

# Customers Equity and Purchase Intention in the Fashion Industry through Social Media Marketing Activities among Generation Y

Noorshella Che Nawi<sup>a</sup>, Abdullah Al Mamun<sup>b</sup>, Dzulkipli Bin Mukhtar<sup>c</sup>, Wan Nurulasiah Wan Mustapha<sup>d</sup>, Norfazlirda Hairani<sup>e</sup>, <sup>a,c,d,e</sup>Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Entrepreneurship and Business, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Pengkalan Chepa, 16100 Kota Bharu, Kelantan, Malaysia, <sup>b</sup>Research Fellow, Global Entrepreneurship Research and Innovation Centre (GERIC), Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Pengkalan Chepa, 16100 Kota Bharu, Kelantan, Malaysia, Email: <sup>a</sup>[norshella@umk.edu.my](mailto:norshella@umk.edu.my), <sup>b</sup>[abdullah.a@umk.edu.my](mailto:abdullah.a@umk.edu.my), <sup>c</sup>[dzulkifli@umk.edu.my](mailto:dzulkifli@umk.edu.my), <sup>d</sup>[xiaojienuurulmustapa@gmail.com](mailto:xiaojienuurulmustapa@gmail.com), <sup>e</sup>[fazlirda.h@umk.edu.my](mailto:fazlirda.h@umk.edu.my)

In the context of social media marketing activities, customer engagement becomes the main goal. Many businesses use social media marketing to attract customers. This study examined customer equity and purchase intention through social media marketing activities in the fashion industry among Generation Y. The research employed a cross-sectional design and quantitative method was utilized. The chosen platform in collecting the data was Google form. The data was imported into Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS) and Smart-PLS for further analyses. The findings of this study revealed that social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on brand personality, brand equity and relationship equity. Further, it was revealed that brand personality, brand equity and relationship equity have a positive and significant effect on purchase intention. The findings of this study can help business owners understand the importance of brand personality, brand equity and relationship equity in influencing purchase intention. Social media use as a marketing platform that reaches an emerging consumer market is recommended.

**Key words:** *Social Media Marketing Activities; Brand Personality; Brand Equity; Relationship Equity.*

## Introduction

Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) use social media as the platform to sell their products because this platform requires minimum technique and the cost is very low (Ferrer et al., 2013). Ahmad et al. (2018), state that the social media platform provides low cost analytics, marketing, automated publishing, customer targeting and conversion tracking. These are the reasons that social media is the best platform to promote products. According to Trainor et al (2014), the social media platform has become important in the business environment (Mourtada & Alkhatib, 2014). Kietzmann et al. (2011), note that there are different definitions of social media. This study used the definition of social media by Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) as follows: “*a group of internet-based application that builds on the ideological and technological foundation of Web 2.0 and allows the creation and exchange of User Generated Content*”. Gazal et al. (2016), state that the social media platform is considered an electronic trading floor, where purchaser and shopper can interact with each other. Social media can help the organisation to expand business activities effectively. According to Siamagka et al. (2015), the social media platform has become progressively more popular as the key platform for small businesses worldwide.

Edosomwan et al. (2011), propose that the impact of the social media platform as an electronic market place for business has become a critical issue in business and the literature of entrepreneurship. A study by Durkin et al. (2013), found that social media is used as an alternative business tool so that small and medium enterprises (SMEs) can gain advantages such as engaging in a marketplace which is situated far from their geographical area without necessitating physical presence. Several studies examined the use and benefit of social media in business (Ahmad et al., 2018; Siamagka et al., 2015; Ainin et al., 2015). Pookulangara and Koesler (2011) focused on the impact of social media on customer purchase decision, Siamagka et al., (2015) on the use of social media in increasing brand recognition, Ahmad et al. (2018) the impacts of social media adoption on business performance and Ainin et al., (2015) the use of social media to improve business performance. Several studies focused on the usage, impacts and benefits of social media in the SME context but there were relatively few studies that investigated how social media can affect customer equity and purchase intention in Malaysia. Thus, this study investigated customer equity and purchase intention through social media marketing activities.

