

Consumer behaviors: a research to measure purchase-intended decision-making processes of the students in Marmara University

Şeyda Akyol

Department of Public Relations and Publicity
Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey

Keywords

Consumer behaviour, decision making process, purchase behaviour

Abstract

As an outcome of the increased popularity of consumption culture, daily life in modern age has now been shaped in line with consumption. Consumer choices and dispositions change frequently and the value of consumers is rising each new day for both the organizations and brands alike. In modern-age markets that witness a harsh competition, it has now become a major task for marketing staff to identify the needs and wills of consumers and to discover what they purchase; at what time; from which place; in which manner. In order for the organizations to develop consumer-focused marketing strategies and distinguish among their competitors, they are required to have comprehensive awareness on the new consumer mass possessing a sizeable variety of needs and wills. There are a range of factors affecting purchase decisions of consumers. Within this framework this study is geared to detecting the factors effective on consumer behaviors.

In parallel with the rapid developments in technology, communication sector managed to keep up with this advancement and the rapid development, particularly in mobile communication or mobile phone sector, has led to a proliferation in the quantity of operating companies.

The purpose of this study is to determine the factors affecting mobile-phone purchase behaviors of university students. To conduct this research survey method has been the applied as a data collection method. Present study has been limited with graduate and undergraduate students in Marmara University. To reach research objectives face-to-face interviews have been held among Marmara University students. Data collected in these interviews have been statistically interpreted via SPSS program and obtained results have been presented in this study.

Introduction

In an attempt to illuminate the causes behind purchase decisions of consumers a myriad of disciplines such as neurology, sociology and cognitive sciences are utilized. It can thus become feasible to demonstrate the functioning of consumer mind and studies are conducted on what to buy from where and in which way and on what purpose. 95% of the thinking process takes place in the subconscious mind (Zaltman, trans.: A. Semih Koç, 2004). A word or image filtered from one part of the brain triggers a specific point in the mental network which in effect enables reminiscing a specific moment, word, message of an image and even a particular brand (Sutherland, Max, Slyvester Alice K., trans.: İnci Berna Kalınyazgan, 2000:359-360).

In connection with the recent advancements in technology and economy, rise in mass production, materialization of social values and increased expansion of consumption culture have led to the practice of daily life around consumption culture. Consumption has now become a component of culture. Consumer behaviors attempt to shed light on the decision-making process that involves why, how and when individuals meet their personal needs. In this process the person's perceptions, motives, character and attitudes play active roles. To put this differently consumer behaviors emerge as a consequence of marketing components, socio-economic and socio-cultural factors. It has been aimed to analyze the complex behaviors of consumers or purchase-intended decision making processes and levels.

One research has been conducted to investigate brand loyalty as sign of status in mobile phone purchase behaviors of university students.

Mobile phone purchase behavior is indicative of status loyalty which translates to brand loyalty. Prepared within the framework of field study titled as "Factors influencing mobile phone purchase behaviors of university youngsters", present questionnaire utilized closed-end and Likert scale questions to manifest the conditions that students give priority in purchasing mobile phones.

Consumer Behavior Concept

Consumer behaviors relate to the analysis of the entire set of processes relevant of individual or group-based selections, purchases, uses and the eventual disposal of certain products, services, opinions or experiences so as to fulfill the users' personal needs and wills (Solomon, Second Edition). As an interdisciplinary research domain, Consumer Behavior focuses on consumption-directed activities of individuals (Hanna, Wozniak, quot. in 2001: Okumuş, 2013: 6). Consumer Behavior, in its generic terminology, corresponds to the behaviors that are performed by individuals or groups in the processes of purchases, uses and the eventual disposal of certain products, services, opinions or activities so as to fulfill the users' personal needs and wills (Solomon, 2011 quot. in: Okumuş, 2013: 6). Consumer behavior is indeed a marketing strategy.

Consumer is the individual purchasing and using a certain product and service. Consumer Behavior is an applied science domain that investigates consumer behaviors in the marketplace and interrogates the root causes of such behaviors. Previous investigation on consumer behaviors equals to collecting the kind of data that can fully fit the projected marketing blend into the needs and wills of consumers. It becomes easier to develop a strategy with the collected data and the probability to achieve desired results is thus heightened. Having insight on consumer behaviors is an inevitable requirement for marketing studies (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015, 16-20) inasmuch as consumers are, in modern age, more powerful than ever before. Presently it is not the companies, brands and products that shape the consumers but rather consumers are the shapers in the presence of modern market conditions. The main reason accounting for this shift of roles is that consumers can now reach information much easily hence it is a must to present achievable and sound promises and discourses. Today consumers can instantly find out other users' comments or opinions on any given product or brand. Consumers are now very much aware of the fact that it is just one click away to share their complaints about a product or service and to raise antipathy among hundreds of thousands of users rather than simply communicating their dissatisfaction to the consumer service departments or authorities. Empowered with this awareness, consumers demand better service or better products. Consumers are quite knowledgeable about the fact that they can apply to simple search engines to check the prices of an identical product manufactured by a different brand (Açikel, Emre, Çelikel, Mehmet, 2nd ed., 2014: 15). In effect modern companies and brands are mandated to take action in line with this reality.

