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The technology has significantly influenced and changed consumer behavior nowadays. In this era of technology, Facebook has particularly become integral in the university students’ daily lives. They may share their news feed, communicate with friends and family, information sharing, and making Facebook commerce as well as sell and purchase activities. This has led to the virtual company today inclining to Facebook commerce to target on the growing university students’ market in Malaysia. Facebook commerce advertising becomes more popular and effective advertising tool to reach them as computer is the common function used by the university students in Malaysia.

Hence, understanding university students’ purchase intentions towards Facebook commerce is important to the virtual companies in Malaysia. The UTAUT model which has been widely adopted in many technology studies is extended to develop insights about the factors influencing the university students’ purchase intentions.
ABSTRACT

Nowadays, internet is commonly found among university students and the number of users is growing rapidly along with usage in Facebook. However, F-Commerce in Malaysia is still at its infancy stage as compared to other developed countries. The purpose of this study is to identify the factors and relationship of purchase behavioral intention toward Facebook-Commerce among university students in Malaysia. Thus, the study develops a model to predict on university students purchase behavioral intention towards F-Commerce by adding trust on an original Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology model. In order to test the validity of the model, Statistical Analysis System (SAS) is used to analyze the effect between performance expectancy, effort expectancy, facilitating condition, social influence, and trust towards purchase behavioral intention. Performance expectancy, effort expectancy, facilitating condition, social influence, and trust are significant to have positive relationship towards university students purchase behavioral intention to adopt F-Commerce. The research findings are believed to send invaluable theoretical and managerial implication that will contribute to the decision making process by government, institutions, Facebook developers and etc. to formulate their business strategies more accurately in developing F-Commerce platform.
CHAPTER 1: RESEARCH OVERVIEW

1.0 Introduction

This chapter provides overall the research background about behavioral intention towards Facebook commerce among University students. This chapter begins with research background, problem statement, research objectives, following by hypotheses and significance of study.

1.1 Research Background

1.1.1 Electronic Commerce (Internet Web 2.0)

According to Cova and White (2012), the continuing development of internet, include the Web 2.0, social commerce has great potential for reshaping consumers interact through online. Web 2.0 is a web page that is two-way communication that connects users, granted the users have interaction and socialize online (Evans, 2008). Web 2.0 technologies enables buyers and sellers share their experience and knowledge regarding the products and services by using social media (Pitta & Fowler, 2005). According to Al-Debei et al. (2013), several constructs that are seen to drives users’ intention and behaviors. In modern lifestyle, online shopping has become very important (Fagerstrøm & Ghinea, 2010). Conducted business activities via social media are social commerce or social shopping (Liang, Ho & Li, 2012). Social commerce expanded form e-commerce such as Facebook, Twitter, and others (Huang and Benyoucef, 2013).
1.1.2 Facebook commerce

The rise of social media has become such an important reference to consumers in order to making purchasing decisions wisely and this has changed the consumers’ decision-making behavior (Elzinga, Mulder & Vetvik, 2009). Social media such as Facebook commerce has become mainstream around the global and the numbers of social media businesses has increasing rapidly (Edelman, 2010). Social media plays an important role in business marketing strategy compare to traditional advertisement such as television, newspapers, and magazines. Refer to Michaelidou, Siamagka, and Christodoulides (2011), Facebook social commerce can enhance the business relationship with consumers, increase the views and rate of the company websites, and able provides opportunity for business. Therefore, this could make business to provide high quality products, increase the effectiveness regarding company advertisement broadcasting through social media, and able to forecasting the market trends and flow of the sales (Constantinides, Romero & Boria, 2008).

1.1.3 The important of Facebook commerce

Facebook is Social Networking Sites where the consumers interact with other users and Facebook is the most visited website which possess around ten percent share about entire websites visited (Experian, 2014). 1.23 billion Facebook active users is the world’s largest user bases (Facebook, 2014). In the Malaysian context, there are high internet penetration and social media engagement, fast rise among Malaysia online retailers (Dawot, Hashim, Song & Hussin, 2014). According to Barnes et al. (2013), around 70 percent of Fortune five hundred companies used Facebook in year 2013; meanwhile, that has consists 96 percent of Fortune 500 specialty retailers used Facebook. Retailer Facebook pages granted approximately 68 percent consumers to market their products and services with other users
especially in Asian (Duggan & Brenner, 2013). Facebook commerce is a new trend amongst of Malaysian shoppers nowadays because of the implementation of the newest and innovative business model which able selling and buying variety of products (Dawot, Hashim, Song & Hussin, 2014).