## Literature Review

### *Social Media Marketing and Brand Personality*

Currently, youngsters prefer online shopping as they can gather information about a product easily and this method is more suitable, economical and timely in delivering their purchase. Belk (1998) stated that brand personality is important as it is symbolic and customers used it

to attach themselves with a brand and make a connection with the products. Aaker (1997) proposes that a brand personality must be based on sincerity, competence, sophistication, ruggedness and sincerity. Keller (1993) stated that brand personality could be defined as brand characteristics that are derived from customer perceptions. Fuchs and Schreier (2011) and Fuller (2010) stated that customers usually learn about the characteristics of the brand via social media before purchasing it. Van Dijk et al. (2014) add that products that present their characteristics and name could attract more customers. This statement is consistent with Kumar et al. (2018) who found that social media marketing activities can lead to a positive perception of brand personality. The following hypothesis was formulated for this study:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): *Social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on brand personality.*

### ***Social Media Marketing and Brand Equity***

Brand equity has a remarkable value characteristic in a familiar brand name. Bello and Holbrook (1995) state that brand equity happens when a customer voluntarily spends more due to the attraction of the name that supports the product. Brand equity involves differential effects of brand knowledge which include the customers' reaction to the marketing of brand image and brand awareness Keller (1993). A study by Chang et al. (2019) revealed that brand equity provides a business with a firm foundation for an online presence, where the business can provide more information on their products. Chen and Lin (2019) mention that brand equity is the external factor for customers, whereas social media activities are the result of the communication between a customer and a business. The following is the second hypothesis of this study:

Hypothesis 2 (H2): *Social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on brand equity.*

### ***Social Media Marketing and Relationship Equity***

The social media platform has led the introduction of the latest online marketing activities that interact with customers (Chu et al., 2019). Luo (2007) states that the relationship is important and commonly acknowledged in customer daily lives. A study by Gu et al. (2008), proposed that the relationship is important for an online business to attract more customers. Zhang et al. (2014) stated that the relationship equity could be linked to the relationship between business and customers. A study by Kim and Ko (2012) revealed that brands that assign a social media presence as a marketing activity with intent to form a good relationship with a customer, generally gain more profit and trust. Hence, the following hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 3 (H3): *Social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on relationship equity.*

### ***Brand Personality and Purchase Intention***

Aaker (1997) defined brand personality as the human personality connected with a certain brand. When the brand personality is presented appropriately, it can affect customer loyalty, satisfaction and emotional connection in the context of purchase intention (Kim et al., 2001). Boudreaux and Palmer (2007) revealed that brand personality is a significant predictor of purchase intention. Chang et al. (2019) note that it is important to understand customer purchase intention as it can affect business success. Berbegal-Mirabent et al. (2016) found that brand personality is connected to customer purchase intention. Customers might experience uncertainty regarding the risks of an online transaction when they are not sure about the product's personality (Chang et al., 2019). Rouibah et al. (2016) discovered that brand personality could affect behavioural intention in the online business platform. Thus, the following fourth hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 4 (H4): *Brand personality has a positive and significant effect on purchase intention.*

### ***Brand Equity and Purchase Intention***

In marketing, brand equity is indicated by indefinable brand properties. According to Aaker (1991), brand equity stems from brand loyalty, quality and brand awareness, requiring economic benefits and upcoming earning streams. Kim and Ko (2012) note that social marketing activities could create a positive impact on customer brand equity and purchase intention. Brand equity can affect customer behaviour in the demonstrated purchasing behaviour of a brand (Elliott & Yannopoulou, 2007). Davcik et al. (2015) state that brand equity is a relational market-based asset where the continuing communication between brands and customers can lead to the purchase of the product. Khoi and Tuan (2018) concluded that customers have personal feelings and reasons that are considered when buying a product and they gather information about the product based on their experience or market. After information gathering about the product, the customer will make a purchase decision. Thus, the following hypothesis was proposed for this study:

Hypothesis 5 (H5): *Brand equity has a positive and significant effect on purchase intention.*

