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YouTube platform has been rising in popularity for the past decade, we have seen the emergence of numerous influencers on the platform. With over 2 billion monthly active users in 2020, according to Statista research institute, YouTube represent an opportunity for brand marketer who would like to promote their products or services to a large audience.

First, this study aims to determinate the effect perceived influencer’s credibility of an influencer on YouTube might have on the viewer’s buying intention of the advertised product. Then secondly, to determine which aspect of credibility (attractiveness, expertise, or trustworthiness) has the greater influence on buying intention of the advertised products. Thirdly, to investigate whether there is any difference regarding gender characteristics.

For this study we use online survey responses of 208 participants and the statistical programs to analyze the data are SPSS and Gretl.

The finding this study is that trustworthiness followed by attractiveness have the greater influencer on buying intention of the advertised product on YouTube. It appears that for female and male respondents expertise dimension of credibility, doesn’t significantly impact viewer’s buying intention of the advertised product on YouTube.

The business implication is that brand marketers should select influencers who are considered trustworthy and attractive by their community in order to have more effective online marketing campaigns on YouTube platform.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Nowadays, social medias occupy an increasingly important place in our everyday lives. A study carried out by the Digital marketing agency in 2018 shows that Thai people spend on average 3 hours 20 minutes on social media daily. Among the multitude of new services that have been developed with the emergence of Internet, one new type of offer has imposed itself in our everyday life: online video. YouTube has established itself as the essential social media for video, and this for almost all types of video with the notable exception of cinema and series for the small screen, for copyright reasons, Brodersen, A. & Wattenhofer, M. (2012).

The choice of influencer is crucial for brands because it can contribute to the good positioning of the promoted product on the market or modified the image the consumer has about the product (Van Waldt et al. 2009). When talking about influencer marketing, credibility is one crucial factor that has a significant influence on buying intention. According to Lim, XJ, Radzol, JH and Wong (2017), the likelihood of a consumer to buy a product presented by an influencer who is considered to be credible is higher than an influencer with low credibility level. Brand managers and marketers should therefore be interested in the influencer’s perceived credibility on YouTube. Previous research on the topic of influencers has led to the conclusion that this type of marketing is considered less intrusive by consumers than traditional marketing techniques. (Chuan-Chuan Lin, Chiang, Hsu, 2011).

YouTube is in 2020 the second most used social media platform with over 2 billion monthly active users, according to Statista research institute, which represent a great opportunity for brand marketers to promote their products or services to a large number of viewers. YouTube platform has been a determinant factor for online shoppers in their early stage purchase decision making, according to a study conducted by Google/Ipsos on 700 US shoppers who used YouTube in 2018, indeed in the study 80% of shoppers who watch YouTube videos on future purchase intention watched YouTube in the beginning of their shopping purchase decision process making. A study conducted by Pew research center (2019) on 29,000 respondents, found out that in the US for the age group 18 to 49 more than 85% of
the respondents have used YouTube during the year 2019 at least once, higher than for other social media platform such as Instagram or Twitter for example.

Monthly active users from 2004 to 2019 on different social media platforms:

Data source: Statista and TNW (2019)

Share of adults in the United States who used the following social media paltform at least once during the year 2019, divided by age group:

Data source: Pew research center (2019)
The first objective of this study is to understand whether perceived influencer’s credibility on YouTube impact viewer’s buying intention and which credibility’s aspects has a greater influence on viewer’s buying intention. Second objective is to test if there is any difference regarding gender characteristics. Does gender characteristics influence the way YouTube viewers perceived the credibility of an influencer and buying intention of the advertised product by the influencer?

This study has for goal to help marketer and brand manager to better understand gender difference in consumer’s perceived influencer’s credibility and their buying intentions regarding the advertised product by the influencer, so they can create more effective marketing campaign and better target their audience.

1.2 Definition of an influencer on social media

In the world of web, an influence is an individual who through his audience on social medias has the ability to positively influence his audience with regard to a brand or a commercial offer. Consumers consider them more accessible and trustworthy compared to big celebrities (Veirman, Cauberghe, Hudders, 2017).

1.3 Web 2.0 and the emergence of influencers

Web 2.0 consists in using the Internet no longer as a simple complementary medium on which consumers come to seek information to treat it individually but more like a space in which people can share, meet and exchange together. Web 2.0 is considered as a place where the users is actually active in a sense that they interact between each other rather than just users interacting with brands as in Web 1.0. One drawback for brands in this Web2.0 is that they cannot fully control the communications regarding their products anymore, now users exchange information directly between each other without the intermediary of the brands.

Tim O’Reilly (2005) generalized the use of the term Web2.0, it consists of 2 major developments: it is now easy for consumers to interact with each other thanks to social media and secondly it is easy to spread information virally using word of mouth (WOW) via these SM (Poncin, 2018).
These developments have allowed consumers, among other things, to acquire a certain power in the face of brands (Nandagiri, Philippe, 2018). Electronic word of mouth (eWOW) is a term that started to be used widely after the emergence of Web 2.0, Mellet (2009). eWOW is the action of promoting or denigrating a product, a commercial or marketing offer or an organization through which consumers recommend or criticize the offer or product on social media. Since the emergence of the eWOM, consumers have increasingly searched on social media, review forums, and blogs of other consumers before purchasing a product or service. Previous studies have highlighted the existence of a positive impact of these online reviews on consumers’ purchasing intentions (Khan, Hashmi, 2016; Lopez, Sicilia, 2013). Consumers perceive recommendations made by other consumers as non-commercial and less intrusive, so they tend to give more importance to these recommendations, Kotler, Keller, Manceau, (2015), Hsu Chuan Lin, Chiang, (2013).

Some of these consumers exert a real influence via their blogs, Instagram/Facebook page, this represents a real opportunity for brands wishing to promote their products or communicate their brands by reducing their advertising expenses in the traditional media and it enable them to better target their customers (Mellet , 2009).