Decision-Making Process of Consumers

In the decision-making process of consumers attitudes also play active role. Attitudes are learned-dispositions that generate an effect such as consistently approaching towards an object or groups of objects with either a positive or a negative stance. Attitudes towards brands are likewise learned-consumer-dispositions that generate an effect as consistently approaching towards a brand with either a positive or a negative stance (Assael, 4th ed., 1992: 194-196). The attitude formed in this manner leads the consumer to make a decision to purchase or not. It is thus the aim of marketers to create among consumers a positive attitude that would eventually lead to purchase behavior.

Each new day consumers repeatedly face situations that force them to make decisions. In fact the decision not to purchase a product is in essence a decision on its own terms. Decision-making act of consumers involves a range of activities that is kicked off on the instance a need is perceived and ensued by set of activities throughout the process. Perceiving a need, or in a different saying,

realization of a need creates a problem that demands solving in terms of the consumers. In the following step the consumer goes through definite stages. Decision-making stages of consumers are broadly classified under five groups: Identification of the problem, searching information, assessing the alternatives, decision-product selection and post-purchase outputs. Identification of the problem: realizing that there is a need to be fulfilled. Searching information: searching the alternatives that can fulfill the specific need. Assessing the alternatives: Assessing the alternatives available to select the best option. Decision-product selection: Deciding to purchase or not; utilizing the selected alternative. Post-purchase outputs: Receiving feedbacks on the company and other consumers' views on the specific product; re-entering decision-making process; ending the process. Based on the satisfaction level of the selected option the last stage may lead to certain changes such as learning, attitude development, loyalty and similar psychological transformations. The positive or negative changes triggered among the consumers at this stage may, in the subsequent stage, affect the probability of consumers to reach analogous decisions provided that a similar scenario for deciding to fulfill similar needs emerges in the future (Okumuş, 2013, 27-28).

A range of models have been developed concerning decision-making processes of consumers. These models are; 1) Problem Solution Model, 2) AIDA (Attention, Interest, Desire, Action) Model, 3) Hierarchy of Effects Model, 4) Innovation Acceptance Model. As these four primary approaches are contrasted it is detected that all models rely on persuasion process and all models entertain cognitive, emotional and behavioral dimensions (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:331-332). In marketing, persuasion is a frequently applied technique and once managed effectively persuasion process is concluded with success.

Consumers attempt to solve their problems under the effect of both internal and external factors. This problem solving process holds a cognitive structure. The foundation of such an approach is founded on the hypothesis that consumer behavior is a problem-solving behavior and consumers, in effect, are the problem solvers or in a different saying the decision makers. Even though decision-making or problem-solving model is quite an effective approach in a wide array of instances consumers are likely to cut this process shorter and skip one or a few of the stages. Actual process is heavily dependent upon behavioral impacts, decision-making approaches and involvement levels (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:333).

Purchase decisions of individuals are affected by the emergent condition. Situational impacts are witnessed on the current behavior that can be observed in a definite time period and place and correspond to all factors that trigger any systematic impact (Quester, Smart, 1998: 220-238 quot. in: Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015: 334). Physical impacts relate to the factors that address to our senses viz. light, smell, air and sounds (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:334).

Social environment points to the presence of third parties that can affect consumer behaviors (Hawkins, Best, Coney, 1998: 481 quot. in: Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:335). Due to environmental impact, certain changes can be observed in behaviors. Social impact may alter changes in the behavior of an individual trying to fit into the expectations of a group. The time that consumers have can also affect purchase behavior much strongly. A consumer who would perform purchase action under time pressure may have limited options in the search for information and assessment of options (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:335-336). It is also feasible to list time-related terms such as day, hour and week that are also effective on purchase behaviors (East, 1997: 246 quot. in: Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:336). The objective and cause of a specific purchase behavior could also affect purchase behavior. The first one relates to whether the purchase is for personal use or for offering as a gift. The second crucial point relates to the setting in which consumption will be made and be actualized (Quester and Smart, 1998: 220-238 quot. in: Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:336-337). Emotional condition manifests itself most effectively in the process of purchasing. Emotional feature of the person affects the stages of collecting and monitoring the information, shopping process and consumption behavior (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:337). Facilitator factors such as the financial

and monetary status of the individual and economy are also the factors that affect purchase decision. Economic effects (wage rises, high interests, price increases etc.) may also affect the type and frequency of shopping in a positive or negative format (Warwick, Mansfield, 2000: 617-626 quot. in: Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:337-338). All these impacts related to decision-making behavior play critical role in the decision-making process of consumers.