### ***Relationship Equity and Purchase Intention***

Khuong and Nguyen (2015) propose that purchase intention is the customer's intention to buy a specific product. Rust et al. (2004) defined relationship equity as the trend adopted by customers to use a certain brand and that the factors of relationship equity are loyalty, recognition, treatment and knowledge. Lemon et al. (2001) defined relationship equity as a trend of the customers who prefer a brand based on their experience using the brand. Lemon et al. (2001) claim that customer relationship is one of the important aspects for a customer when purchasing brand items. Kim and Ko (2012) found that customer equity could influence purchase intention. Thus, the fifth hypothesis was proposed:

Hypothesis 6 (H6): *Relationship equity has a positive and significant effect on purchase intention.*

### **Methodology**

This study employed a cross-sectional design and quantitative method in examining customers' equity and purchase intention through social media marketing activities. The data collection was done using Google form as the chosen platform due to its features such as linking with Google account and Docs editor. Then, the data were imported into Statistical Package Social Science (SPSS) and Smart-PLS for further analyses.

### **Research Instrument**

The questionnaire tool for the online survey was designed using simple and unbiased wording so that the respondents could easily understand the questions. Table 1 below summarises each variable and its sources. This study used a seven-point Likert scale (very strongly disagree, strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree and very strongly agree) for all variables.

**Table 1:** List of variables and sources

Variable	Items	Source
Perceived Social Media Marketing	- 5 items	- Ismail (2017)
Brand Personalities	- 5 items	- Aaker (1997)
Brand Equity	- 5 Items	- Aaker (1991) and Yun (2006)
Relationship Equity	- 5 items	- Henning, Gwinner and Gremler (2002) and Ju and Chun (2002)
Purchase Intention	- 5 items	- Park et al., (2007)

### ***Sample Selection and Data Collection***

The target population for this study was undergraduate students who represent the population of generation Y in Malaysia. The respondents were approached by the researcher via email with an online link survey and they were assured that all responses would be kept confidential. The required sample size for this study, calculated using the GPower software program, was 74. Overall, this study obtained data from 145 respondents.

## **Results**

### ***Descriptive Analysis***

The data was collected from 145 respondents in which the majority of 129 or 89% of the respondents were female and 11% or 16 of the respondents were male. In terms of ethnicity, 112 or 77.2% of the respondents were Malay, 22 or 15.2% of the respondents were Chinese and the rest of the respondents were Indian, 11 or 7.6%. The majority of the respondents were in the age range of 21-22 years old, 117 or 80.7%, followed by 26 or 17.9% who were 23-25 years old and the remaining 1 or 7% were in the age range of 18-20 years old and 26-27 years old respectively. In terms of the duration of social media use, the majority of respondents, 69% or 100, used social media less than four times per month. A total of 34 or 23.4% of the respondents used social media about five to ten times per month and 4 respondents or 2.8% of the respondents used social media 11 to 20 times per month. The remaining respondents, 7 or 4.8%, recorded social media use of more than 20 times per month. Table 2 below presents details regarding respondent profile.

### ***Reliability and Validity***

Table 3 below presents the reliability and validity values for all items in this study. The Cronbach's alpha values in this study exceeded the 0.7 threshold (Nunnally, 1978) indicating that all items are reliable. For composite reliabilities, all the values exceeded 0.7 (Hair et al., 2011) indicating a high internal consistency of indicators in measuring each item. Hence, the result verified the construct reliability. Dillon-Goldstein *rho* was used to measure the construct reliability in this study. The Dillon-Goldstein *rho* values for all the constructs was more than 0.7 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) which indicates that the items are reliable. This study examined the average variance extracted (AVE) for convergent validity. Table 3 shows that all the AVE values are more than 0.5 (Hair et al., 2011) and this verifies the convergent validity except for Social Media Marketing Activities which is below 0.5. This study also calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF) to test multi-collinearity issues. Table 3 shows that the VIF values were less than 5 (Hair et al., 2011) which indicates there is no multi-collinearity issue between the variables.