1.4 YouTube
An influencer acts as an intermediary between the brand and consumers. He interacts with his community through social media (Uzunoglu, Misci Kip, 2014, Gong, Li, 2017).

YouTube is a free social media, which currently has 1.9 billion users (Tauzin, 2019). Users can watch and share videos on various topics. The giant Google is the company owning YouTube. Influencers can create a YouTube channel where they post videos. Other users can subscribe to it to follow their news. They can also put a thumb up or down and comment on the video. In addition, they can publish polls, statutes, live videos and since the end of 2018 publish a story. The videos broadcast on this platform can also be shared on different social networks (Hossler, Murat, Jouanne, 2015).
2. Literature review

2.1 Why brands are using influencers?

Nowadays, many companies like to engage in marketing campaigns with SM influencers because consumers perceive the recommendations of these influencers as non-intrusive and non-commercial. These marketing operations via influencers are therefore generally more effective.

There are different levels in purchasing decision-making process and influencers can impact all of these levels. Blackwell, Kollat and Engel (1995) created this model which has a total of 5 stages: recognition of the need, research of information, evaluation of alternatives, purchase, and finally post-purchase reaction.

Figure 1– Purchase decision-making process, Koller, Keller, Manceau, (2015)

First step: Problem recognition. This is when the consumer becomes aware of a need. This is done through internal or external stimuli. An internal stimuli is everything concerning the person himself, relating to its internal feeling for example hunger, sleepiness or thirst. External stimuli is about the person’s environment, the impact of a relative, reaction to the world around this person.

Second step: Information search. After the consumer has decided that he/she wants to satisfy the identified need, the consumer will search for the available options. There is 2 available research for information search, Punj, G. N., & Staelin, R (1983): internal search, meaning using your own memories, previous experiences and, external search, for example word of mouth or asking your relatives about the product or service.
Third step is the evaluation of alternatives. After the information has been collected, the consumer will assess the alternatives available to meet his needs. Each product, service or brand is made up of attributes, which are different characteristics that the consumer will take into account when comparing products, services or brands, Olshavsky, R. W., & Granbois, D. H. (1979). The importance of each attribute varies according to each individual.

Fourth step: the purchase decision. Two factors can influence the consumer's final choice between the third and fourth stages: the unexpected and the attitude of others. The attitude of others is the influence that their family, those around them or members of a virtual group have on the consumer, Kolter, Keller, Manceau, (2015). For example, he may be tempted to purchase a recommended product by other consumers.

Fifth and last step: post-purchase evaluation. It is here that the consumer will create his own opinion on the product, service or brand consumed, Mugge, R., Schifferstein, H. N & Schoormans, J. P. (2010).

Influencers can have an effect on all the decisions-making process stages, they can stimulate a consumer need via product placements or partnerships, Hsu, Chuan-Chuan Lin, (2013). The recommendations made by SM influencers on products or services, the advice given to their communities on the advantages and disadvantages of a certain product or service can have an influence on the consumer’s information search. Influencers can change, in a good or bad way consumer's opinion / attitude about a certain brand.

In summary, opinion leaders can be used to: change or strengthen the image of a brand, Misci Kip, Uzunoglu, (2013), increase the visibility of the brand or product promoted, Nandagiri & Philip (2018) Li Lai, Chen, 2011; Lui, Jiang, Ding, Duan & Xu, 2015; Uzunoglu, Misci Kip, (2014), strengthen commitment to the brand Hsu, Chuan-Chuan Lin, (2013), or finally, increase purchase intentions, Lui, Jiang, Lin, Ding, Duan, Xu, 2015; Misci Kip, Uzunoglu, (2014).
2.2 Influencers’ credibility and buying intention

In this study, perceived credibility refers to what extent an influencer on YouTube is perceived to be non-biased, believable, and true (Rabjohn, C. M., & Lee, M. K. (2008). The attractiveness of a brand on YouTube is influenced greatly by the influencer’s credibility, Schlecht, (2003). Past research have shown that an influencer’s credibility is main factor in affecting the behavior of the consumers, it appears that influencers who are perceived as credible by their audience, increase the message’s persuasiveness, Desarbo & Harshman, (1985). Credible influencers can have a great influence on consumer behavior, for example, attitude change towards a brand, increase brand awareness, Eren-Erdogmus et al., (2016). When the audience perceive an influencer as highly credible, they act positively with the brand promoted and the advertisement, Kapitan & Silvera, (2016), the end result is that consumers buying intention will increase, Newell, Goldsmith, & Lafferty, (2000). A highly credible influencer would be able to change his/her audience’s attitude in greater measure than a less credible influencer, Desarbo & Harshman, (1985). Researchers have found that if an influencer tell his/her audience the product he/she promotes is a commercial paid placement, it might lead to a negative influence on the intention of word of mouth and audience’s attitude, because the influencer’s credibility has decreased, Casaló et al., (2018).

According to a study conducted by Pornpitakpan.C (2004), Chinese celebrity endorsements’ credibility is significantly related to purchase intention, respondents from this study were all from Singapore and were aged between 19 and 24 years old. In her study Dr Pornpitakpan C (2004) highlighted the fact that her research was focused only on a particular type of population (Singaporean students). A study conducted by Djafarova and Rushworth (2017), aims to study the effects of celebrities and influencers on purchase intention, this study was carried out on young women users of Instagram. The researchers concluded that social media influencers was more influential and credible than traditional television or movie celebrities among young women.

Previous research on influencer credibility’s dimension diverge. In a study conducted by Hovland, Janis and Kelley (1953) credibility is described as the component of 2 components which are trustworthiness and expertise. On the other hand, Mc Guire
(1985) added a third dimension of credibility: attractiveness. According to Goldsmith et al. (2000), a credible endorser have a positive effect on consumer perception. An individual considered credible by others might be able to impact the attitudes, behavior, opinions, beliefs of consumers, Wang et al. (2017). Influencers who are perceived as credible and expert by their followers will tend to be more persuasive and better able to influence consumer buying intention, Aaker and Myers 1987, Ohanian 1991, Hovland et al. (1951) Anyhow, researchers all agree that credibility is composed of several concepts/dimensions, Eisend, (2006).