1.2 Problem Statement

The fast growing market which encourage marketers, businesses and advertisers’ to leverage Facebook commerce as University students able to be reached easily. This had caused considerable attention among researchers to conduct the research on the particular issue. According to Boyd and Ellison (2007), as a social networking site, Facebook offers an online platform which allows users to generate and share information and content, create profiles, and interact with other people. It has about 661.3 million users worldwide with represented 45.2% of annual growth (Inside Facebook Gold, 2011). Although there is existence of studies regarding Facebook commerce, there are very few researches about Facebook commerce in Malaysia context.

Facebook commerce was being studied by researchers using Technology Acceptance Model and other element such as trust (Zhang & Mao, 2008). Despite that, there are very less study is being conducted on Facebook commerce using Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) model. TAM focuses more on organizational context while UTAUT focuses more on consumer context. Thus, this model able to give better explanation on behavioral intention compared to TAM model which has been used widely in many technology related studies (Gruzd, Staves & Wilk, 2012; Venkatesh et al., 2003; Héctor San Martín, 2012). Researchers Venkatesh, Thong and Xu (2012) said that UTAUT should be adopting in various fields and countries besides extending the model through determining alternative factors relevant to various research in the future.
Trust issues, for example, scamming and phishing had caused Personal Data Protection Act 2010 (PDPA) to be introduced in Malaysia. This signifies why this element should be included into Facebook Commerce.

In order to contribute to academic field which relevant to technology and marketing other than providing better understanding on Facebook commerce more efficiently to businesses, it is vital to understand factors that influenced behavioral intentions towards Facebook commerce among university students by extending UTAUT model with trust, as a vital element in Malaysia recently.

1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 General Objective

Main reason conducting the research is to investigate factors that influencing behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The objectives of our research are as bellows:

1. To investigate relationship between performance expectancy and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

2. To investigate relationship between effort expectancy and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.
3. To investigate relationship between social influence and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

4. To investigate relationship between facilitating condition and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

5. To investigate relationship between trust and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

1.4 Research Question

Research questions below have been developed based on research objectives above:

1. Does performance expectancy affects behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students?

2. Does effort expectancy affects and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students?

3. Does social influence affects and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students?

4. Does facilitating condition affects and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students?

5. Does trust affects and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students?
1.5 Hypotheses of the study

Following hypotheses are developed from research objective above along with past researches findings:

H1: There is significant relationship between performance expectancy and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

H2: There is significant relationship between effort expectancy and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

H3: There is significant relationship between social influence and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

H4: There is significant relationship between facilitating condition and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

H5: There is significant relationship between trust and behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

1.6 Significance of the Study

There are two kinds of purpose have been contributed by this study which is academic and industrial. In terms of academic, this study has provides a comprehensive survey that regarding the university students’ behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce. It has bridged a research gap by studying Facebook commerce using UTAUT model. In this research, the UTAUT model original structures have adding in trust which is crucial to
this study. Therefore, this study has contributed to existing and future studies regarding the social commerce, Facebook commerce, and UTAUT model.

Meanwhile, for the industrial purpose, this study has provides idea, insight, and intuition to the marketers and businesses which are aims on the university students in Malaysia. Constructs that has significant effect can be a better guidance for social commerce-related companies or Malaysian marketers who is interested to develop their market share and gain reputation in Facebook commerce area.

So, this study able to benefits those researcher about the factors are influencing university students’ behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce in Malaysia.

1.7 Conclusion

In short, this chapter explains overall background of research on behavioral intention toward F-commerce among university students in Malaysia. It outlined some of the key aspects of F-commerce to better understand the behavioral intention toward F-commerce among university students. Overall, information gathered in this chapter will be serving as preference to conduct further review of relevant studies for coming chapter.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter starts with description of two relevant that models that broadly use to discuss behavioral intention toward new technology acceptance. Then this chapter will continuously with the five elements interconnected to behavioral intention, performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating condition, and trust. Relevant theoretical models and proposed conceptual framework with hypotheses will to be presented here as well.

2.1 Review of Literature

2.1.1 Behavioral intention toward Facebook-Commerce

The UTAUT construct consist a helpful emerging idea in studying the behavioral intention and social media used (Gruzd, Staves & Wilk, 2012). The behavioral intention is assessment about the purpose in order to perform or complete some or particular behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Therefore, the intention will influence the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Intention has revealed the individual are attempts to have a try with effort that they are intent to use as to perform behavior (Ajzen, 1991). When the intention has much employ in behavior, the more achievable the performance come about (Ajzen, 1991).

According to the past research, the effect of individuals’ tool expectations on a difference of behavioral intentions such as the intention to use high tech tools
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(Davis et al., 1989; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000) and also the intention to use technology in online shopping (Koufaris, 2002). The structural equation modeling approach is examines learners’ behavioral intention to use social media to obtaining the procedural knowledge (Lee & Lehto, 2013). Credibility is important to the user experiences and able enhancing behavioral intentions in virtual community environments (Hsu & Tsou, 2011).