**Table 2:** Profile of the Respondents

	n	%		n	%
<i>Gender</i>			<i>Age</i>		
Female	129	89.0	18 - 20 years old	1	.7
Male	16	11.0	21 - 22 years old	117	80.7
Total	145	100.0	23 -25 years old	26	17.9
			26 - 27 years old	1	.7
<i>Ethnicity</i>			Total	145	100.0
Malay	112	77.2			
Chinese	22	15.2	<i>Frequent of using Social Media</i>		
Indian	11	7.6	≤ 4 Times per Month	100	69.0
Total	145	100.0	5-10 Times per Month	34	23.4
			11-20 Times per Month	4	2.8
			≥ 20 Times per Month	7	4.8
			Total	145	100.0

**Source:** Author(s) own compilation

Discriminant validity was used in this study to examine the cross-loading and Fornell-Larcker criterion (Hair et al., 2014). Table 4 below shows that all indicator loadings are greater than 0.7 (Hair et al., 2013) except for Social Media Marketing Activities (*I love to follow the latest fashion trend in SM pages; popular bloggers have influenced the growth of fashion industry through SM pages; most of my time is spent on reviewing the comments on my preferred fashion brand*), Brand Personality (*I prefer fashion brand that suits my personality; my preferred fashion brand is a trusted brand*), Brand Equity (*I would be proud of my preferred fashion brand collection*), and Purchase Intention (*I intend to buy a fashion brand when it has many comments on SM pages*) which have a component loading value of below 0.7 and are accepted because the component value is higher than 0.5 (Hair et al., 2013).

**Table 3:** Reliability Analysis

Variables	Items	CA	DG rho	CR	AVE	VIF
Social Media Marketing Activities	5	0.716	0.725	0.815	0.469	1.000
Brand Personality	5	0.782	0.807	0.848	0.529	2.075
Brand Equity	5	0.833	0.852	0.883	0.604	2.562
Relationship Equity	5	0.854	0.861	0.895	0.632	2.037
Purchase Intention	5	0.807	0.812	0.866	0.564	

**Note:** CA: Cronbach's Alpha; DG rho - Dillon-Goldstein's rho; CR - Composite Reliability; AVE - Average Variance Extracted; VIF - Variance Inflation Factors

**Source:** Author's data analysis

This study confirmed the discriminant validity and showed that all indicator loadings are higher than the entire cross loading. This study also used Fornell-Larcker criterion to verify the discriminant validity. The Fornell-Larcker criterion method requires that the AVE values for all constructs must be higher than the highest square correlation with the other criterion and this study managed to meet the requirement. Additionally, the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) was used to calculate the correlation between the constructs which are parallel with the disattenuated construct score creation. This study referred to the value of 0.9 as the threshold and confirmed there is no lack of discriminant validity and all the constructs fulfilled the criteria as presented in Table 4 below.

**Table 4:** Outer Model Loading and Cross Loading

	SSM	BRP	BR E	REE	PEI
<i>Social Media Marketing Activities</i>					
I love follow latest fashion trend through SM pages.	<b>0.66</b> 5	0.36 1	0.38 3	0.33 3	0.48 6
Popular bloggers have influenced the growth of fashion industry through SM pages	<b>0.64</b> 5	0.29 8	0.35 7	0.29 1	0.27 6
SM marketing has increased my awareness towards brand in fashion industry	<b>0.75</b> 1	0.43 5	0.46 6	0.38 9	0.32 7
I am having fun with my preferred fashion brand SM page	<b>0.71</b> 7	0.32 9	0.42 3	0.29 6	0.30 9
Most of my time I spend on reviewing the comments on my preferred fashion brand	<b>0.64</b> 0	0.27 8	0.33 4	0.38 1	0.49 2
<i>Brand Personality</i>					
I prefer fashion brand, which has its own brand personality.	0.50 2	<b>0.81</b> 2	0.59 5	0.53 0	0.50 4
I prefer fashion brand that suits to my personality.	0.29 9	<b>0.66</b> 6	0.48 9	0.37 4	0.23 8
My preferred fashion brand is sociable brand.	0.41 6	<b>0.73</b> 0	0.54 5	0.46 7	0.52 4
My preferred fashion brand is trusted brand.	0.31 6	<b>0.65</b> 9	0.46 6	0.29 1	0.31 0
My preferred fashion brand is exciting brand.	0.22 2	<b>0.76</b> 0	0.43 4	0.47 6	0.45 5
<i>Brand Equity</i>					
I prefer value offered by a product compared to a brand itself.	0.44 1	0.51 4	<b>0.71</b> 9	0.51 3	0.50 0