In this study I will measure perceived influencer’s credibility on YouTube in these 3 dimensions. Ohanian (1990) proposed a scale to measure these 3 credibility’s dimensions and I will use his scale to answers the research question.

2.3 Attractiveness

Social media influencer’s physical attractiveness is considered to have higher chance in driving the advertising’s acceptance rate, it can influence the perception others have of that individual, Petroshius & Crocker, (1989). Attractiveness means how agreeable an influencer’s physical attractive is to his followers, Eren-Erdogmus et al., (2016). Attractiveness of an endorser refer to physical traits but also to other characteristics such as personality, likeability or ability ,Erdogan (1999). According to Ohanian, (1991), most individuals rates others people base on their physical attractiveness, for this reason the use of attractive influencers is frequent practice by marketers, Schlecht, (2003). Several researches have highlighted the existence of a positive correlation between attractiveness and buying intention, Petty et al. (1983); Erdogan (1999), attractive influencers tends to have more positive influence on the product they advertise than influencers who are considered not attractive by their community, Van der Waldt et al., (2009) A study conducted by Kahle and Homer, (1985) also concluded the higher effectiveness of influencers perceived as attractive on promoting a product than not attractive influencers. Attractiveness is considered to directly impact the endorser’s message effectiveness, Schlecht, (2003). Kapitan & Silvera, 2016, demonstrated that regardless of the product category, an attractive influencer in terms of physic tends to be more persuasive. Therefore marketers, brand managers, should be particularly attentive to the influencer’s attractiveness in order to
give an effective message. Marketers use the attractiveness of an influencer to change consumer’s attitude, Menon, Boone, & Rogers, (2001).

Social media influencers who are considered to be physically attractive for others, influence consumers with positive outcomes, indeed consumers perceived them with a positive attitude which will influence their buying intention, Till and Busler (2000). On the other hand, several researchers contrasted that influencers’ physical attractiveness might be relevant only if the product they promote has for aim to enhance user’s attractiveness, for example beauty influencers, attractiveness is a crucial factor in affecting consumer’s attitude and buying intention. Social media influencers with incredible appearance traits have a higher probability to attract consumer’s attention on YouTube. The more physical traits (attractiveness) enhance an individual’s popularity, the more the influence on his/her audience increase, Petroshius & Crocker, (1989). Studies have shown that physical traits of an opinion leader and the audience liking of an advertisement are positively related, Petroshius & Crocker, (1989). Attractiveness has several influences, it can: impact consumer’s attitude towards brand, Erdogan, (2008), increase positive change in consumer’s attitude, Ohanian, (1990).

In this study I will use the attractiveness’ scale from Ohanian (1990) to develop the survey’s structure. Ohanian (1990) developed five items scales to measure an individual attractiveness: attractive, classy, handsome, elegant, and sexy.

2.4 Expertise
The degree to which an individual’s claims are accurate is defined as expertise, Hovland, Janis, & Kelley, (1953). Expertise is the knowledge on a subject that an influencer has, Eren-Erdogmus et al., (2016) and is also a dimension of credibility, Ohanian, (1990). Influencers who have a wide knowledge on a specific topic can make accurate and pertinent comments on that type of product class because the expertise they have on the topic give them validity to back their declarations up which are made in the advertisements, Ohanian, (1991), Chan & Misra, (1990). Interesting fact about expertise is not that the influencer should be actually an expert about the product he/she promotes but rather that the target audience thinks he/she is an expert, Erdogan, (2008). Influencers considered as expert by their audiences have more
power of recommendation in comparison to influencers less skilled, Jamil & Hassan, (2018). According to Till and Busler, (2000), expertise is considered to be more suitable than attractiveness for matching products with influencers. In is study, Ohanian, (1991) pointed out that expertise was the only dimension of credibility that has a notable impact on consumers’ buying intention. An influencer who is perceived by his/her audience to have a certain expertise can boost in a positive way the perception a consumer has on a product or brand, Kapitan & Silvera, (2016). Previous research highlighted the fact that expertise affects in a positive way the change in attitude of consumers, Lafferty et al., (2005). Even though influencer attractiveness is shown in several studies to have a positive attitude change, the literature review on whether attractive influencer can impact on consumer’s purchase intention diverges. On one hand, studies have shown that an influencer who is physical attractive to others can create purchase intention among his/her audience, on another hand, other studies have shown that physical attractive influence are not able to influence purchase intention of his/her audience, Erdogan, (2008). While Churchill Jr (1977) and Ohanian (1991) found in their research that attractiveness has not a important effect on consumer’s buying intention, other research argue that conclusion. Friedman, Termini, & Washington, 1976, Jamil & Hassan, (2018),Pornpitakpan, (2004 ), have similar result in their studies, they have found that a physical attractive influencer can impact positively purchase intention among consumers

