

# Effectiveness of Youtube Influencers on Consumer's Buying Behavior with Special Reference to Kerala

Subitha N Assistant Professor, MES AIMAT, Kerala, India

## ABSTRACT

The main aim of this study is to know the effects that YouTuber's will have on their viewers' buyingbehaviour. It also helps to know their decision-making process and the factors that influence their buyingbehaviour which focusses on the beauty industry. YouTubers have reached a status as they are one of thebiggest influencers of social media having a great, loyal audience to support them. For years now, Virtualcommunities are highly becoming the most important sources of consumer knowledge which influencesconsumer behaviour (De Valck, VanBruggen,&Wierenga, 2009). 200customers selected as selected as status as they are one of the beauty industry. The selected through structured question and selected the selected selected through the selected.

Keywords: YouTube influencer, consumer, buying behaviour, purchasing decision, demographicalprofile

## I. INTRODUCTION

In 2017, growth of influencer marketing in Kerala evolved. This happened with the starting of YouTubechannels with content which is related to Kerala. This aims at huge majority of people using YouTube inKerala. The contents thar are useful and related to topics led to popularity of many YouTube channels inKerala.Hence,itisregardedasthemosteffectiveandnewestwayforcreatingbuzzonline.Theaimofthis research paper is to know the role of such YouTubers who influence the purchasing decisions of people in Kerala.

The concept of influencer marketing in this digital evolution is new. These influencers have always spentmany years in developing theiraudiences, and looks at maximizing that sense of affiliation. They alsolook at inclusion within their groups.Consumers always trust recommendations. They feel they are moretrustworthy. Social media influencers are considered more powerful in this aspect. If a product is accepted in their own circle, it immediately raises its reputation and affiliated connection.

## II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This research will reveal factors which affect consumer attitude and perception like experience, trustworthiness and redibility to assess this form of marketing. An important area to be explored is the impact of sponsored content and their disclosures. The following research provides insights for further research in this real be



scholars and alsoprovides relevant data distributed across different genders and age. This research will also help us identify variousrelationships, challenges, issues and will also burst the false notions built by various companies.

# III. OBJECTIVES

- 1. Toanalyzetheimpact of YouTubeinfluencer onpurchasingdecisionas per demographicalvariables.
- 2. Toknowthe factors to follow the YouTubeinfluencer for makingapurchasedecision

## IV. SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

ThescopeofstudyistoanalyzetheimpactofYouTubeinfluenceronpurchasingdecisionaspedemographical variables and to know the factors to follow the YouTube influencer for make a purchasedecision. It helpsboth the business and youtubers to increase their customers as well as followers.

# V. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Inthispresentscenario, most of the peopleare highly depending on social medias like Facebook, Instagram, You Tube, twitter etc. so that its all aspects influencing the viewers or its users by their lifestyle, buying behaviour, attitude, perception etc. This study focusing to analyse the influential factors of You Tube influencers on their buying behaviour with different demographical character. So it will help the entrepreneurs and you tubers.

# VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is descriptive in nature and makes use of a descriptive research design. Both primary and secondary data are used for this study. Primary data is collected through survey. Secondary data werecollected from website, books, journals etc. Primary data was collected from sample of 200 respondents inKerala.TocollecttheinformationabouttheimpactofYouTubeinfluenceroncustomer'sbuyingbehaviour, the methodology adopted in the research comprises of primary secondary and data and their systematic analysis. Cross tabulation and chai-square test are used to analyse the first objective. Regression the set of thcoefficient method used for analysing the reason to follow the YouTube influencer on theirpurchasedecision.

## VII. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The media richness theory states that certain communication channels are much rich than others. Thisdepends on the characteristics that the channel has to pass the information, mainly the feedback and thecueswhich the mediumcangive saysDennis& Kinney, 1998. According toFredberg, the victory ofsocial media influencers is more important to brands; hence, technology has been developed to find andtrack influencers' relevance pertaining to a brand or organization. Influencer marketing on social mediapaves way for a new channel for brands to engage with consumers more directly and organically says(Adweek). Social media influencers encourage their brands through their personal lives, making themengaging to the average consumer. Ledbetter says that when a party attempts to influence another party totake specific actions, a dynamic follows to change the course and content of the relationship. Influencersare ultimate connection among a brand and a consumer.