I will recommend my preferred fashion brand to my friends.	0.51 9	0.53 7	<b>0.85</b> <b>1</b>	0.54 1	0.54 1
I have positive personal feelings towards my preferred fashion brand.	0.50 4	0.59 1	<b>0.84</b> <b>6</b>	0.54 3	0.51 9
Style of my preferred fashion brand suits my personality.	0.42 9	0.58 2	<b>0.82</b> <b>1</b>	0.55 9	0.44 4
I would be proud to own my preferred fashion brand collection.	0.31 2	0.52 3	<b>0.62</b> <b>4</b>	0.58 9	0.31 9
<i>Relationship Equity</i>					
My preferred brand sharing much information about its brand through its SM pages.	0.35 8	0.45 1	0.48 4	<b>0.75</b> <b>3</b>	0.44 6
My preferred fashion brand has interactive contents.	0.43 1	0.54 4	0.58 0	<b>0.79</b> <b>1</b>	0.44 9
My preferred fashion brand has more infographics contents.	0.31 9	0.42 8	0.49 3	<b>0.77</b> <b>9</b>	0.39 0
My preferred fashion brand has creative marketing strategies through its SM pages.	0.46 1	0.48 5	0.63 1	<b>0.85</b> <b>0</b>	0.52 3
Frequent posts on SM account foster the relationship between me and my brand.	0.38 0	0.47 6	0.55 6	<b>0.79</b> <b>7</b>	0.53 2
<i>Purchase Intention</i>					
I intent to buy well-known fashion brand through SM pages.	0.57 1	0.49 5	0.54 4	0.53 9	<b>0.74</b> <b>3</b>
I love others seeing me buy products from well-known fashion brand on the SM.	0.30 9	0.41 5	0.43 2	0.50 5	<b>0.80</b> <b>4</b>
I intent to buy when I watch the advertisement on the SM pages.	0.40 6	0.41 5	0.42 6	0.48 6	<b>0.74</b> <b>8</b>
I intent to buy when the fashion brand have many likes on its SM pages.	0.40 5	0.46 9	0.45 5	0.32 0	<b>0.78</b> <b>2</b>
I intent to buy the fashion brand when they have many comments on its SM pages.	0.32 7	0.38 9	0.40 9	0.33 7	<b>0.67</b> <b>2</b>
<i>Fornell-Larcker Criterion</i>					
Social Media Marketing Activities	<b>0.68</b> <b>5</b>				
Brand Personality	0.50 3	<b>0.72</b> <b>8</b>			
Brand Equity	0.57 8	0.70 2	<b>0.77</b> <b>7</b>		
Relationship Equity	0.49 5	0.60 2	0.69 5	<b>0.79</b> <b>5</b>	

Purchase Intention	0.54 8	0.58 5	0.60 9	0.59 4	<b>0.75</b> <b>1</b>
<i>Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)</i>					
Social Media Marketing Activities	-				
Brand Personality	<b>0.63</b> <b>3</b>	-			
Brand Equity	0.73 1	<b>0.86</b> <b>7</b>	-		
Relationship Equity	0.62 5	0.71 4	<b>0.83</b> <b>5</b>	-	
Purchase Intention	0.71 2	0.69 6	0.72 5	<b>0.69</b> <b>5</b>	-

**Note:** Social Media (SM), Social Media Marketing Activities (SMM), Brand Personality (BRP), Brand Equity (BRE), Relationship Equity (REE), Purchase Intention (PEI)

**Source:** Author's data analysis

### ***Path Coefficients***

The path coefficients show the hypothesised relationship between the constructs in this study (Hair et al., 2014). Table 5 below shows that the coefficient value for social media marketing activities on brand personality (Hypothesis 1) is 0.503 with a  $p$ -value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ , which means that social media marketing activities have a significant positive effect on brand personality. Hence hypothesis 1 or  $H_1$  is accepted. For hypothesis 2, Table 5 shows the coefficient value for social media marketing activities on brand equity which is 0.578 with a  $p$ -value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ . This result reveals that social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on brand equity. Thus, hypothesis 2 or  $H_2$  is accepted. Additionally, the same positive and significant effect was found for social media marketing on relationship equity. The coefficients value for social media marketing activities has a positive ( $\beta = 0.495$ ) and significant ( $p$ -value of  $0.000 < 0.05$ ) effect on relationship equity ( $H_3$ ). Hence, hypothesis 3 is accepted.