Ohanian (1990) developed five attributes as scales to measure an individual expertise: being expert, experienced, knowledgeable, qualified, and skilled.
2.5 Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is an individual’s integrity, honesty and believability, Van der Waldt et al., (2009) and has been defined as an important source of power for an influencer on social media, Uzunoğlu & Misci Kip, (2014). Another definition for trustworthiness could be the consumer’s confidence level put into the information origin source for giving honest advice, Ohanian, (1991). Companies wanting to promote their products on social media should select the influencers who are viewed as trustful by their audience in order to develop efficient relationship with the consumers, Konstantopoulou et al., (2019). Familiarity might be an important factor in trustworthiness as most individuals sees relatives trustworthy on many subjects, Ohanian, (1991). According to Erdogan, (2008), similitude between and influencer and the target audience is important in order to rise his/her trustworthiness because the public typically trust influencers who are similar to them. Let’s take the example of a black American audience with a beauty influencer who is from the same race-related group, the trust level in the influencer put by the audience will be greatly above than an influencer from a different ethnic group than the black American audience, Jamil & Hassan, (2018). In the event that the promoted product by an influencer turn out not to meet the audience’s expectation, the latter will have an unfavorable attitude toward the influencer and the brand, Djafarova & Rushworth, (2017). A trustworthy influencer can use his good reputation to attenuate a negative impression towards a specific brand formed by consumers, but the drawback for the influencer would be a loss of some of his trusted reputation, Desarbo & Harshman, (1985). Traditional celebrities are perceived naturally by consumers as trustworthy source of information, people usually like celebrities and thus they will have a tendency to trust them Jamil & Hassan, (2018), Ohanian, (1990). Brand manager should select influencers who are appreciated/liked in their community because likeability is considered to be the crucial trust element according to Erdogan, (2008). Erdogan (2008) also highlighted in his study that trustworthiness is a main credibility element, an influencer who is both considered by the audience as trustworthy and expert will be apt to change the audience opinion, Ohanian, (1990). The result of a persuasive and trustworthy influencer on consumers could be a change in their attitude, Kapitan & Silvera, (2016). Consumers who perceived an influencer’s sayings
on a particular product as valid, have a positive attitude towards the brand, Djafarova & Rushworth, 2017). Trustworthy influencer could help facilitate, accelerate the consumers selection making process, Konstantopoulou et al., (2019) and also impact assurance and the audience loyalty, Li & Miniard, (2006). An opinion leader declaration or message who is considered to be trustworthy can be more effective in changing consumers’ attitude, Ohanian, (1990). Literature review on trustworthiness diverges, some studies shows that trusted influencers tend to have an influence on consumer’s buying intention, Liu et al., (2015), on the other hand other studies argue that trustworthiness is not an important factor to considered for consumers’ buying intention, Ohanian, (1991). Ohanian (1990) developed five attributes as scales to measure trustworthiness: being honest, dependable, reliable, sincere, and trustworthy.

2.6 Buying intention

Since the emerge of social media, marketing strategies on internet has dramatically changed over the years. The apparition of social platform such as Facebook, Instagram and YouTube has changed how consumers communicate on internet. The expansion of these social media platform has remodeled the place of consumers, from being passive to being active and able to influence others, Kozinets et al, 2008, Merz et al, (2009). Nowadays consumers have more influence over brands than before, Constantinides and Fountain, (2008). Brand marketers have now new opportunities and challenges as social media interactions greatly affect consumer’s buying intention, Hinz et al. (2011). Before buying goods or services online, consumers usually look for product reviews on social media before making a decision to buy, they rely more and more on online reviews by others consumers, Horst et al., 2007; Harris, 2012; Racherla & Friske, (2012). Buying intention concept has been utilized to estimate the actions of consumers, Kim et al, (2008), Lee et al, (2015). The final goal for consumer regarding a product is buying intention, Fishbein and Ajzen, (1975). Brand markets main’s objective while conducting marketing campaign on social media is to increase the consumers intention to buy the advertised product by the influencer Ko, Kim, and Zhang, (2008).
2.7 Gender

Past research have shown a difference in awareness between female and male viewers towards attractive female influencers, Petroshius & Crocker, (1989). On one hand, some researchers have found out that male and female audiences have more positive attitudes towards a female influencers than towards a male one, Debevec & Kernan, (1984), on another hand, other research concluded that male tends to have greater purchase intention towards male endorsers and female audience towards female endorsers, Caballero, Lumpkin, & Madden, (1989).

In the marketing field gender is always used to segment the target audience, Palanisamy, (2004). In past research, notable differences as been discovered between female and male online actions, Palanisamy, (2004) Females seems to be using internet more for communicating than male users, and females also tends to post more pictures on social medias than male users, Sasson & Mesch, (2016). Males internauts tends to perceived a lower level of risk when buying goods or services online, than female users, Garbarino & Strahilevitz, (2004). Male and females have a difference in perception for information coming from internet, indeed past research have shown that male tend to believe more easily social media influencer, male usually rate message credibility of an influencer above than female, Flanagin & Metzger, (2003). Therefore, it is plausible that gender characteristics might have an essential role in the way viewers perceived an influencec credibility on YouTube.

Following my rational, studying the difference between male and female in the way they perceived an influencer credibility on YouTube and their buying intention of the advertised product or service could help companies adapt their social media marketing strategies to better target the consumers.
2.8 Conceptual framework

In this study the aim to determine whether an influencer’s credibility on YouTube significantly affect consumer’s buying intention. Secondly, we would like to investigate which credibility element (attractiveness, expertise or trustworthiness), has a greater effect on viewer’s buying intention. Lastly, we would like to understand if gender characteristic influence viewer’s buying intention and the way they perceive the credibility of an influencer on YouTube. To create the conceptual framework we used Ohanian, (1990) credibility’s dimensions, which are: attractiveness, expertise and trustworthiness.

![Conceptual framework](image)

Figure 2: Conceptual framework
2.9 Sub-questions to be answered in this study

Sub-question 1: Does influencer’s credibility on YouTube affect consumer’s buying decision?

Sub-question 2: Which dimension of credibility (attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness), has a greater influence on viewer’s buying intention on YouTube?

Sub-question 3: Does demographic gender characteristics impact the way YouTube viewers perceived the credibility of an influencer and their buying intention of the advertised products by the influencer?

Sub-question 4: Which dimension of credibility has a greater influence on YouTube viewer’s buying intention depending on gender characteristics?
3. Methodology

3.1 Research design and survey

A structured and self-administrated questionnaire is used to collect the data needed to answer the sub-research questions. While making the survey, all questions were thought to be the clearest as possible, short, and not ambiguous. The survey is composed of 16 questions, mostly multiple-choice questions, close ended and open-ended questions.

