. Therefore, this study only focuses on those three dimensions. CSI represents consumption life style of one individual, and it’s in the stage of needs recognition. The construct of eWOM represents the operationalization on the stage of information search. Next, attitude represents the stage of alternative evaluation. Meanwhile, consumer purchase intention through social media represents the stage of purchase.

Brand Consciousness

Anić et al., (2014) define brand consciousness as a consumer behavior that leads to the orientation toward well known or widely - recognizable brands that have expensive prices. This CSI’s dimension is closely connected to acquiring well-known and very expensive brands. This represents the condition that the consumers believe that the higher price, the better of its quality (Kang, et al., 2014). This type of consumers tend to choose best selling brands and well-advertised brands (Bakewell and Mitchell, 2003). Kang et al., (2014) also describe that online social shopping through social network/social media is capable to provide information and opinions from other consumers concerning the image and reputation of a particular brand.

Cowart & Goldsmith, (2007) in their study reveal that consumers who have brand consciousness tend to go shopping online. Therefore, consumers who are aware about a particular brand, will seek opinion from other consumers in social network/social media, and such consumer attitude is beneficial for performing online social shopping via social network/social media (Brown et al., 2003; Kang et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2011). A study conducted by Mohsenin et al., (2018) show that brand consciousness which has a role in forming the CSI. Previous research also indicate that women tend to choose well-known brands more often than men (Anić et al., 2014). Women are also capable to buy a certain brand with much higher price, and they show stronger involvement to certain brand (Mukherjee et al., 2012). Another study show that older consumers tend to buy products that have existed on the market for longer time (long-established brands) (Paandroa and et al., 2005) and the consumers are also more conscious to a certain brand (Anić et al., 2014). Therefore, two hypotheses related to brand consciousness is proposed:

H1: Brand consciousness positively influence opinion seeking using eWOM via Facebook.
H2: Brand consciousness positively influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook.

Price Consciousness

Anić et al., (2014) reveal that consumers who are categorized as price consciousness, tend to have greater awareness of products with cheaper price. In other words, price consciousness is a decision-
making style that focuses on cheaper prices. Consumers with this kind of style are aware/conscious with discounts (Kang et al., 2014). This kind of consumers have main goal to acquire the best value for each amount of money that they spend (Cowart & Goldsmith, 2007) and they have tendency to compare prices (comparison shoppers) (Kamaruddin & Mokhlis, 2003). Regarding online shopping, price consciousness is the amount of time and money that is spend in shopping for products online (Cowart & Goldsmith, 2007). Several past studies show that consumers who are aware of value/price tend to introduce new brand and products to other consumers, and they inquire/request information from other people regarding such products (Kim & Eastin, 2012; Mowen et al., 2007). Women are more sensitive towards prices compared to men (Anić et al., 2014). Past studies also showed that younger consumers are more prudent compared to elderly consumers (Zeithaml, 1985).

Dennis et al., (2010) discover that consumers who are capable in taking full advantage of the acquired benefit could possess the capability to make price comparisons and discounts from social shopping websites. Kang et al., (2014) reveal that consumers with price consciousness will seek opinions from other consumers in the social network/social media. This action is intended to ensure them that they get the best value for money and it forms positive attitude toward online social shopping using the social network/social media (Kang, 2013). Therefore, two hypotheses on price consciousness can be proposed:

H3: Price consciousness positively influence opinion seeking using eWOM via Facebook.
H4: Price consciousness positively influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook.