In marketing realm, consumer behaviors generically treat decision-making process from an eclectic perspective. This is primarily due to the fact that unlike finance theory, consumer behavior is not solely based on economic motives nor as is argued in psychology, it is primarily the consequences of subjective consumer needs and motives, learning process, personality, perceptions, attitude and faiths; nor as is claimed in sociology, it is essentially the consequences of socio-cultural structure factors such as culture, subculture, social class, reference groups and family. In real life consumer behavior manifests itself as the consequences of the relative marketing attempts executed in line with all the factors above and marketing blend factors of the company and their mutual interactions (Mucuk, 15th ed. 2006: 80).

Consumer behaviors entail a wide scope of decisions. Consumer behavior aims to construe how, when, why, from where, in what quantity and which frequency will the consumers purchase, use, dispose the provided offers or choose not to be involved in any of these processes. Each single process includes in itself a myriad of decisions (Hoyer, Macinnis, 2001 quot. in: Okumuş, 2013: 16). Once a consumer realizes the presence of a need, psychological processes of consumers are kicked off via a decision-making process during which consumers strive hard to find the wherewithal to fulfill their needs. Accompanied with a bunch of decisions this particular process also encompass opinions, emotions and actions (Lake, 2009 quot. in: Okumuş, 2013:16). Provided that all relevant insights on consumer decisions are grasped prior to the construction of any behavior, it can be partially feasible to take behavior under control (Okumuş, 2013:16). Consumer Behaviors is a multidimensional, complex and dynamic process. The entire set of marketing decisions is founded upon the basic hypotheses on consumer behaviors (Khan, 2006 quot. in: Okumuş, 2013: 16).

Levels of Consumers' Decision-Making Processes

Decision-making process of consumers does not necessarily manifest itself in the same level and frequency for each situation and period and many a times it is probable to witness various levels of decision-making process. The specifications and investigation of each level vary greatly. Based on the urgency of the decision to make and the amount of needed information it surfaces that consumers make decisions by harnessing intensive, restricted or routine decision-making alternatives (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:339).

Routine or automatic behavior is characterized with the need for limited information and urgency of the decision. Consumers are attached to one specific brand and they repeatedly purchase the same brand. The criteria for information and assessment are no longer required since past experiences have enabled the sufficient amount of data for decision making. Selection criteria have been forged for limited or problem solving stages and consumers require fewer amounts of time. This instance can come to the stage in the event of promoting a novel brand within an established product group. In the cases of intensive problem solving, creation of a new product, limited information and forging assessment criteria for consumers it becomes feasible to experience this process (Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:340).

Involvement stands for the relationship that any individual builds with a product or a brand. To put this differently the personal importance that an individual attaches to a product unveils involvement. Purchase Involvement, despite the analogies with Product Involvement, still maintains in itself certain divergences. Once consumers move from low involvement level to higher involvement level as regards purchase behavior, purchase decision gains an increasingly complex nature. Once a personal need is discovered an analysis is rendered how much effort to put in order to meet this need consciously or unconsciously. In the event that gathered information is deemed to

be insufficient in terms of amount and content, consumers are resolved to collect information more effectively and conduct further extensive researches. In that case high-involvement purchases that require passing through all purchase-decision stages come to the fore. If, on the other hand, the consumers are in a state to comfortably and easily utilize the information, purchase-decision is of low involvement. In such instances the consumer can directly move to decision-making stage (Stanton, Etzel, Walker, 1995:156 quot. in: Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:342-343).

In the cases of high-involvement the first step is realization ensued by gaining insight and followed by attitude formation based on the collected data. Should the attitude be positive, the consumer skips to the testing stage. In the event that the product tested as an outcome of positive attitude provides satisfaction, the behavior turns into a long-term and repetitive phenomenon of consumption. In the event of low-involvement, process of decision-making once again starts with realization but individuals are not involved in an active effort to collect information hence they are in need of persuasion to test the product by being imposed to constantly repetitive messages. Attitude comes to the fore after testing stage and attachment is forged provided that the quality of product is satisfactory. In the instances of low-involvement, attitude is a crucial factor that enables long-term purchase behavior. In sum involvement is relevant of not the product but consumers' perspective (Fill, 1999: 103-525 and Warrington and Shim, 761-782 quot. in: Odabaşı, Barış, 15th ed., 2015:343-348).

1. Findings and comments

In this part of the study, findings that were obtained via analyzing the data collected through scales conducted among participatory youngsters for the objectives of current research have been exhibited. Explanations and comments have been provided on the basis of obtained findings.