The first part of the questionnaire, question 1 to 5 are designed to collect demographic characteristics of the respondent such as, age, gender, education, income and occupation. We will use gender characteristics answers to analyze if there is a significant difference regarding respondents from different sex.

Then, definition of what is an influencer on social media is given to make sure the respondents understand what is the questionnaire about, and filter questions are used to separate the respondents into 2 categories:  
- people following influencers on YouTube (target for this study),  
- people not using YouTube or don’t following influencer on YouTube (not relevant for this study). Questions about the respondent behavior are also included in part two, the aim is to understand how the respondents are using YouTube platform.

Finally, in part three, questions are designed to measure the respondents’ perception of an influencer’s credibility into three dimensions from the literature review, attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness. I will be using the scale from Ohanian (1990) to measure these dimensions. The last two questions of the questionnaire are about buying intention of the respondents.
3.2 Sample population
In this study participants are composed of individual above the age of 18, using YouTube to watch videos and following influencers on the platform, I will not considered individuals who are not using YouTube nor individuals not following influencers on YouTube in this study.

3.3 Measurements
A total of 15 items composed Ohanian (1990) scale to measure credibility and 2 items composed Dodds Monroe and Grewal (1991) scale to measure buying intention.
Each credibility’s dimensions are measured under the form of a seven-point Linkert scale, 1 meaning that the respondent strongly disagree with the declaration and 7 meaning that the respondent strongly agree with the declaration. Buying intention of the respondents will also be access with a seven-point rating Linkert scale.
4. Descriptive statistics

In this part 4, I will go over the collected data, the statistic software used are IBM SPSS and Gretl to interpret the data.

Firstly, I will use descriptive statistics to present the demographic characteristic of the respondents, graphs and diagram will be used to visualize the data more clearly.

A total of 249 answers have been collected via social media (Line, Facebook, Instagram). Out of the answers, 208 can be exploited as they meet the criteria of this study, which is to watch YouTube videos and following influencers on the platform. 11 don’t enter the qualification criteria for this study and another 30 have not answers the questionnaire completely.

4.1 Demographic characteristics

4.1.1 Gender

57% of the respondents were female and 43% were male.

Figure 3: Gender of the respondents
4.1.2 Age
Most of the respondent, 62% are between the age of 18 to 25 years old, while 32% are between the age of 26-35, 5% between 36-45 years old and 1% above the age of 46.

![Age of the respondents](image)

**Figure 4: Age of the respondents**

4.1.3 Education
Concerning the respondent’s education level, 52% have a Bachelor’s degree, 28% have a Master degree, 12% High school diploma and 8% Doctorate degree.

![Education of the respondents](image)

**Figure 5: Education of the respondents**
4.1.4 Employment situation

Regarding the respondents’ employment situation, 38% are still student, 22% are working part time, 21% are self-employed, 13% are employee and 6% have other occupation.

Figure 6: Employment of the respondents
4.1.5 Income
Concerning the respondent’s income, 35% have an average monthly less than 15 000 bath, 27% in the range of 25 000 to 35 000 Thai baht, 21% in the range of 35 000 to 50 000 Thai baht, 12% in the range of 15 000 to 25 000 Thai bath and 5% more than 50 000 Thai bath.

![Income Distribution Chart](chart.png)

**Figure 7: Income of the respondents**

4.2 Behavior on YouTube
The data collected indicates that 95% of the respondents watch videos on YouTube on a regular basis.
Regarding the time of the day when the respondents mostly access YouTube to watch videos, 54% watch YouTube videos in the evening, 26% late night, 9% in the morning, 7% in the afternoon and 4% in early morning.
Concerning the average time spend on YouTube watching videos each day, 32% spend between 30 minutes to 1 hour, 22% between 1 hour to 1:30 hours, 17% between 1:30 hours to 2 hours, 11% between 2 hours to 2:30 hours, 10% less than 30 minutes and 8% more than 3 hours.

Figure 8: Period of the day when the respondents mostly access YouTube

Figure 9: Average time the respondents spend on YouTube each day
A question was asked to identify which variety of influencers, the respondents like to follow on YouTube, and they could choose among different varieties of influencers. From the data collected, it seems that Beauty and Fashion is the most common reason why the respondents access YouTube, followed by how to and “diy” (do it yourself), science and education, blogs/vlog (travel), tech, cooking and health, news, sport, music and other.

![Figure 10: Reasons why to access YouTube for the respondents](image)

4.3 Reliability test
Firstly, we need to access the reliability or internal consistency of our different measurement scales. Internal consistency means to what extend one item in our scales is measuring the same things as another item. To do so, Cronbach’s alpha test will be performed. Internal reliability is specifically important when it comes to use a scale composed of several items like in this study, Bryman and Cramer, (2002).
When interpreting the Cronbach’s alpha value, below 0.65 we consider the coefficient as unacceptable, an alpha value between 0.70 and 0.80 is considered to be good and alpha value > 0.80 is considered as very good, George & Mallery, (2003). From our results in the table above, we can see that all our values for Cronbach’s alpha are greater than 0.80, so our scales’ internal consistency are high meaning that buying intention and all credibility dimensions are reliable internally.

### 4.4 Correlation test

In this section I will perform a Pearson correlation analysis between the different items of the measurement scales, in order to evaluate the strength of the relationship between the variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>attractiveness</th>
<th>expertise</th>
<th>trustworthiness</th>
<th>buying intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attractiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.142*</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>0.142*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.549**</td>
<td>0.198**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.549**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.393**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buying intention</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
<td>0.198**</td>
<td>0.393**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Table 2: Correlation matrix

From the results in the above table, we can see that all the variables are positively correlated and also significant with the exception of trustworthiness and
attractiveness. Expertise and attractiveness are significant at the 0.05 level, all the other variables which are significant are at the 0.01 level.