Their candidness and open talk with consumers, influencers have great social hit and credibility says Buyer, 2016. However, the voice of an influencer and the trust that consumers have for individual is implanted in the brand through the two-way conversation which is established for the product through social media outlets says Booth and Matic,

#### VIII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

| Table 1Gender:ImpactofYouTubeinfluenceronpurchasing decision Crosstabulation |        |               |          |                 |            |              |         |  |
|--|--------|---------------|----------|-----------------|------------|--------------|---------|--|
|  |        |               | Impactof | YouTubeinfluenc | eronpurcha | singdecision |         |  |
|  |        | -             | Always   | Occasionally    | Rarely     | Donot visit  | Total   |  |
|  |        | Count         | 8        | 32              | 60         | 4            | 104     |  |
|  | Male   | %withinGender | 7.70%    | 30.80%          | 57.70%     | 3.80%        | 100.00% |  |
| Gender   |        | Count         | 8        | 44              | 24         | 20           | 96      |  |
|  | Female | %withinGender | 8.30%    | 45.80%          | 25.00%     | 20.80%       | 100.00% |  |
|  |        | Count         | 16       | 76              | 84         | 24           | 200     |  |
| Т  | otal   | %withinGender | 8.00%    | 38.00%          | 42.00%     | 12.00%       | 100.00% |  |

H0: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision is independent of Gender.H1: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer'sbuying decision is dependents on Gender.Table2 Chi-SquareTests

|                   | Value   | df | Asymp.Sig.(2-sided) |
|-------------------|---------|----|---------------------|
| PearsonChi-Square | 27.714a | 3  | <0.001              |
| Significant       |         |    |                     |

Theresultofthechi-squaretesttotestexhibitedinthefollowingtableindicatethatthetestissignificantas the p value is <0.05, so conclude that Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision isdependenton Gender.

#### Maritalstatus

| Table3Maritalstatus:ImpactofYouTubeinfluenceronpurchasingdecisionCross |         |                           |        |              |             |        |         |  |  |
|--|---------|---------------------------|--------|--------------|-------------|--------|---------|--|--|
| tabulation   |         |                           |        |              |             |        |         |  |  |
| Impact of YouTube influencer on  |         |                           |        |              |             |        |         |  |  |
|  |         |                           |        | purcha       | singdecisio | n      | Total   |  |  |
|  |         |                           | Always | Occasionally | Rarely      | Donot  |         |  |  |
|  |         | 111/14/0                  |        |              | visit       |        |         |  |  |
|  |         | Count                     | 8      | 28           | 44          | 24     | 104     |  |  |
|  | Single  | %<br>withinMarital_status | 7.70%  | 26.90%       | 42.30%      | 23.10% | 100.00% |  |  |
| Marital_status   |         | Count                     | 8      | 48           | 40          | 0      | 96      |  |  |
|  | Married | %<br>withinMarital_status | 8.30%  | 50.00%       | 41.70%      | 0.00%  | 100.00% |  |  |



|       | Count                     | 16    | 76     | 84     | 24     | 200     |
|-------|---------------------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| Total | %<br>withinMarital_status | 8.00% | 38.00% | 42.00% | 12.00% | 100.00% |

Ho: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision is independent of Marital status.H1: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision is dependents on Marital status.Table4 Chi-SquareTests

| , 0               | -      |    |                     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|--------|----|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|                   | Value  | df | Asymp.Sig.(2-sided) |  |  |  |  |  |
| PearsonChi-Square | 29.180 | 3  | <0.001              |  |  |  |  |  |
| Significant       |        |    |                     |  |  |  |  |  |

Theresultofthechi-squaretesttotestexhibitedinthefollowingtableindicatethatthetestissignificantas the p value is <0.05, so we conclude that impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decisionisdependent on Marital status.