Table 1. Descriptive features of the participatory youngsters

Tables	Groups	Frequency(n)	Percentage (%)
Age	19-22	71	71.0
	23-25	17	17.0
	Above age 25	12	12.0
	Total	100	100.0
Gender	Male	41	41.0
	Female	59	59.0
	Total	100	100.0
Regional hometown	Marmara	47	47.0
	Aegean	10	10.0
	Mediterranean	5	5.0
	Black Sea	23	23.0
	Central Anatolia	6	6.0
	Eastern Anatolia	3	3.0
	South Eastern Anatolia	2	2.0
	Abroad	4	4.0
	Total	100	100.0
Education	Undergraduate	83	83.0
	Graduate	17	17.0
	Total	100	100.0
var00002	- TRY 1000	5	5.1
	TRY 1001 - TRY 1500	10	10.1
	TRY 1501 - TRY 2000	13	13.1

	TRY 2001 - TRY 2500	18	18.2
	TRY 2501 - TRY 3000	15	15.2
	TRY 3001 - TRY 3500	7	7.1
	TRY 3501 - TRY 4000	6	6.1
	TRY 4001 - TRY 4500	5	5.1
	TRY 4501 - TRY 5000	8	8.1
	TRY 5001 +	12	12.1
	Total	99	100.0
Family income level	TRY 1500 and below	15	15.0
	TRY 1501-2500	32	32.0
	TRY 2501-3500	22	22.0
	TRY 3501-4500	11	11.0
	TRY 4500 and above	20	20.0
	Total	100	100.0
Employment	Yes	33	33.0
	No	67	67.0
	Total	100	100.0
Employment Form	Part Time	18	54.5
	Full Time	15	45.5
	Total	33	100.0
Monthly Expenditure	TRY 500 and below	27	27.0
	TRY 501 - TRY 750	27	27.0
	TRY 751 - TRY 1000	16	16.0
	TRY 1001 - TRY 1250	15	15.0
	TRY 1250 above	15	15.0
	Total	100	100.0

With respect to age variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 71 youngsters (71.0%) are between ages 19-22, 17 youngsters (17.0%) are between ages 23-25, 12 youngsters (12.0%) are above age 25.

With respect to gender variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 41 youngsters (41.0%) are males, 59 youngsters (59.0%) are females.

With respect to regional hometown variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 47 youngsters (47.0%) are from Marmara Region, 10 youngsters (10.0%) are from Aegean Region, 5 youngsters (5.0%) are from Mediterranean Region, 23 youngsters (23.0%) are from Black Sea Region, 6 youngsters (6.0%) are from Central Anatolia Region, 3 youngsters (3.0%) are from Eastern Anatolia Region, 2 youngsters (2.0%) are from South Eastern Anatolia Region, and lastly 4 youngsters (4.0%) are from abroad.

With respect to education variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 83 youngsters (83.0%) have undergraduate degrees, 17 youngsters (17.0%) have graduate degrees.

With respect to var00002 variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 5 youngsters (5.1%) possess - TRY 1000, 10 youngsters (10.1%) possess TRY 1001 - TRY 1500, 13 youngsters (13.1%) possess TRY 1501 - TRY 2000, 18 youngsters (18.2%) possess TRY 2001 - TRY 2500, 15 youngsters (15.2%) possess TRY 2501 - TRY 3000, 7 youngsters (7.1%) possess TRY 3001 - TRY 3500, 6 youngsters (6.1%) possess TRY 3501 - TRY 4000, 5 youngsters (5.1%) possess TRY 4001 - TRY 4500, 8 youngsters (8.1%) possess TRY 4501 - TRY 5000, and 12 (12.1%) youngsters possess TRY 5001 +.

With respect to family income variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 15 youngsters (15.0%) possess an income level of TRY 1500 and below, 32 youngsters (32.0%) possess an income level between TRY 1501-2500, 22 youngsters (22.0%) possess an income level between TRY 2501-3500, 11 youngsters (11.0%) possess an income level between TRY 3501-4500, and 20 youngsters (20.0%) possess an income level above TRY 4500.

With respect to employment variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 33 youngsters (33.0%) are employed and 67 youngsters (67.0%) are unemployed.

With respect to employment form variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 18 youngsters (54.5%) are part-time employed and 15 youngsters (45.5%) are full-time employed.

With respect to monthly expenditure variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 27 youngsters (27.0%) spend TRY 500 and below, 27 youngsters (27.0%) spend between TRY 501 - TRY 750, 16 youngsters (16.0%) spend between TRY 751 - TRY 1000, 15 youngsters (15.0%) spend between TRY 1001 - TRY 1250, 15 youngsters (15.0%) spend above TRY 1250.

Table 2.

Tables	Groups	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age when the first mobile phone was purchased	9.00	1	1.0
	10.00	4	4.0
	11.00	3	3.0
	12.00	12	12.0
	13.00	16	16.0
	14.00	16	16.0
	15.00	26	26.0
	16.00	9	9.0
	17.00	8	8.0
	18.00	4	4.0
	23.00	1	1.0
	Total	100	100.0
Mobile Phone Model	Smart Phone	1	1.0
	Standard Phone	99	99.0
	Total	100	100.0
Payer of the Mobile Phone Bill	Parents	36	36.0
	Elder brother/elder sister	5	5.0
	Personally	59	59.0
	Total	100	100.0
Using more than one Mobile Phone	Yes	6	6.0
	No	94	94.0
	Total	100	100.0
Number of Changed Models	1	2	2.0
	2	9	9.0
	3	25	25.0
	4	34	34.0
	5	24	24.0
	Other	6	6.0
	Total	100	100.0