Regarding buying intention, it seems to have the strongest correlation with trustworthiness, with a positive value of 0.393. Second solid correlation with buying intention is attractiveness with a positive value of 0.270 and third with expertise with a lower value of positive 0.198.

**4.5 Mean and standard deviation**

In the following tables you can find the mean and standard deviation (how spread out numbers are from the mean) for each scale.

**Attractiveness** 5 items scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classy</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handsome</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegant</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexy</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Attractiveness as a construct | 4.88 |

*Table 3: Attractiveness, mean and standard deviation*
**Expertise 5 items scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise as a construct</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Expertise, mean and standard deviation**

**Trustworthiness 5 items scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness as a construct</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Trustworthiness, mean and standard deviation**
**Buying intention** 2 items scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are willing to buy the products that the influencers advertise on YouTube</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are likely to buy the products that the influencers advertise on YouTube</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying intention as construct</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Buying intention, Table 4: Expertise, mean and standard deviation**

We can see from the tables above that the credibility’s dimension with the highest mean is attractiveness (4.88), followed by expertise (4.54) and finally trustworthiness (4.00). We can interpret the results as the following: attractiveness appears to be an important factor for the respondents when following an influencer on YouTube platform, followed by expertise and then trustworthiness seems to be less important relatively to the other factors when it comes to follow an influencer on YouTube according to our survey’s result.
5. Analysis and discussion

In this part we will discuss the findings from the previous part and their implications concerning our research questions.

For reminder in this study we have 4 sub research questions which are:
- Sub-question 1: Does credibility of an influencer on YouTube affect viewer’s buying intention of the advertised products?
- Sub-question 2: Which dimension of credibility (attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness), has a greater influence on viewer’s buying intention on YouTube?
- Sub-question 3: Does demographic gender characteristics impact the way YouTube viewers perceived the credibility of an influencer and their buying intention of the advertised products by the influencer?
- Sub-question 4: Which dimension of credibility has a greater influence on YouTube viewer’s buying intention depending on gender characteristics?

5.1 Sub-question 1

**Does credibility of an influencer on YouTube affect viewer’s buying intention of the advertised products by the influencer?**

To answer whether or not an influencer’s credibility affects viewer’s buying decision we will run a simple linear regression between the variable credibility as a construct and buying intention as construct, the aim of the linear regression is to estimate to what extent there is a relationship between the 2 variables. Before conducting the simple linear regression we need to test for autocorrelation in the residuals, to do so we use a Durbin-Watson test and our result is 1.941, meaning that no autocorrelation was detected in the sample.
Table 7: Simple linear regression, buying intention and credibility as a construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient $\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above we can see that our results from the linear regression are statistically significant, our p-value is 0.000 which less than 0.05, our significance level.

Our R-squared value is 0.161, meaning that 16.1% of the dependent variable (buying intention), is explained by the independent variable (credibility).

Standardized coefficient $\beta$ is 0.387, meaning that influencer’s credibility and buying intention have a positive relation.

In conclusion, influencer’s credibility does affect viewer’s buying intention on YouTube.

5.2 Sub-question 2

Which dimension of credibility (attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness), has a greater influence on viewer’s buying intention on YouTube?

In this section we want to know which aspect of credibility has the greater impact on viewer’s buying intention. To do so, we will run a multiple regression between each aspect of credibility (attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness) and buying intention which will be our dependent variable.
Attractiveness and trustworthiness have p-values equal to 0.000 which is less than 0.05 our confidence level, meaning that the results for these 2 variables are statistically significant.

On the other hand, expertise has a p value of 0.396 which is above our confidence level of 0.05, meaning that expertise is not statistically significant in this multiple regression.

Our R-squared is equal to 0.214, meaning that 21% of respondent buying intention on YouTube can be explained by these credibility’s dimensions.

Trustworthiness have the higher coefficient $\beta$ (0.391) followed by attractiveness ($\beta=0.231$)

In conclusion for this section, trustworthiness followed by attractiveness have the greater impact on viewer’s buying intention on YouTube platform.
5.3 Sub-question 3
Does gender characteristics impact the way YouTube viewers perceive the credibility of an influencer, and their buying intention of the advertised products by the influencer?

In this section we want to know whether gender characteristics impact the way consumers perceived credibility of an influencer and their buying intention regarding the advertised products. To do so, we will use Chi-square test.

Chi-square test between gender and attractiveness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Chi-Square test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>46.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Chi square test, attractiveness, and gender

Null hypothesis, H0: Variable gender and attractiveness are independent
Alternative hypothesis, H1: Variable gender and attractiveness are not independent
In this section the significance level is equal to 0.05.
Since the p-value (Asymptotic significance) is equal to 0.005 and is less than 0.05, the significance level, we reject the null hypothesis H0, variable gender and attractiveness are not independent.
In conclusion, gender does impact the way the respondent perceive an influencer
attractiveness, male and female respondents differ in their answers regarding influencer’s attractiveness.

Chi-square test between gender and expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Chi-Square test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>30.640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symmetric measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal by nominal</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Chi square test, expertise, and gender

Null hypothesis, H0: Variable gender and expertise are independent
Alternative hypothesis, H1: Variable gender and expertise are not independent
Significance level is equal to 0.05.

P-value (0.270) is greater than 0.05, the significance level, we accept the null hypothesis H0, variable gender and expertise are independent.
In conclusion, no relationship has been found between the variable gender and expertise, gender does not impact the way the respondents perceive an influencer’s expertise.
Chi-square test between variable (gender) and variable (trustworthiness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Chi-Square test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>32.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Chi square test, trustworthiness, and gender

Null hypothesis, $H_0$: Variable gender and trustworthiness are independent
Alternative hypothesis, $H_1$: Variable gender and expertise are not independent
Significance level is equal to 0.05.

The p-value (0.270) is greater than 0.05, the significance level, we accept the null hypothesis $H_0$, variable gender and trustworthiness are independent.