## Age:

|     | Table5Age:ImpactofYouTubeinfluenceronpurchasingdecisionCrosstabulation |             |         |                 |            |                |         |  |  |  |
|-----|--|-------------|---------|-----------------|------------|----------------|---------|--|--|--|
|     |  |             | Impacto | fYouTubeinfluer | nceronpurc | hasingdecision |         |  |  |  |
|     |  | -           | Always  | occasionally    | Rarely     | Donot visit    | Total   |  |  |  |
|     | Upto25   | Count       | 8       | 40              | 24         | 0              | 72      |  |  |  |
|     |  | %within Age | 11.10%  | 55.60%          | 33.30%     | 0.00%          | 100.00% |  |  |  |
|     | 26-35  | Count       | 4       | 28              | 40         | 0              | 72      |  |  |  |
|     |  | %within Age | 5.60%   | 38.90%          | 55.60%     | 0.00%          | 100.00% |  |  |  |
| Age | 36-45  | Count       | 0       | 4               | 12         | 12             | 28      |  |  |  |
|     |  | %within Age | 0.00%   | 14.30%          | 42.90%     | 42.90%         | 100.00% |  |  |  |
|     | 46-55  | Count       | 0       | 4               | 8          | 4              | 16      |  |  |  |
|     |  | %within Age | 0.00%   | 25.00%          | 50.00%     | 25.00%         | 100.00% |  |  |  |
|     | Above55  | Count       | 4       | 0               | 0          | 8              | 12      |  |  |  |
|     |  | %within Age | 33.30%  | 0.00%           | 0.00%      | 66.70%         | 100.00% |  |  |  |
|     | Total  |             | 16      | 76              | 84         | 24             | 200     |  |  |  |
|     |  | %within Age | 8.00%   | 38.00%          | 42.00%     | 12.00%         | 100.00% |  |  |  |

H0: Impactof YouTubeinfluenceroncustomer'sbuyingdecisionis independentofAge.

H1: Impactof YouTubeinfluenceroncustomer'sbuyingdecisionis dependentsonAge

## Table6Chi-SquareTests

|                   | Value  | df | Asymp.Sig. (2-sided |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|--------|----|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| PearsonChi-Square | 27.212 | 3  | <0.001              |  |  |  |  |
| Significant       |        |    |                     |  |  |  |  |

Theresultofthechi-squaretesttotestexhibitedinthefollowingtableindicatethatthetestissignificantas the p value is <0.05, so conclude that impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision isdependenton Age.



#### Education:

| Table     | Table7Education:Impactof YouTubeinfluenceronpurchasingdecisionCrosstabulation |                      |        |              |          |                |         |  |
|-----------|---|----------------------|--------|--------------|----------|----------------|---------|--|
|           |   |                      | Im     |              |          |                |         |  |
|           |   |                      |        | purchasing   | decision |                | Total   |  |
|           |   |                      | Always | occasionally | Rarely   | Donot<br>visit |         |  |
|           |   | Count                | 0      | 0            | 0        | 4              | 4       |  |
|           | Illiterate  | %within<br>Education | 0.00%  | 0.00%        | 0.00%    | 100.00%        | 100.00% |  |
|           |   | Count                | 4      | 8            | 4        | 8              | 24      |  |
|           | Highschool  | %<br>withinEducation | 16.70% | 33.30%       | 16.70%   | 33.30%         | 100.00% |  |
| Education | n   | Count                | 0      | 0            | 8        | 4              | 12      |  |
|           | Intermediate  | %<br>withinEducation | 0.00%  | 0.00%        | 66.70%   | 33.30%         | 100.00% |  |
|           |   | Count                | 4      | 32           | 44       | 8              | 88      |  |
|           | Degree  | %<br>withinEducation | 4.50%  | 36.40%       | 50.00%   | 9.10%          | 100.00% |  |
|           | Master'sdegree  | Count                | 8      | 36           | 28       | 0              | 72      |  |
|           | C .   | %within<br>Education | 11.10% | 50.00%       | 38.90%   | 0.00%          | 100.00% |  |
|           |   | Count                | 16     | 76           | 84       | 24             | 200     |  |
|           | Total   | %within<br>Education | 8.00%  | 38.00%       | 42.00%   | 12.00%         | 100.00% |  |

H0: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decisionis independent of Educational level.H1: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer'sbuying decisionis dependents on Educational level.8Chi-SquareTests

|                   | Value  | df | Asymp.Sig.(2-sided |  |  |  |
|-------------------|--------|----|--------------------|--|--|--|
| PearsonChi-Square | 31.706 | 4  | <0.001             |  |  |  |
| Significant       |        |    |                    |  |  |  |

The result of the chi-square test to test exhibited in the following table indicate that the test is significantas the p value is <0.05, so conclude that Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision isdependenton Educational level.