Daily time spent on Mobile Phone	Below 1 Hour	9	9.0
	1-3 Hours	17	17.0
	3-5 Hours	30	30.0
	Above 5 Hours	44	44.0
	Total	100	100.0
Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Brand	Yes	41	41.0
	No	59	59.0
	Total	100	100.0
Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Features	Yes	57	57.0
	No	43	43.0
	Total	100	100.0
Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Price	Yes	37	37.0
	No	63	63.0
	Total	100	100.0

With respect to "Age when the first mobile phone was purchased" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 1 youngster (1.0%) was purchased the first mobile phone at age 9.00, 4 youngsters (4.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 10.00, 3 youngsters (3.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 11.00, 12 youngsters (12.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 12.00, 16 youngsters (16.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 13.00, 16 youngsters (16.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 14.00, 26 youngsters (26.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 15.00, 9 youngsters (9.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 16.00, 8 youngsters (8.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 17.00, 4 youngsters (4.0%) were purchased the first mobile phone at age 18.00, 1 youngster (1.0%) was purchased the first mobile phone at age 23.00.

With respect to "Mobile Phone Model" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 1 youngster (1.0%) owned Smart Phone, 99 (99.0%) youngsters owned standard phone. With respect to "Payer of the Mobile Phone Bill" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: Mobile phone bills of 36 youngsters (36.0%) were paid by their parents, Mobile phone bills of 5 youngsters (5.0%) were paid by their elder brother/elder sister, Mobile phone bills of 59 youngsters (59.0%) were paid personally.

With respect to "Using more than one Mobile Phone" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 6 (6.0%) had more than one but 94 had (94.0%) only one mobile phone.

With respect to "Number of Changed Models" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: Distribution of Number of Changed Models variable among youngsters is such: 2 youngsters changed (2.0%) 1 time, 9 (9.0%) youngsters changed 2 times, 25 (25.0%) youngsters changed 3 times. 34 (34.0%) youngsters changed 4 times. 24 (24.0%) youngsters changed 5 times. 6 youngsters (6.0%) selected other item.

With respect to "Daily time spent on Mobile Phone" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 9 (9.0%) youngsters spend less than 1 hour, 17 (17.0%) youngsters spend between 1-3 hours, 30 (30.0%) youngsters spend between 3-5 hours, 44 (44.0%) youngsters spend more than 5 hours.

With respect to "Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Brand" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 41 (41.0%) youngsters responded Yes as regards Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Brand variable while 59 (59.0%) youngsters responded No as regards Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Brand variable.

With respect to "Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Features" variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 57 (57.0%) youngsters responded Yes as regards Comparing with a friend's Mobile Phone Features variable, 43 (43.0%) youngsters responded No.

With respect to “Comparing with a friend’s Mobile Phone Price” variable, the distribution of youngsters is such: 37 (37.0%) youngsters answered as Yes, 63 (63.0%) youngsters answered as No. Mean age of the first mobile phone purchase was measured as (14.230 ± 2.141).

Distribution of the responses participatory youngsters provided to explain the people whom they were influenced by in buying mobile phone is as demonstrated in Table x.

Table 1. Distribution of the responses youngsters provided to explain the people whom they were influenced by in buying mobile phone

	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I am undecided		I agree		I strongly agree		mean	Sd
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Being influenced by a friend in buying mobile phone	11	11.0	9	9.0	17	17.0	42	42.0	21	21.0	3.530	1.235
Being influenced by family in buying mobile phone	25	25.0	24	24.0	14	14.0	25	25.0	12	12.0	2.750	1.388
Being influenced by commercials in buying mobile phone	15	15.0	17	17.0	25	25.0	28	28.0	15	15.0	3.110	1.286
Being influenced by the Internet in buying mobile phone	11	11.0	6	6.0	18	18.0	46	46.0	19	19.0	3.560	1.192
Being influenced by his/her best friend in buying mobile phone	21	21.0	19	19.0	23	23.0	24	24.0	13	13.0	2.890	1.340

As the responses participatory youngsters provided to explain the people whom they were influenced by in buying mobile phone are examined, it surfaces that;

With respect to “*Being influenced by a friend in buying mobile phone*” statement, 11.0% (n=11) of youngsters selected “I strongly disagree” item, 9.0% (n=9) of youngsters selected “I disagree” item, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected “I am undecided” item, 42.0% (n=42) of youngsters selected “I agree” item, 21.0% (n=21) of youngsters selected “I strongly agree” item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.530 ± 1.235) “*Being influenced by a friend in buying mobile phone*” statement.