Novelty Consciousness

Novelty consciousness is a decision-making style that reflects a tendency to stay relevant with current, latest trend and fashion (Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003). Sproles & Kendall (1986) define novelty consciousness as a condition in which the consumers are more interested with new products and they are always up to date with latest trend/style. Searching various information is one of the important aspects for consumers who are conscious with new trend or fashion (Kamaruddin & Mokhlis, 2003). Previous studies show that older consumers or pensioners do not have novelty consciousness behavior, because they tend to choose their usual routine, preferring long-established brands, and they are not keen in exploring new products (Cole et al., 2008). In the mean time, the higher education level of the consumers, the bigger their novelty consciousness (Kumar & Sarangi, 2008). Online social shopping utilizes shopping activities via social network/social media that provide information on current, relevant trend/styles as well as opinions and comments from other consumers. This may indicates the consumers’ acceptance on a new product (Kang et al., 2014). Previous studies show that consumers who like to get new experience tend to gather information from other people about sales or discounts (Mowen et al., 2007; Morwitz et al., 2007; Muruganathan & Bhakat, 2013). and they also have positive attitude towards online shopping (Wang et al., 2004). By contrast, findings from previous studies also indicate that income of an individual has positive effect consumer’s novelty consciousness (Anić et al., 2014). Consequently, consumers whose style of decision making is novelty consciousness will search others’ opinions from social network/social media, and they also have positive attitude towards online shopping via social network/social media. Therefore, two hypotheses related to novelty consciousness are formulated:

H5: Novelty consciousness positively influence opinion seeking using eWOM via Facebook.
H6: Novelty consciousness positively influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook.

Opinion Seeking Using E-WoM

Social media and have brought significant influence to the world of marketing. Many firms have shifted their perspective from one-way communication to interactive in mintaining consumers’
involvement on products. In addition, the presence of social media enables consumers become a product’ agents by promoting it in their circle and sharing their experiences in their personal account (Delafrooz et al., 2009). Individuals information sharing or comment about a product via social media able to inform and influence other consumers. Current technology shows positive trend of online media, smartphones, social media, and internet development. All these have changed the way people connect to each other.

Such phenomenon also greatly affects the efforts to make the company and the brand keep connected to their customers, and how the costumers are connected to other costumers. It also affects the attitude towards a certain brand. Social media provides an online platform where people can share important information and stay connected with others, and they can share moments on their lives (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018). The influence from online interpersonal or eWOM is important aspect in online trading (Goldsmith & Horowitz, 2006). In communicating product and brand, opinion seekers find an opportunity to produce or strengthen their connection to a group of people and they’re implicitly open for normative influence (Bertrandias & Goldsmith, 2006). If the action of seeking opinion can fulfill the need to increase the options of products and to reduce experienced risks, then eWOM can also become socialization process (Goldsmith and Horowitz, 2006).

Meanwhile, Senecal & Nantel (2004) discover that consumers who consult for advice online, would be twice more likely to choose the recommended product. As such, other researchers have found that consumers who give and search for opinion online with similar methods that they use conventionally offline would influence the sales of product and service (Goldsmith & Horowitz, 2006). Yun (2011) state that consumers who perform online social shopping and share their opinion/comment tend to use sites of social network/social media to search for information. Kang et al., (2014) state that opinion seekers will relate their positive attitude and their intention to do online social shopping by using sites of social network.

On the other hand, Kotler & Kartajaya (2017) reveal that consumers become determined to buy a product after they are influenced by several factors such as marketing communication, opinion from friends or family, and personal knowledge, and attitude, based on past experience, towards a certain product. Consumers make their choice or take a decision by following what many people have chosen. This situation is further strengthened by the consumer’s lack of trust for product advertisment and their limited time to compare prices and qualities (Esmaeili et al., 2015). However, people may feel more comfortable by taking advice from others, in this case eWOM is able to increase consumer purchase intention (Cheung & Thadani, 2010; Fan et al., 2013). Therefore, the following hypotheses can be formulated:

**H7** Opinion seeking using eWOM positively influence purchase intention using online social shopping (Facebook).

**H8** Opinion seeking using eWOM positively influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook.

**Attitude Towards Online Social Shopping**

Attitude is a determinant that strongly influences intention behavior and it plays crucial role in shaping behavior intention of an individual (Eagly & Chaiken, 2007; Fan et al., 1997; Kang et al., 2014; Shwu-Iing Wu, 2003; Venkatesh, 2000). Seock & Norton (2007) argue that an individual’s attitude towards his/her favorit product site is proven to affect the intention of the individual, not only to search for information in that site, but also to buy product online. Manzano et al., (2009), Jun & Jaafar (2011), and Mariani et al., (2010) also have similar view that the attitude towards mobile commerce is a determinant that can influence someone’s intention to do shopping via mobile technology. Hence, a hypothesis related to attitude towards online social shopping can be formulated:

**H9** Attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook positively influence purchase intention of shoes product via Facebook.
Theoretical Framework

Figure 1 presents the proposed theoretical framework of this study. All hypotheses proposed are also displayed in the figure 1.
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Source: Adapted from Kang et al., (2014)

**Figure 1. Proposed Theoretical Framework**

**Methods**

**Data and Sampling**

Data collection used in this study is non-probability sampling approach by employing purposive sampling as the method to collect data. This sampling method is implemented to individuals who able provide information and having several criteria created by the researchers. Hence, the design of this sampling termed as purposive sampling (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Sekaran & Bougie, 2016; Vellido, 2000). Several criteria of surveyed respondents are as follows: 1) Not having buying experiences of shoes product via Facebook, b) Having active personal Facebook account.

**Research Questionnaire**

Indicators used in this study are adapted from the previous study conducted by Kang et al., (2014). The four main variables consist of price consciousness, novelty consciousness, brand consciousness, and the intention to purchase shoes product via Facebook. Each variable consists of four indicators/items. While, the rest of variables i.e. opinion seeking using eWOM and the attitude towards online social shopping, each has six indicators/items. All indicators were tested and proven valid and reliable in the previous study using confirmatory factor analysis test. Self-administered questionnaire questionnaires were distributed directly to 230 respondents in the City of Jakarta and Bekasi. Of 230 questionnaires, 207 were returned and analyzed in this study.

**Result and Discussion**

**Respondents Characteristic**

Respondents in the study are dominated by millennials with the age range 18 – 14 years old (44.2%) and 26 – 34 years old (55.8%). All respondents not having experiences buying shoes product via Facebook, having active personal Facebook, and using it on daily basis. Educational background of respondents is dominated by bachelor degree (91.5%), while the rest of them graduated from diploma (8.5%). In terms of gender, female respondents are outnumbered male respondents 51.7% versus 48.3%.
Evaluation of Research Model

The result from confirmatory factor analysis test (CFA) show that the model of this study have acceptable construct validity and reliability, and it indicated a good fit model, in which all indicators used to measure each variable have been proven valid with factor loading higher than 0.60. Good fit model can be seen from CFI value = 0.98, NNFI = 0.98, $\chi^2 = 645.39$ with 338 df, $\chi^2$/df = 1.91, and RMSEA = 0.048. The result also shows that the model in this study is qualified to be used. Table 1 shows that the value of convergent validity which is supported if construct reliability on each variable has value more than 0.70, and the variance extracted for each variable is more than 0.50 (Hair et al., 2010).

### Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test Result

| Construct/Variable* | Indicator | Factor Loading | Construct’s Reliability | Variance Extracted |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Brand consciousness | BC1       | 0.78           |                         | 0.575              |
|                     | BC2       | 0.76           | 0.845                   |                    |
|                     | BC3       | 0.83           |                         |                    |
|                     | BC4       | 0.66           |                         |                    |
| Price consciousness | PC1       | 0.76           |                         | 0.550              |
|                     | PC2       | 0.82           | 0.844                   |                    |
|                     | PC3       | 0.72           |                         |                    |
|                     | PC4       | 0.73           |                         |                    |
| Novelty consciousness | NC1     | 0.81           |                         | 0.550              |
|                     | NC2       | 0.68           |                         |                    |
|                     | NC3       | 0.71           | 0.830                   |                    |
|                     | NC4       | 0.76           |                         |                    |
| Opinion seeking using E-WoM | eWOM1 | 0.77           |                         | 0.576              |
|                     | eWOM2 | 0.76           |                         |                    |
|                     | eWOM3 | 0.73           |                         |                    |
|                     | eWOM4 | 0.75           |                         |                    |
|                     | eWOM5 | 0.74           |                         |                    |
|                     | eWOM6 | 0.80           |                         |                    |
| Attitude towards online social shopping via social network site /social media | A1     | 0.81           |                         | 0.538              |
|                     | A2     | 0.73           |                         |                    |
|                     | A3     | 0.76           |                         |                    |
|                     | A4     | 0.76           | 0.874                   |                    |
|                     | A5     | 0.66           |                         |                    |
|                     | A6     | 0.67           |                         |                    |
| Intention to make purchase via social network site /social media | I1     | 0.75           |                         | 0.554              |
|                     | I2     | 0.66           |                         |                    |
|                     | I3     | 0.75           | 0.832                   |                    |
|                     | I4     | 0.81           |                         |                    |