Occupation:

Table 9 Occupation: Impact of You Tube influence ron purchasing decision Cross



|            | tabulation    |                       |        |                |            |        |         |  |  |
|------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------|----------------|------------|--------|---------|--|--|
|            |               |                       | Im     | pact of YouTub | e influenc | er     |         |  |  |
|            |               |                       |        | onpurchasi     | ngdecision | L      | Total   |  |  |
|            |               |                       |        | Occasionally   | Rarely     | Donot  |         |  |  |
|            |               |                       |        |                |            | visit  |         |  |  |
|            |               | Count                 | 0      | 0              | 4          | 4      | 8       |  |  |
|            | Agriculturist | %within<br>Occupation | 0.00%  | 0.00%          | 50.00%     | 50.00% | 100.00% |  |  |
|            |               | Count                 | 4      | 64             | 48         | 4      | 120     |  |  |
|            | Employee      | %within<br>Occupation | 3.30%  | 53.30%         | 40.00%     | 3.30%  | 100.00% |  |  |
| Occupation | Business      | Count                 | 0      | 4              | 20         | 0      | 24      |  |  |
| occupation |               | %within<br>Occupation | 0.00%  | 16.70%         | 83.30%     | 0.00%  | 100.00% |  |  |
|            |               | Count                 | 8      | 8              | 12         | 0      | 28      |  |  |
|            | Professional  | %within<br>Occupation | 28.60% | 28.60%         | 42.90%     | 0.00%  | 100.00% |  |  |
|            |               | Count                 | 4      | 0              | 0          | 16     | 20      |  |  |
|            | Others        | %within<br>Occupation | 20.00% | 0.00%          | 0.00%      | 80.00% | 100.00% |  |  |
|            |               | Count                 | 16     | 76             | 84         | 24     | 200     |  |  |
| Total      |               | %within<br>Occupation | 8.00%  | 38.00%         | 42.00%     | 12.00% | 100.00% |  |  |

H0: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer'sbuying decisionis independent of Occupation.H1: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer'sbuying decisionis dependents on Occupation.Table10 Chi-SquareTests

|                   | Value  | df | Asymp.Sig. (2-sided) |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------|--------|----|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| PearsonChi-Square | 17.772 | 3  | <0.001               |  |  |  |  |
| Significant       |        |    |                      |  |  |  |  |

The result of the chi-square test to test exhibited in the following table indicates that the test is significantas the p value is <0.05, so conclude that impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision isdependent onoccupation.

Income:

| Table 11 Monthly income: Impact of You Tube influence ron purchasing decision Cross tabulation |                |                  |                                 |                  |        |                |        |  |  |
|--|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|--------|----------------|--------|--|--|
|  |                |                  | Impact of YouTube influencer on |                  |        |                |        |  |  |
|  |                |                  | purchasingdecision              |                  |        |                |        |  |  |
|  |                |                  |                                 | Occasionall<br>y | Rarely | Donot<br>visit | Total  |  |  |
|  | Upto<br>10,000 | Count            | 4                               | 0                | 4      | 20             | 28     |  |  |
|  |                | %withinMonthly_i | 14.30%                          | 0.00%            | 14.30% | 71.40          | 100.00 |  |  |