With respect to “*Being influenced by family in buying mobile phone*” statement, 25.0% (n=25) of youngsters selected “I strongly disagree” item, 24.0% (n=24) of youngsters selected “I disagree” item, 14.0% (n=14) of youngsters selected “I am undecided” item, 25.0% (n=25) of youngsters selected “I agree” item, 12.0% (n=12) of youngsters selected “I strongly agree” item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with “*Being influenced by family in buying mobile phone*” statement on medium level (2.750 ± 1.388).

With respect to “*Being influenced by commercials in buying mobile phone*” statement, 15.0% (n=15) of youngsters selected “I strongly disagree” item, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected “I disagree” item, 25.0% (n=25) of youngsters selected “I am undecided” item, 28.0% (n=28) of youngsters selected “I agree” item, 15.0% (n=15) of youngsters selected “I strongly agree” item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with “*Being influenced by commercials in buying mobile phone*” statement on medium level (3.110 ± 1.286).

With respect to “*Being influenced by the Internet in buying mobile phone*” statement, 11.0% (n=11) of youngsters selected “I strongly disagree” item, 6.0% (n=6) of youngsters selected “I disagree” item, 18.0% (n=18) of youngsters selected “I am undecided” item, 46.0% (n=46) of youngsters selected “I agree” item, 19.0% (n=19) of youngsters selected “I strongly agree” item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.560 ± 1.192) “*Being influenced by the Internet in buying mobile phone*” statement.

With respect to “*Being influenced by his/her best friend in buying mobile phone*” statement, 21.0% (n=21) of youngsters selected “I strongly disagree” item, 19.0% (n=19) of youngsters selected “I

disagree" item, 23.0% (n=23) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 24.0% (n=24) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 13.0% (n=13) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "Being influenced by his/her best friend in buying mobile phone" statement on medium level (2.890 ± 1.340).

Distribution of the responses participatory youngsters provided to explain the determinants in their mobile-phone preferences is as demonstrated in Table x.

Table 1. Distribution of the responses participatory youngsters provided to explain the determinants in their mobile-phone preferences

	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I am undecided		I agree		I strongly agree		mean	Sd
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Reflecting my status	24	24.0	28	28.0	18	18.0	19	19.0	11	11.0	2.650	1.329
Popularity	17	17.0	18	18.0	17	17.0	35	35.0	13	13.0	3.090	1.319
Broad service network	5	5.0	9	9.0	20	20.0	53	53.0	13	13.0	3.600	0.995
Durability	4	4.0	3	3.0	14	14.0	48	48.0	31	31.0	3.990	0.969
Performance	1	1.0	3	3.0	9	9.0	40	40.0	47	47.0	4.290	0.832
Reliability	1	1.0	4	4.0	16	16.0	44	44.0	35	35.0	4.080	0.872
Brand	4	4.0	11	11.0	9	9.0	47	47.0	29	29.0	3.860	1.083
Price	8	8.0	22	22.0	20	20.0	28	28.0	22	22.0	3.340	1.265
Promotion	11	11.0	20	20.0	21	21.0	31	31.0	17	17.0	3.230	1.262
Camera	3	3.0	10	10.0	14	14.0	40	40.0	33	33.0	3.900	1.068
Screen size	4	4.0	10	10.0	18	18.0	38	38.0	30	30.0	3.800	1.101
Outlook/style	3	3.0	8	8.0	12	12.0	39	39.0	38	38.0	4.010	1.049
Social Media features	2	2.0	5	5.0	19	19.0	35	35.0	39	39.0	4.040	0.984
Touch-screen features	2	2.0	8	8.0	15	15.0	34	34.0	41	41.0	4.040	1.034
Battery life	3	3.0	17	17.0	16	16.0	21	21.0	43	43.0	3.840	1.237
Weight and size	5	5.0	16	16.0	29	29.0	33	33.0	17	17.0	3.410	1.102
I reckon I can sell it easily	31	31.0	27	27.0	23	23.0	13	13.0	6	6.0	2.360	1.219
On recommendation	12	12.0	17	17.0	25	25.0	38	38.0	8	8.0	3.130	1.160
Extended warranty period	14	14.0	26	26.0	25	25.0	22	22.0	13	13.0	2.940	1.254

As the responses participatory youngsters provided to explain the determinants in their mobile-phone preferences, it surfaces that;

With respect to "Reflecting my status" statement, 24.0% (n=24) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 28.0% (n=28) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 18.0% (n=18) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 19.0% (n=19) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 11.0% (n=11) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "Reflecting my status" statement on medium level (2.650 ± 1.329).

With respect to "Popularity" statement, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 18.0% (n=18) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 35.0% (n=35) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 13.0% (n=13) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "Popularity" statement on medium level (3.090 ± 1.319).

With respect to "Broad service network" statement, 5.0% (n=5) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 9.0% (n=9) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 20.0% (n=20) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 53.0% (n=53) of youngsters selected "I agree" item,

13.0% (n=13) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.600 ± 0.995) "Broad service network" statement.

With respect to "Durability" statement, 4.0% (n=4) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 3.0% (n=3) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 14.0% (n=14) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 48.0% (n=48) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 31.0% (n=31) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.990 ± 0.969) "Durability" statement.