*All constructs use 5-point Likert-type scale, from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree)

Research Hypothesis

The analysis using structural equation model (SEM) by using LISREL show that price consciousness ($t = 3.30$, $p < 0.05$) and novelty consciousness ($t = 4.72$, $p < 0.05$) positively and significantly influence opinion seeking using eWOM via Facebook. Inline with such results, brand consciousness ($t=3.56$, $p<0.05$), price consciousness ($t=5.35$, $p<0.05$), and novelty consciousness ($t=6.61$, $p<0.05$) positively and significantly affect online social shopping via Facebook. Next, opinion seeking using eWOM positively influence purchase intention ($t=5.24$, $p<0.05$) and attitude toward online social shopping via Facebook ($t=2.92$, $p<0.05$). Lastly, attitude towards online social shopping (Facebook)
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(t = 3.02, p < 0.05) has positive influence on purchase intention via Facebook. The figure 2 shows the study model including statistical outputs.

![Figure 2. Study Model and Statistical Outputs](image)

**Table 2. Results of Hypothesis Test**

| Hypotheses                                                                 | Coeff. Regression | t-value | Decision |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|
| H1  Brand consciousness positively influence opinion seeking using eWOM via Facebook. | -0.02             | -0.023  | Rejected |
| H2  Brand consciousness positively influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook. | 0.20              | 3.56    | Accepted |
| H3  Price consciousness positively influence opinion seeking using eWOM via Facebook. | 0.24              | 3.30    | Accepted |
| H4  Price consciousness positively influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook. | 0.27              | 5.35    | Accepted |
| H5  Novelty consciousness positively influence opinion seeking using eWOM via Facebook. | 0.40              | 4.72    | Accepted |
| H6  Novelty consciousness positively influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook. | 0.41              | 6.61    | Accepted |
| H7  Opinion seeking using eWOM positively influence purchase intention using online social shopping (Facebook). | 0.23              | 5.24    | Accepted |
| H8  Opinion seeking using eWOM positive influence the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook. | 0.24              | 2.92    | Accepted |
| H9  Attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook positively influence purchase intention of shoes product via Facebook. | 0.22              | 3.02    | Accepted |
Discussion and Conclusion

The finding from this study shows that consumer style inventory that consists of brand consciousness, price consciousness, and novelty consciousness play important role in influencing opinion seeking through eWOM and attitude towards online social shopping by using Facebook. However there is an exception, brand consciousness shows no positive impact on opinion seeking through eWOM. A possible explanation is that consumers with this style of decision making tend to choose brands that have been widely advertised in paid advertisement, and they tend to choose best selling products or brands (Goh et al., 2012; Kamaruddin & Mokhlis, 2003; Mokhlis, 2009). This may indicate that the consumers that high level of brand consciousness do not consider or utilize opinion seeking through eWOM. Consumers with such characteristic believe that the more expensive and famous of a product, the better its quality will be (Lysonski et al., 1996; Sproles, 1985; Sproles & Kendall, 1986). By contrast, consumers with high level of brand consciousness has positive attitude towards online social shopping (Facebook). This finding supports the previous study conducted by Kang et al. (2014).

Consumers that display price consciousness tend to search and acquire the best price of a product (Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003). Therefore, in the digital era, many consumers do online research and seek opinion from others prior buying a product. Four out of five internet users use smartphones to go shopping, to search product information using mobile websites or mobile applications, to read online product reviews, to look for and to trade in coupons, and others. Nearly 30 % of online purchase are done using cellular gadgets. Sales through mobile devices also has increased significantly 2.6 times as fast as online total sales (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018). Buying activities of shoes product using Facebook is favorable and regarded positive by the respondents of this study. Previous studies also proved that the majority of consumers nowadays believe more in the “f” factor (families, friends, Facebook fans, Twitter followers) compared to the marketing communication conducted by the firms (Kotler & Kartajaya, 2017).