The behavioral intention has frequently studied as a dependent variable (DV) in past researches (Venkatesh et al., 2003; Brown, Venkatesh & Goyal, 2014). The behavioral intention will forecast the desired behavior or the actual use and this is extreme significant element of the actual use (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis, 2003). Therefore, the research regarding the behavioral intention toward social media such as Facebook commerce will contributes significant information for those companies which to plan to use social media.

2.1.2 Performance expectancy

Performance expectancy is an extent to which individual trusts that, by use technology system has assist to meliorate or achieves the valued performance of tasks (Venkatesh et al., 2003). The performance expectancy construct has proved as influential and effectiveness predictor of use and behavioral intention (Venkatesh et al., 2003). The performance expectancy consist five different constructs which are relative advantage, outcome expectations, job-fit, extrinsic motivation, and perceived usefulness (Venkatesh et al., 2012).

According to Davis (1989), perceived usefulness has similar with the effectiveness. Those items are included relevant, useful, important, and valuable are correspond with perceived usefulness (Swanson, 1987). Perceived usefulness is a variable that similar to performance expectancy, significantly forecasted
internet-using users intentions to use social networking websites (Braun, 2013a). Perceived usefulness is refer to a consumer perceives that shopping in virtual store could enhance users shopping experience (Davis, 1989). Performance expectancy has influenced social network website users’ intentions to adopt social networking (Kaba & Touré, 2014). Based on the past research shown, the impact of individual’s tools expectations on several of use intention (Davis et al., 1989 & Venkatesh and Davis, 2000).

External factors such as performance expectations, social values, and technical support could be influence learning outcomes and learner satisfaction (Keller, 2008a, Keller, 2008b & Sun et al., 2008). Perceived highly positive usefulness performance will increase the consumer intention to use particular system (Agarwal & Karahanna, 2000). According to Venkatesh et al., (2012) and Bauer et al., (2005) stated that, some previously research to show that performance expectancy could influence the behavioral intention by using contemporary technology.

### 2.1.3 Effort Expectancy

Effort expectancy is degree of easiness related to consumers in utilizing technology (Venkatesh et al., 2012). Casey and Wilson-Evered (2012) explained personal evaluation of a consumer on level of ease in engaging with an information system is defined as effort expectancy. Besides, Venkatesh (2003) also stated that effort expectancy is the extent of easiness that users trust after they used a technology. There are three dimensions in effort expectancy which consist of perceived ease of use, systematic complexity and also operating simplicity (Venkatesh et al., 2012). Whether users able to use information system easily or not are depending on the dimensions of information technology acceptance (Yu,Yu, & Pei, 2008). This is also supported by Davis (1989) stated that
application’s ease of use will affects the probability of users in accepting an application.

Perceived ease of use is defined as an individual’s effort required when they using a system (Nasri & Chafeddine, 2012). Raida and Néji (2013) explain that easiness of use is meant by non-complex and without much psychological effort in using a system. Perceived ease of use is categorized into three elements which consisted of perceived ease of use of a system, mental effort and also physical effort (Davis, 1989). He suggested that it has similarity with complexity factor under the diffusion of innovation theory by Shoemaker (1971). According to Ziadat, Malek, Al Muala, and Khawaldeh (2013), the key factors of attitudes towards adoption of new technology in terms of easiness of is location navigation, location design, location speediness, information planning, search facilities, time saving and convenience. Perceived ease of use will have crucial impact on user acceptance and behavior towards information technologies (Bugembe, 2010). It is a main determinant in influencing attitudes towards adoption of new technology.

### 2.1.4 Social Influence

Based on Ajzen’s (1991), social influence is an extended component from subjective norms in theory of planned behavior (TPB). Social influence has similarity with subjective norms in TRA (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Social influence is an individual has aware that people that important to the individual belief and think the particular individual should take part in using the system that been recognized by them (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Social influence can be used to explain an individual’s feelings, attitudes, behaviors or thoughts in changes that occur when interaction with individuals or groups (Rashotte, 2007). Social influence can be a measurement in determining subjective norms which include desirability of social using IT artifact (Venkatesh et al., 2003).
According to Deutsch and Gerrard (1995), there are two kinds of social influence which are normative and informational that able to affect the judgment of an individual. Based on Scellato (2011), normative influences use to connect with others through social media while informative influence is to obtain accurate insights by looking for expert viewpoint and guidance. These influences in social influence can lead an individual judgment and response in some specific areas. Normative influence is more consideration in information system especially in the studies on technology acceptance (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

Social influence can generate from member from family and close friends as well as from peers in adoption of social media for their specialized use (Gruzd, Staves & Wilk, 2012). Variability of social influence can shape an individual perception when they interact with each other socially through social media (Baker & Moore, 2011; Bandura, 1977; Brandtzaeg, 2012). Based on Garbarino and Strahilevitz (2004), recommendation from friends has greater influence toward individual intention to shop through online. According to Lopez-Nicolas, Molina-Castillo, & Bouwman, 2008, social influence imitate the consequence of environmental factors such as opinion of a friends, superiors and relatives on behavior of user. By joining a social community, individual been affected by others with their social influence as well (Ajzen, 1998, 1991; Fishbein, 1979).