|  |                   | ncome                     |            |        |             | %          | %           |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------|------------|--------|-------------|------------|-------------|
|  | 10,000-<br>15,000 | Count                     | 4          | 20     | 28          | 0          | 52          |
| Monthly_incom<br>e                         |                   | %withinMonthly_i<br>ncome | 7.70%      | 38.50% | 53.80%      | 0.00%      | 100.00<br>% |
|  | 15,001-<br>20,000 | Count                     | 0          | 20     | 28          | 0          | 48          |
|  |                   | %withinMonthly_i<br>ncome | 0.00%      | 41.70% | 58.30%      | 0.00%      | 100.00<br>% |
|  | 20,001-<br>25,000 | Count                     | 0          | 28     | 4           | 4          | 36          |
|  |                   | %withinMonthly_i<br>ncome | 0.00%      | 77.80% | 11.10%      | 11.10<br>% | 100.00<br>% |
|  | 25,001-<br>30,000 | Count                     | 4          | 4      | 8           | 0          | 16          |
|  |                   | %withinMonthly_i<br>ncome | 25.00<br>% | 25.00% | 50.00%      | 0.00%      | 100.00<br>% |
| 30,001<br>-<br>35,000<br>35,001-<br>40,000 |                   | Count                     | 0          | 0      | 12          | 0          | 12          |
|  |                   | %withinMonthly_i<br>ncome | 0.00%      | 0.00%  | 100.00<br>% | 0.00%      | 100.00<br>% |
|  |                   | Count                     | 4          | 4      | 0           | 0          | 8           |
|  |                   | %withinMonthly_i<br>ncome | 50.00<br>% | 50.00% | 0.00%       | 0.00%      | 100.00<br>% |
|  |                   | Count                     | 16         | 76     | 84          | 24         | 200         |
| To<br>tal                                  |                   | %withinMonthly_i<br>ncome | 8.00%      | 38.00% | 42.00%      | 12.00<br>% | 100.00<br>% |

H0: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision is independent of Income level.H1: Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision is dependents on Income level.Table12 Chi-SquareTests

|                   | Value     | df | Asymp.Sig. (2-sided) |
|-------------------|-----------|----|----------------------|
| PearsonChi-Square | 26.729    | 5  | <0.001               |
|                   | Significa |    |                      |
|                   | nt        |    |                      |

The result of the chi-square test to test exhibited in the following table indicate that the test is significant as the p value is <0.05, so we conclude that Impact of YouTube influencer on customer's buying decision is dependent on Income level.



Analysesthereasons to follow YouTubeinfluencer tomakepurchasedecision

 $Table 13 Model fit Indices for CFA reasons for adoption of \ E-pharmacy services$ 

|                    | χ2     | DF | Р     | Normed <sub>2</sub> 2 | GFI   | AGFI  | NFI   | TLI   | CFI   | RMR   | RMSEA |
|--------------------|--------|----|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Influencingfactors | 12.559 | 5  | 0.028 | 2.52                  | 0.988 | 0.888 | 0.997 | 0.985 | 0.998 | 0.014 | 0.103 |

(Source:surveydata)

All the attributes loaded significantly on the latent constructs. The value of the fit indices indicates areasonable fit of the measurement model with data. In short the measurement model confirms to the factor structure of the constructs.

| Path                             | Estimate | CR     | Р       | Varianceexplained |
|----------------------------------|----------|--------|---------|-------------------|
| Honestreview->Reason             | 0.953    | 26.155 | < 0.001 | 90.8              |
| Guidance->Reason                 | 0.859    | 18.099 | < 0.001 | 86.2              |
| tentionto use theirproducts->Rea | 0.886    | 19.692 | < 0.001 | 97.3              |
| Fanism ->Reason                  | 0.973    | 30.117 | < 0.001 | 94.7              |
| Theirown experience->Reason      | 0.987    | 35.296 | < 0.001 | 78.5              |
| YouTuber'spromotion->Reason      | 0.929    | 23.173 | < 0.001 | 73.8              |
| Offercode->Reason                | 0.988    | 35.861 | < 0.001 | 90.8              |

#### Table14Regressioncoefficient

(Source:surveydata)

The results revealed that the Honest review, Guidance, Intention to use their products, Fanism, their ownexperience, YouTuber'spromotionandoffercodehavehighestvaluewhich aremorethan0.5.soacceptallhypothesisandconcludethatHonestreview,Guidance,Intentiontousetheirproducts,Fa nism, their own experience, YouTuber's promotion and offer code are the reason to follow YouTubeinfluencerto makepurchasedecision.