With respect to "Performance" statement, 1.0% (n=1) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 3.0% (n=3) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 9.0% (n=9) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 40.0% (n=40) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 47.0% (n=47) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (4.290 ± 0.832) "Performance" statement.

With respect to "Reliability" statement, 1.0% (n=1) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 4.0% (n=4) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 16.0% of youngsters selected (n=16) "I am undecided" item, 44.0% (n=44) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 35.0% (n=35) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (4.080 ± 0.872) "reliability" statement.

With respect to "Brand" statement, 4.0% (n=4) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 11.0% (n=11) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 9.0% (n=9) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 47.0% (n=47) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 29.0% (n=29) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.860 ± 1.083) "brand" statement.

With respect to "Price" statement, 8.0% (n=8) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 22.0% (n=22) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 20.0% (n=20) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 28.0% (n=28) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 22.0% (n=22) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "price" statement on medium level (3.340 ± 1.265).

With respect to "Promotion" statement, 11.0% (n=11) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 20.0% (n=20) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 21.0% (n=21) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 31.0% (n=31) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "promotion" statement on medium level (3.230 ± 1.262).

With respect to "Camera" statement, 3.0% (n=3) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 10.0% (n=10) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 14.0% (n=14) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 40.0% (n=40) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 33.0% (n=33) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.900 ± 1.068) "camera" statement.

With respect to "Screen size" statement, 4.0% (n=4) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 10.0% (n=10) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 18.0% (n=18) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 38.0% (n=38) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 30.0% (n=30) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.800 ± 1.101) "screen size" statement.

With respect to "Outlook/style" statement, 3.0% (n=3) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 8.0% (n=8) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 12.0% (n=12) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 39.0% (n=39) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 38.0% (n=38) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (4.010 ± 1.049) "Outlook/style" statement

With respect to "Social media features" statement, 2.0% (n=2) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 5.0% (n=5) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 19.0% (n=19) of youngsters

selected "I am undecided" item, 35.0% (n=35) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 39.0% (n=39) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (4.040 ± 0.984) "Social media features" statement.

With respect to "Touch-screen features" statement, 2.0% (n=2) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 8.0% (n=8) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 15.0% (n=15) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 34.0% (n=34) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 41.0% (n=41) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (4.040 ± 1.034) "Touch-screen features" statement.

With respect to "Battery life" statement, 3.0% (n=3) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 16.0% (n=16) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 21.0% (n=21) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 43.0% (n=43) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.840 ± 1.237) "Battery life" statement.

With respect to "Weight and size" statement, 5.0% (n=5) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 16.0% (n=16) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 29.0% (n=29) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 33.0% (n=33) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (3.410 ± 1.102) "Weight and size" statement.

With respect to "I reckon I can sell it easily" statement, 31.0% (n=31) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 27.0% (n=27) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 23.0% (n=23) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 13.0% (n=13) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 6.0% (n=6) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "I reckon I can sell it easily" statement on weak level (2.360 ± 1.219).

With respect to "On recommendation" statement, 12.0% (n=12) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 25.0% (n=25) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 38.0% (n=38) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 8.0% (n=8) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "On recommendation" statement on medium level (3.130 ± 1.160).

With respect to "Extended warranty period" statement, 14.0% (n=14) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 26.0% (n=26) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 25.0% (n=25) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 22.0% (n=22) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 13.0% (n=13) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "Extended warranty period" statement on medium level (2.940 ± 1.254).

Distribution of the responses participatory youngsters provided for the statements in relation to is as manifested in Table x.

Table 1. Distribution of the responses participatory youngsters provided for the statements in relation to.....

	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I am undecided		I agree		I strongly agree		mean	Sd
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
The brand of your mobile phone reflects your style	17	17.0	16	16.0	24	24.0	36	36.0	7	7.0	3.000	1.223
The brand of mobile phone owned by someone I just met renders information on the socio-economic status of that person.	14	14.0	24	24.0	26	26.0	29	29.0	7	7.0	2.910	1.173
I occasionally feel that people I know use their mobile phones as an accessory just to show off.	2	2.0	2	2.0	14	14.0	45	45.0	37	37.0	4.130	0.872

As the responses participatory youngsters provided for the statements in relation to..... are examined, it surfaces that;

With respect to "*The brand of your mobile phone reflects your style*" statement, 17.0% (n=17) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 16.0% (n=16) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 24.0% (n=24) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 36.0% (n=36) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 7.0% (n=7) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "*The brand of your mobile phone reflects your style*" statement (3.000 ± 1.223) on medium level.

With respect to "*The brand of mobile phone owned by someone I just met renders information on the socio-economic status of that person*" statement, 14.0% (n=14) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 24.0% (n=24) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 26.0% (n=26) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 29.0% (n=29) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 7.0% (n=7) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters agreed with "*The brand of mobile phone owned by someone I just met renders information on the socio-economic status of that person*" statement on medium level (2.910 ± 1.173).