In conclusion, no relationship has been found between the variable gender and trustworthiness, gender does not impact the way the respondents perceive an influencer’s trustworthiness.
Chi-square test between gender and buying intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buying intention</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Asymptotic Significance (2 sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>39.112</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approximate significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Chi square test, buying intention and gender

Null hypothesis, H0: Variable gender and buying intention are independent
Alternative hypothesis, H1: Variable gender and buying intention are not independent
Significance level is equal to 0.05.
Since the p-value (Asymptotic significance) is equal to 0.003 and is less than 0.05, the significance level, we reject the null hypothesis H0, variable gender and buying intention are not independent.
In conclusion, male and female respondent differs in their behavior regarding buying intention of the advertised products on YouTube.
5.4 Sub-question 4

Which dimension of credibility has a greater influence on YouTube viewer’s buying intention depending on gender characteristics?

In this section we want to know which aspect of credibility between attractiveness, expertise, or trustworthiness, has a greater influence on consumer’s buying intention depending on gender. To do so, we need to separate/split the sample into male on one side and female on the other side.

The dependent variable here is buying intention and the independent variables are attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness.

**Male respondents’ answers, multiple linear regression between buying intention and attractiveness, expertise, trustworthiness.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.624*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>3.682</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P value

F value 8.96

R-squared 0.167

*not statistically significant*

Table 13: Multiple regression, male, buying intention and attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness
For male respondents, the p-value for the overall model is equal to 0.000 which is less than our confidence level of 0.05, meaning that the regression model is significant, a linear relationship exists between the dependent and independent variables. R-squared is 0.167, meaning that 16.7% of male respondents buying intention can be explained by the variables: attractiveness, expertise and trustworthiness.

Expertise variable has a p-value (0.624) greater than our confidence level (0.05), meaning that the variable expertise does not have a significant influence on buying intention for male respondents.

Attractiveness and trustworthiness variables have a P value of 0.011 and 0.000 respectively and coefficient β of 0.217 and 0.358 respectively, meaning that both variables have a positive and significant influence on buying intention for male respondents.

Trustworthiness have the higher coefficient β (0.358) followed by attractiveness (β=0.217).

In conclusion, trustworthiness followed by attractiveness have a greater impact on buying intention of the advertised product by the influencer on YouTube.
Female respondents’ answers, multiple linear regression between buying intention and attractiveness, expertise, trustworthiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.835</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>-1.187</td>
<td>0.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P value = 0.000
F value = 13.117
R-squared = 0.197

* not statistically significant

Table 14: Multiple regression, female, buying intention and attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness

For female respondents, the p-value for the overall model is equal to 0.000 which is less than our confidence level of 0.05, meaning that the regression model is significant, a linear relationship exists between the dependent and independent variables.

R-squared is 0.197, meaning that 19.7% of female respondents buying intention can be explained by the variables: attractiveness, expertise and trustworthiness.

Expertise variable has a p-value (0.234) larger than 0.05, our confidence level, meaning that the variable expertise does not have a significant influence on buying intention for female respondents.

Attractiveness and trustworthiness variables have a P value of 0.001 and 0.000 respectively and coefficient β of 0.257 and 0.427 respectively, meaning that both
variables have a positive and significant influence on buying intention for female respondents.

Trustworthiness have the higher coefficient $\beta$ (0.427) followed by attractiveness ($\beta=0.257$).

In conclusion, trustworthiness followed by attractiveness have the greater impact on Female viewer’s buying intention of the advertised product by the influencer on YouTube.
6. Conclusion, limitation, and future research

6.1 Conclusion

Concerning our first sub research question which was whether or not the credibility of an influencer affect viewer’s buying intention on YouTube, from our results we have seen that it exists a relationship between credibility of an influencer and viewer’s buying intention on YouTube and this relationship is positive, meaning that consumers who recognize an influencer as having a high credibility level will be more likely to buy a product from that influencer on YouTube.

Second sub research question in this study was to understand which aspect of the influencer credibility has a greater impact on viewer’s buying intention. We have seen that attractiveness and trustworthiness have an influence on viewer’s buying intention, but expertise does not, meaning that influencer’s expertise does not impact viewer’s buying intention of the advertised product by the influencer on YouTube.

Third sub research question was to understand whether gender characteristic impact the way viewers perceived an influencer’s credibility and buying intention of the advertised product on YouTube. From our results we concluded that male and female respondents do differ in their perception of an influencer’s attractiveness and buying intention. Meaning that perceived influencer’s attractiveness and buying intention of the advertised product by the influencer on YouTube, is different whether the respondent is a male or a female.

And finally, fourth sub research question was to understand which aspect of an influencer’s credibility has a greater impact on viewer’s buying intention depending on the respondent’s gender (male or female). We concluded that trustworthiness was the credibility aspect that has the greater impact on male and female viewer’s buying intention on YouTube. From our results, expertise of an influencer on YouTube. From our results, expertise of an influencer intention for both male and female respondents.

Attractiveness and trustworthiness are the two most important credibility dimensions to significantly impact buying intention of YouTube viewer’s, we found the same results both for male and female respondents. Business implications of our findings would be that brand marketer who would like to advertise a product using YouTube influencer should make sure that these two credibility dimensions are present in the
influencer and perceived by the audience, in order to maximize the results for their social media marketing campaigns.

6.2 Limitations and Further Research

In this study we couldn’t regulate the number of respondent in each category for example age, gender, income or education, therefore we had un-equal category in term of respondent number for example 62% of the respondent are age below 25 and only 5 % are in the 36-45 years old range, so we couldn’t analyze the possible effect of age in our study.

Due to the small sample size (208 valid observations), we cannot generalize our findings to the whole community watching videos on YouTube and following influencers on the platform.

Not having a diverse population background is another limitation of our findings, most of the respondents were student and holding a bachelor’s degree, so the recommendation for future research would be to have bigger sample population with more diverse background in terms of occupation and education as well.