The fourth hypothesis investigation reported that the coefficients value for brand personality is 0.249 with a  $p$ -value of  $0.002 < 0.05$ . Brand personality has a positive and significant effect on purchase intention and  $H_4$  is accepted. Another positive and significant effect was found for brand equity on purchase intention. The path coefficient value for brand equity is 0.245 with a  $p$ -value of 0.018 thus,  $H_5$  is accepted. Finally, the coefficient value for relationship equity has a positive ( $\beta = 0.275$ ) and significant ( $0.001 < 0.05$ ) effect on purchase intention. In light of these results, this study accepts  $H_6$ . Table 5 summarises all the hypotheses in this study and that they are accepted.

**Table 5:** Path coefficient

	Coefficient	t-value	p-value	Decision
Social Media Marketing Activities → Brand Personality	0.503	7.488	0.000	<i>Accept</i>
Social Media Marketing Activities → Brand Equity	0.578	9.731	0.000	<i>Accept</i>
Social Media Marketing Activities → Relationship Equity	0.495	7.759	0.000	<i>Accept</i>
Brand Personality → Purchase Intention	0.249	2.885	0.002	<i>Accept</i>
Brand Equity → Purchase Intention	0.243	2.097	0.018	<i>Accept</i>
Relationship Equity → Purchase Intention	0.275	3.016	0.001	<i>Accept</i>

**Source:** Author's data analysis

## Conclusion

The study results confirm that social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on brand personality. The findings of this study supported  $H_1$  and the result is consistent with the findings of Aaker (1997), Belk (1998), Fuller (2010), Fuchs and Schreier (2011), Van Dijk et al. (2014) and Kumar et al. (2018). In the case of hypothesis 2, social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on brand equity which resulted in the acceptance of  $H_2$ . This result is consistent with the findings of Bello and Holbrook (1995), Chang et al. (2019), Chen and Lin (2019). For hypothesis 3, it was found that social media marketing activities have a positive and significant effect on relationship equity. Thus,  $H_3$  is accepted and is consistent with the previous studies of Luo (2007), Gu et al. (2008), Kim and Ko (2012) and Chu et al. (2019). For  $H_4$ , it was revealed that brand personality has a positive and significant effect on purchase intention. Thus, hypothesis 4 is accepted and this is consistent with studies by Boudreaux and Palmer (2007), Berbegal-Mirabent et al. (2016), Rouibah et al. (2016) and Chang et al. (2019). For hypothesis 5, this study revealed that brand equity has a positive and significant effect on purchase intention. Thus,  $H_5$  is accepted and this is consistent with the studies by Elliott and Yannopoulou (2007), Kim and Ko (2012), Davcik et al. (2015), Khoi and Tuan (2018). Finally, relationship equity has a positive and significant effect on purchase intention. Thus, hypothesis 6 is accepted which is consistent with the studies by Lemon et al. (2001), Kim and Ko (2012), Khuong and Nguyen (2015).

Small and Medium enterprise (SMEs) can use these results as this study revealed that social media marketing activities have impacts on customer equity and purchase intention. This study found that social media marketing activities have a positive effect on brand personality, brand



equity and relationship equity. Social media marketing activities provide advantages to digital marketers so that they can expand their potential customers, brand royalty and brand name. While negative responses from customers can be disadvantageous for business, the use of social media as a marketing platform can help a business to reach customers who are isolated by their geographical location and thus increase the brand image and brand name.