With respect to "*I occasionally feel that people I know use their mobile phones as an accessory just to show off*" statement, 2.0% (n=2) of youngsters selected "I strongly disagree" item, 2.0% (n=2) of youngsters selected "I disagree" item, 14.0% (n=14) of youngsters selected "I am undecided" item, 45.0% (n=45) of youngsters selected "I agree" item, 37.0% (n=37) of youngsters selected "I strongly agree" item. It was thus concluded that youngsters strongly agreed with (4.130 ± 0.872) "*I occasionally feel that people I know use their mobile phones as an accessory just to show off*" statement.

Conclusion and discussion

This study analyzing the factors influencing purchase-intended processes of consumers consists of theory and practice parts. As the responses participatory youngsters provided to the questions relevant of the people being influenced in mobile phone purchase behaviors it surfaced that youngsters strongly agreed with "*Being influenced by a friend in buying mobile phone*" statement.

It was detected that youngsters also strongly agreed with "*Being influenced by the Internet in buying mobile phone*" statement.

Hence it was concluded that friends and the Internet played vital role in mobile phone purchase choices of students.

As the responses provided by participatory youngsters on the determinants effective in their mobile phone choices have been examined;

It was identified that youngsters agreed with "*Reflecting my status*" statement on medium level

It was also determined that youngsters agreed with "*Popularity*" statement on medium level.

It was demonstrated that youngsters strongly agreed with "*Brand*" statement.

It was shown that youngsters strongly agreed with "*Outlook/style*" statement

It was witnessed that youngsters strongly agreed with "*I occasionally feel that people I know use their mobile phones as an accessory just to show off*" statement.

It was seen that youngsters agreed with "*Price*" statement on medium level.

Nowadays societies have transformed into consumption communities and consumption now translates into prestige and differentiation among the rest of people rather than satisfaction of men's natural needs via products and services (Baudrillard, 6th ed., 2013). It can be argued that findings of this questionnaire are also supportive of these results. It is assumed that university youth perceive mobile phone as a sign of status and this in effect paves way to brand loyalty.

In modern age consumption is viewed as a global and consistent system of indicators arranged via codes and regulations rather than satisfaction of natural needs via products or services. In such a system, the contingent world of needs and pleasures as well as the natural and biological system has been replaced with a system of social values and classifications. In such a consumption

society in which the difference between actual and pseudo needs are blurred, the individual holds the belief that buying and showing off consumption goods introduce one form of social privilege and prestige. In effect a logic founded on general social differentiation emerges. In that case the need is no longer towards a particular object but rather it relates to the desire for differentiation. As the individual believes in the need to be socially differentiated amongst the others, s/he concurrently unites with consumption society. Therefore consumption turns into a necessity for the individual (Baudrillard, 6th ed., 2013).

Despite the fact that consumers have recently gone through unprecedented transformation, marketing failed to perform any changes. Marketing methods are stuck to the outdated ways. Understanding and deeply investigating the consumers have turned into a mission that is way more challenging than describing the selective qualities of a given product. The world order is in a constant transformation and antiquated methods lead to faulty interpretations on consumer behaviors and opinions. The kind of products and communication methods founded on such techniques are no longer on the same page with modern consumers (Zaltman, trans.: A. Semih Koç, 2004:8).

Resources

- Açikel, Emre, Çelikol, Mehmet, **Dijitoloji: Dijital Çağ Satış ve Pazarlamada Uçmanın Yolları**, 2.Baskı, MediaCat Kitapları, İstanbul, 2014.
- Assael, Henry, **Consumer Behavior and Marketing Action**, 4th ed.PWS-KENT Publishing Company, United States of America, 1992
- Baudrillard, Jean, **Tüketim Toplumu: Söylenceleri/Yapıları**, çev.Hazal Deliceçaylı, Ferda Keskin, 6.Basım, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul, 2013.
- Mucuk, İsmet, **Pazarlama İlkeleri: Ve Örnek Olaylar**, 15. Basım, Türkmen Kitabevi, İstanbul, 2006.
- Odabaşı, Yavuz, Barış, Gülfidan, **Tüketici Davranışı**, 15.Baskı, MediaCat Kitapları, İstanbul, 2015.
- Okumuş, Abdullah, **Tüketici Davranışı: Teorik ve Uygulamalı Bir Yaklaşım**, Türkmen Kitabevi, İstanbul, 2013.
- Solomon, Michael R., **Consumer Behavior**, Second Edition
- Sutherland Max, Sylvester, Alice K., **Advertising and the Mind of the Consumer, Reklam ve Tüketici Zihni**, çev.İnci Berna Kalınyazgan, MediaCat Kitapları, İstanbul, 2003.
- Zaltman, Gerald, **How Customers Think, Tüketici Nasıl Düşünür**, çev.A.Semih Koç, MediaCat Kitapları, İstanbul, 2004.