Consumers who display high level of novelty consciousness toward the newest model generally will seek information about new product in the internet, therefore they will response positively towards opinion seeking through eWOM in social media (Bakewell and Mitchell, 2003; Trusov et al., 2009). Consumers with this kind of characteristic tend to be fond of new products or latest innovations, therefore they eager to look for any new products offered by the firms. This characteristic is driven by their desire to be always up-to-date, or in other words they want to be always relevant with the latest style or trend (Cowart & Goldsmith, 2007). This finding is consistent with the study conducted by Kang et al., (2014) which reveal that the consumers who have desire to update information on trend in the world of fashion in order to adopt latest style and update their looks. Consumers prefer asking their friends and family to get honest opinion about a particular brand. When they hear some new information about a brand, the consumers would clarify the news by discussing it with some reliable friends in their community (Kotler & Kertajaya, 2017). Comments from social media help the consumers to confirm their decision in choosing fashion, and to assert that their attitude which they take will be accepted or even followed by other people (Kang et al., 2014).

Opinion seeking through eWOM and the attitude towards online social shopping using Facebook is proven to play a key role as mediators that connects consumer style inventory with the intention to buy shoes via Facebook. Kotler & Kartajaya, (2017) reveal that the consumers or customers nowadays make their decisions based on the public suggestion i.e. product that is chosen by many people. This is because there is a lack of trust from the consumers towards advertisement and they do not enough time to compare prices and qualities of various products (Meskaran et al., 2013). Therefore, accepting advice from other people is very beneficial for the consumers. eWOM keeps growing and influencing their final decision to make purchase (Lin et al., 2013).

Consumer style inventory with its dimensions: price consciousness, brand consciousness, and novelty consciousness have important role in influencing opinion seeking through eWOM and
the attitude towards online social shopping via Facebook. This ultimately will stimulate the intention to buy shoes product via Facebook. This should be a major focus for marketing managers to understand more comprehensively about social online shopping and consumer style inventory. To attract the attention of consumers who are categorized into price consciousness, the firms should sell the products with competitive prices. Moreover, the research department has to conduct surveys routinely and continuously to understand the behavior pattern of the consumers in a certain period of time, so that the company is able to identify when the price should be reduced, and when it should be increased, by referring to that pattern. In addition, communication in marketing for shoes product should always present the budget price or discount. This because price sensitivity plays a role in influencing or determining consumer’s decision.

To attract consumers possessing brand consciousness, the brand or product should have specific characteristics that are associated with public figure whose traits are capable to represent such brand or product accurately. One of the tactical programs concerning this matter is utilizing celebrity endorsement and content marketing by using the firms’ fan page, especially on social media. Postings uploaded by public figures on the Facebook fan page could increase brand awareness and create brand image which is associated to the selected public figures. This condition could influence the consumers behavior on social online shopping, increase positive eWOM among consumers in social media, and surely can create user-generated content, as explained by Kang et al., (2014).

In the meantime, to attract the attention of consumers with decision-making style of novelty consciousness, the company should give more attention and allocate higher budget for research and development (Park & Gretzel, 2010). Therefore, the top management could find out market preference, latest trend, current needs of the consumers, characteristics, consumer social shopping behaviors that can be classified based on age, educational background, monthly income, social status, most-visited social networking sites, and other classification (Tanksale et al., 2013). This action is very beneficial, and it aims to be a point of consideration for the company to make decision, also to encourage product or service innovation, which is relevant to consumers’ needs at this current age.

This study has limitations that need to be addressed hence could serve as the focus for future studies. First, this study focused on the respondents who had never bought shoes via social media and have active personal account social media. A future study that compares consumers having and not having experiences buying shoes product via social media will be interesting. Second, respondents involved in this study only consumers possessing Facebook. Hence, it is advisable that next studies to conduct analysis on consumers having other social media such as Instagram, Twitter, LinkedIn, or others. The third limitation is that the research used cross-sectional study. For future studies, it is highly advisable to use longitudinal study approach in order to portray the dynamic of online consumer behavior.
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