Furthermore, this study revealed that brand personality, brand equity and relationship equity have a positive effect on purchase intention. Based on these results, the recommendation is that business owners should focus on their marketing strategies more than establishing their brand personality, brand equity and relationship equity which can affect the customer purchase intentions. The findings of this study have implications primarily for business owners and marketing managers who deal with customers. Business owners can minimise and restructure product promotion expenditure using social media activities as a marketing platform to reach their customers. Based on the findings of this study, business owners should set goals for brand personality, brand equity and relationship equity that can influence customers to purchase products. The limitation of this study is that it mainly focused on the general fashion industry and therefore may not be directly applicable to a specific line of products. As such, future studies may place focus on a more specific line of products, for instance, garments and electronic gadgets. Additionally, the sample that comprised of university students may not entirely represent Generation Y as a whole in Malaysia.

**Acknowledgments:** This study was funded by the RMIC, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia; under the grant titled ‘Short Term Research Grant (SGJP)’. Project title: “*Developing Customer’s Equity And Purchase Intention Through Social Media Marketing Activities In Fashion Industry*”. Total Grant: RM5, 000.00 (Ringgit Malaysia).

## REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1991), *Managing Brand Equity*. NY: Free Press
- Aaker, D.A. (1991). *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of Brand Name*, MacMillan, New York, NY.
- Aaker, D.A. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356.
- Ahmad, S.Z., Bakar, A.R.A. & Ahmad, N. (2018). Social media adoption and its impact on firm performance: the case of the UAE. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 25(1), 84-111.
- Ainin, S., Parveen, F., Moghavvemi, S. & Jaafar, N.I. (2015). Factors influencing the use of social media by SMEs and its performance outcomes. *Industrial Management and Data System*, 115(3), 570-588.
- Belk, R. W. (1998). Possessions and the extended self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(2), 139-168.
- Bello, D.C. & Holbrook, M.B. (1995). Does an absence of brand equity generalize product classes? *Journal of Business research*, 34(2), 125-131.
- Berbegal-Mirabent, J., Mas-Machuca, M. & Marimon, F. (2016). Antecedents of online purchasing behavior in the tourism sector. *Industrial Management and Data System*, 116(1), 87-102.
- Boudreaux, C.A. & Palmer, S.E. (2007). Effect of wine label design on purchase intent and brand personality. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 19(3), 170-186.
- Chang, K., Hsu, C., Chen, M. & Kuo, N. (2019). How branded website creates customer purchase intentions. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 30(3-4), 422-446.
- Chen, S. & Lin, C. (2019). Understanding the effect of social media marketing activities: the mediation of social identification, perceived value and satisfaction. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 140, 22-32.
- Chen, M. H. (2017). The analysis of model for electronic commerce–artificial intelligent. *Journal of Asian Business Strategy*, 7(2), 39-43.



- Chu, S., Kamal, S. & Kim, Y. (2019). Re-examining of consumers' responses toward social media advertising and purchase intention toward luxury products from 2013 to 2019: a retrospective commentary. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 4(3), 158-174.
- Davcik, N.S., Da Silva, R.V. & Hair, J.F. (2015). Toward a unified theory of brand equity: conceptualization, taxonomy and avenue for future research. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 24(1), 3-17.
- Durkin, M., McGowan, P. & McKwoen, N. (2013). Exploring social media adoption in small to medium sized enterprise in Ireland. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 20(4), 716-734.
- Edosomwan, S., Prakasan, S.K., Kouame, D., Watson, J. & Seynour, T. (2011). The history of social media and its impacts on business. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 16(3), 79-91.
- Elliott, R. & Yannopoulou, N (2007). The nature of trust in brands: a psychological model. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(9-10), 988-998.
- Ferrer, E., Bousono, C., Jorge, J., Lora, L., Miranda, E & Natalizio, N. (2013). Enriching social capital and improving organizational performance in the age of social networking. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, 5(2), 96-109.
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. (1981). Structural equation with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Fuchs, C. & Schreier, M. (2011). Customer empowerment in new product development. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 28(1), 17-32.
- Fuller, J. (2010). Virtual co-creation of new products and its impacts on consumers' product and brand relationship. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 1, 1-6.
- Gazal, K., Montague, L., Poudel, R. & Wiedenbeck, J. (2016). The forest product industry in a digital age: factors affecting social media adoption. *Forest Products Journal*, 66(5), 343-353.
- Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. & Sarstedt, M. (2013). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage Publication.
- Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M. & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practices*, 19(2), 139-151.