## IX. FINDINGS

The impact of YouTube influencer on consumer's purchasing decision depends on the Gender, Age,Marital status, educational qualification, occupation and income level. So that demographical factorseffecting on impact of YouTube influencer on consumer's purchasing decision. Second objective where toidentify the reasons to follow YouTube influencer on purchase decision. This study found that honestreview, guidance, intention to use their products, Fanism, their own experience, youtuber's promotion andoffer code are the influential factors to follow YouTube influencer on customer's purchase decision. Sothatthisstudyreveals thatYouTubeinfluencers affectingthe consumer's buyingbehaviour.

# X. SUGGESTIONS



- Influencers marketing is useful for creating brand recall and building a favourable image for new brands. While the experienced brands with high brand awareness and visibility can leverage this form of promotion for building relationships through engagement, give aways and reinforcement of the brands.
- Purchase decisions regarding Health and beauty products involve high level of trust, thus influencers should focusmoreon organic postsand real-lifeexperiences with products tobuildasense of trust.
- Though the tests do not display very high degree of correlation on account of purchase intent but the various factorstaken into consideration do contribute to positive brand positioning and drive considerable sales. Thus, brandsshouldselectinfluencersbased oncredibility,motives,experience,reach,appearance and expertise.
- Brandsshouldcreateuniquecampaignsincollaborationwithinfluencerstonotget lostintheclutter.

## XI. SCOPE FOR FURTHER STUDY

ThisstudyfocustoanalysestheimpactofYouTubeinfluenceronpurchasingdecisionaspedemographical variables and to know the factors to follow the YouTube influencer for make a purchasedecision. For further research there is a scope to study the customers attitude and perception towardsYouTubeinfluencers, problems facedbycustomers whilefollowingtheYouTubeinfluencers.

## XII. CONCLUSION

As a conclusion it can be stated that YouTubers play a very important role in the life's of Keralite asfemale group, married group, younger age group, educated group, employees and middle income level group.Demographical variables have an effect of follow the YouTube influencer to make the purchase decision. This is ahuge possibility which many marketers are missing out as there is still scope for promotion in YouTube influencervideos in Kerala. This is a huge advantage for marketers if they want to focus on this age group of KeraliteMarketersshouldtrytoincludemore YouTubersto promotetheir brandand createawareness.

#### XIII. REFERENCES

- [1]. deValck, K., van Bruggen, G. and Wierenga, B. (2009). Virtual communities a marketing perspective.Decisionsupport systems.47(3), p.185-203
- [2]. Kim,J.(2012). TheinstitutionalisationofYouTube:Fromusergeneratedcontenttoprofessionallygeneratedcontent. Media, Culture&Society. 34(1), p53-67
- [3]. Lee, J. and Watkins, B. (2016). YouTube vloggers' influence on consumer luxury brand perceptions and intentions. Journal of Business Research, 69(12),p.5753-5760
- [4]. O'Neil-Hart, C. and Blumenstein, H. (2018). Why YouTube Stars Are More Influential than TraditionalCelebrities.[online]ThinkwithGoogle.Availableat:

https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/consumer-insights/youtube-stars-influence/ [Accessed 10 Nov. 2018].

- [5]. Booth, N., &Matic, J. A. (2011). Mapping and leveraging influencers in social media to shape corporatebrandperceptions. Corporate Communications:An International Journal, 16(3),184-191.
- [6]. Burgess, Eric. "11 Essential Stats for Influencer Marketing in 2016."ION. N.p., 23 Jan. 2017. Web. 29Apr.2017.



- [7]. Buyer, Lisa. "PR Under the Influence: Why Influencer Marketing is all theBuzz."Social PRChat. N.p.,18Jan. 2016. Web. 28 Mar. 2017
- [8]. Freberg, K., et al. Who are the social media influencers? A study of public perceptions of personality.PublicRelations Review(2010), doi:10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.11.001
- [9]. Ledbetter, Erin. "The Change inInfluencer Marketing fromPRStrategy toMedia Strategy." Carusele.N.p.,03 Nov. 2016. Web. 28 Mar. 2017.