We focus our study on people living in Thailand, it would be interesting to study if in other countries the results would be the same or not as ours.
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Appendices

Appendix 1, survey:

Q1: Do you watch videos on YouTube?
Yes
No
Condition: if No Selected. Skip To: End of Survey.

Q2: Do you watch YouTube videos regularly?
Yes
No
Condition: if No Selected. Skip To: End of Survey.

What are influencers? Influencers, digital in this case, are individual who, through their audiences and the influence they exercise over their audience, has the power to modify consumer behavior and perceived perceptions with regard to a brand, product or service. An influencer is someone whose point of view is respected and opinion heard.

Q3: Do you follow any influencers on YouTube?
Yes
No
Condition: if No Selected. Skip To: End of Survey.

Q4: Please indicate, selecting the option that suits your situation. how much time do you spend watching YouTube videos a day?
Less than 30 min
30 min to 60 min
1 to 1.30 hours
1.30 to 2 hours
2h to 2.30 hours
2.30 h to 3 hours
More than 3 hours
Q5: Why do you MAINLY access YouTube?
- Blogs/Vlogs (travel one)
- How-To & DIY
- Tech
- Science & Education
- Cooking & Health
- News
- Music
- Sports
- Beauty & Fashion
- Others

Q6: What is your age
- 18-25 years old
- 26-35 years old
- 36-45 years old
- 46 years old and above

Q7: Please indicate your gender:
- Women
- Male

Q8: Indicate your occupation:
- Student
- Employed by a third party
- Self-employed
- Unemployed
- Worker - Student
- Other
**Q9. Education level:**
No schooling completed
High school diploma
Bachelor’s degree
Master’s Degree
Doctorate Degree

**Q10. Average Monthly Income**
Below 15 000 baht
15 000 to 25 000 Baht
25 000 to 35 000 Baht
35 000 to 50 000 Baht
Above 50 000 Bath

**Q11: Please indicate, on a scale between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 7 (Strongly Agree), to what extent do you agree with the following statements:**

**Credibility scale from Ohanian, (1990):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>I disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>I agree (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are classy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are handsome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are elegant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I follow influencers on Instagram because they are sexy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q12: Please indicate, on a scale between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 7 (Strongly Agree), to what extent do you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>I disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>I agree (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are dependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>I follow influencers on Instagram because they are trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13: Please indicate, on a scale between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 7 (Strongly Agree), to what extent do you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>I disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>I agree (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>I follow influencers on YouTube because they are qualified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>I follow influencers on Instagram because they are skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14: Please indicate, on a scale between 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 7 (Strongly Agree), to what extent do you agree with the following statements:

Buying intention scale from Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal (1991):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>I disagree Totally (1)</th>
<th>I disagree Partially (3)</th>
<th>Not I disagree nor I agree (4)</th>
<th>I agree Partially (5)</th>
<th>I agree (6)</th>
<th>I agree Totally (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buying intention</td>
<td>It is likely that I WILL buy the products promoted by the influencers on YouTube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying intention</td>
<td>I am willing to buy the products promoted by the influencers on YouTube</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2, regression results:

Simple linear regression between credibility variable and buying intention variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>const</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>0.3873</td>
<td>0.1095</td>
<td>6.9717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean dependent var       | 3.9312     | S.D. dependent var | 1.7425 |
| Sum squared resid        | 1.7841     | S.E. of regression | 0.1278 |
| R-squared                | 0.1612     | Adjusted R-squared | 0.1472 |
| F(1, 208)                | 52.713     | P-value(F)         | 0.0001 |
| Log-likelihood           | 13.512     | Durbin-Watson      | 1.9410 |

Multiple regression between attractiveness, expertise, trustworthiness and buying intention variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>const</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>0.2314</td>
<td>0.1097</td>
<td>4.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>0.0393</td>
<td>0.1284</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.3912</td>
<td>0.1185</td>
<td>5.987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean dependent var       | 3.9312     | S.D. dependent var | 1.7425 |
| Sum squared resid        | 1.9752     | S.E. of regression | 0.1387 |
| R-squared                | 0.2023     | Adjusted R-squared | 0.1864 |
| F(3, 208)                | 23.561     | P-value(F)         | 0.001 |
| Log-likelihood           | 11.451     | Durbin-Watson      | 1.9410 |
Male’s respondent answers, multiple regression between attractiveness, expertise, trustworthiness and buying intention:

![Model 3: OLS, using observations Male YouTube users (T = 89)]

Dependent variable: Buying intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>const</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9814</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>0.2173</td>
<td>0.1657</td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>0.011 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>0.0412</td>
<td>0.1741</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.3584</td>
<td>0.1697</td>
<td>3.682</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean dependent var: 3.9312
S.D. dependent var: 1.7425
Sum squared resid: 1.9910
S.E. of regression: 0.1729
R-squared: 0.2021
Adjusted R-squared: 0.1862
F(3, 89): 23.561
P-value(f): 0.000
Log-likelihood: 11.451
Durbin-Watson: 1.9410
Female’s respondent answers, multiple regression between attractiveness, expertise, trustworthiness and buying intention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>const</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9934</td>
<td>1.8354</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>0.2575</td>
<td>0.1587</td>
<td>3.4104</td>
<td>0.001 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>-0.1184</td>
<td>0.1653</td>
<td>-1.1875</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>0.4274</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
<td>4.2850</td>
<td>0.000 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean dependent var | 3.9312 | S.D. dependent var | 1.7425 |
Sum squared resid   | 2.0193 | S.E. of regression | 0.1677 |
R-squared            | 0.1973 | Adjusted R-squared | 0.1741 |
F(3, 118)            | 8.9643 | P-value(F)         | 0.000  |
Log-Likelihood       | 12.117 | Durbin-Watson      | 1.9548 |
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