- Hair, J.F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L. & Kuppelwieser, V.G. (2014). Partial least square structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM): an emerging tool in business research, *European Business Review*, 25(2), 106-121.
- Hennig-Thurau T, Gwinner K, Gremler D. (2002), Understanding relationship marketing outcomes: an integration of relational benefits and relationship quality. *Journal of Service Research*, 4(3): 230–247.
- Ismail, A. R. (2017) The influence of perceived social media marketing activities on brand loyalty: The mediation effect of brand and value consciousness, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 29(1), 129-144,
- Ju, S.R. and Chung, M.S. (2002), The effects of relational benefits between fashion retail stores and customers of relationship quality and customer satisfaction. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles*, 26(7), 1043–55.
- Kaplan, A.M. & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world unite: the challenge and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59-68.
- Keller, K.L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Khoi, B.H. & Tuan, N.V. (2019). Empirical study of purchasing intention in Vietnam. *International Econometric Conference of Vietnam*. Springer, Cham.
- Khuong, M.N & Nguyen, T.D. (2015). The effect of televisions commercials on customers purchase intention: a study of milk industry in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. *Journal of Economics Business and Management*, 3(9), 851-857.
- Kietzmann, J.H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, L.P. & Silvestre, B.S. (2011). Social media? Get serious: understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business Horizons*, 54(3), 241-251.
- Kim, A.J. & Ko, E. (2012). Do social media marketing activities enhance customer equity? an empirical study of luxury fashion brand. *Journal Business Research*, 65(10), 1480-1486.
- Kim., C.K., Han, D. & Park, S.B. (2001). The effect of brand personality and brand identification on brand loyalty: applying the theory of social identification. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 43(4), 195-206.
- Kumar, P., Meng, T. & Kabiraj, S. (2018). Effect of crowdsourcing on consumer brand perception and behavioral intentions. *Business Perspective and Research*, 7(1), 42-58.



- Lemon, K.N., Rust, R.T. & Zeithaml, V.A. (2011). What drives customer equity. *Marketing Management, Spring, 10(1)*, 20-25.
- Mourtada, R. & Alkhatib, F. (2014). *2014 UAE Social Media Outlook: Increasing Connectivity Between Government and Citizen*, Dubai Press Club, Dubai.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, N.Y.
- Pookulangara, S. & Koesler, K. (2011). Cultural influence on consumers usage of social networks and its impacts on online purchase intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 18(4)*, 348-354.
- Rouibah, K., Lowry, P.B. & Hwang, Y. (2016). The effects of perceived enjoyment and perceived risk of trust formation and intentions to use online payment system: new perspectives from an Arab country. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications, 19*, 33-43.
- Rust, R.T., Lemon, K.N. & Zeithaml, V.A. (2004). Return on marketing: using customer equity to focus marketing strategy. *Journal of Marketing, 68(1)*, 109-127.
- Siamagka, N.T., Christodoulides, G., Michaelidou, N. & Valvi, A. (2015). Determinants of social media adoption by B2B organizations. *Industrial Marketing Management, 51(1)*, 89-99.
- Trainor, K.J., Andzulis, J., Rapp, A. & Agnihotri, R. (2014). Social media technology usage and customer relationship performance: a capabilities-based examination of social CRM. *Journal of Business Research, 67(6)*, 1201-1208.
- Van Dijk, J., Antonides, G. & Schillewaert, N. (2014). Effect of co-creation on consumer brand perception and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 38(1)*, 110-118.
- Yun, S.Y. and Ko E. (2006), A study on measuring and defining dimensions of fashion product customer equity. *Journal of the Korean Society of Clothing and Textiles, 30(9/10)*, 1389–99.
- Zhang, S., Doorn, J.V. & Leeftang, P.S.H. (2014). Does the importance of value, brand and relationship equity for customer loyalty differ between eastern and western cultures? *International Business Review, 23(1)*, 284-292.