Social influence has a solid effect toward an individual’s behavioral intention. This is because social influence can boost individual to start on using tools that provided in social media (Gruzd, Staves & Wilk, 2012). By using of a system can makes the willingness of an individual to engage with the particular system and stay loyal in using it (Zhang, 2008). When an individual recognized to the social influence of others and obtain positive feedback from the community, this may supplementary lead to satisfaction for the individual who is complying and conforming to the norms (Lin, 2008). According to Ajzen (1991), in subjective
norms, belief, insight and attitude of individual will generate either positive or negative outcome toward a behavioral regarding their evaluation and belief.

2.1.5 Facilitating Condition

Facilitating condition means level which personal trusts that the technical infrastructure and company presents to assists usage of system. According to Taylor & Todd (1995), it includes IT information, hardware, software resource and also the technical support. Variable of facilitating conditions states to the scope to which a user perceives that technical infrastructure required to use the available organized system.

Facilitating conditions were used in five theories, which are Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), Theoretical Model Alternative 3, Theoretical Model Alternative 4, Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, Davis, DeLone, McLean, Jarvis, MacKenzie, Podsakoff, Chin & others, and Technology Adoption. Moreover, facilitating conditions will allow consumers get their desirable things through internet by downloading, streaming, uploading and others. Furthermore, facilitating conditions allow graphic interface and social interaction between each other, for instances, people use e-commerce for online purchasing and improve social lifestyle by social network while at home.

2.1.6 Trust

According to social network theory, trust can be moved from one personal to another personal (Sih, Hanser, & McHugh, 2009). The trust level may influence by the others and the communication can be hard when the information of the product is complex. Outcomes of trust on e-business environments are
changeable due to customers and sellers cannot interact by face to face (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Gefen, 2000; Jones & Leonard, 2008). Many online firms have defined the challenges in getting the customers’ trust.

However, trust in F-commerce can help interactions between buyers and sellers and provide the opportunities for the sellers to achieve their objectives (Chang & Chen, 2008). Moreover, character of trust in online rust is a key reason influencing the customers’ intention to purchase in the internet (Gefen, 2000). Similar findings from other studies are show that online trust plays a key character in consumers’ buying decisions (Kim et al., 2008).

2.2 Review of Related Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Theory Planned Behavioral

The planned behavior (TPB) was developing by Ajzen in 1998. This theory proposes to describe all behaviors over which individual have the capability to apply self-control. It forecasts the existence of a specific behavior, provided that behavior is planned.

The model is outlined in the next number and represents the three variables which the theory recommends will expect the purpose to carry out behavior. Ajzen and Fishbein formulated in 1980 the theory of reasoned action (TRA) after trying to estimation the inconsistency between behavior and attitude. TRA was related to voluntary behavior. Later on behavior performed under control and will not be 100% voluntary, this caused in the adding of perceived behavioral control. Through the addition, the theory was called the theory of planned behavior (TPB).
The planned behavior theory is a theory which expects thoughtful behavior, since behavior can be purposeful and planned. According to Khalifa& Cheng, 2002 the theory of planned behavior (TPB) has been broadly used to explain the IT adoption in past studies.

2.2.2 Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology

Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) is developed by Venatesh, Morris, Davis, and Davis in 2003. UTAUT model is use to conduct on a broad review and analysis of eight prominent technology acceptance and use model including Diffusion of Innovation Theory by Rogers in 1983 and Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) by Davis in 1989 (Anatoliy Gruzd, 2012).

UTAUT is mainly use to explain and forecast the acceptance of technological innovations in organization (Venkatesh et al., 2003) and also used to study acceptance of consumers and private users toward acceptance of information systems (Héctor San Martín, 2012). This theory included ten critical variables that use to define behavior of users based on information technology (Venkatesh et al. 2003). It also can use to examine and clarify the quantitative data that collected through survey instruments (Anatoliy Gruzd, 2012). This model also has a more integrative and current framework compare with TAM and TPB models. UTAUT model is a model that integrates the influence common to the previous theories. So, this model is logical to assume that others theory models to be superior to the previous theories in explaining technology acceptance and use (Héctor San Martín, 2012).
UTAUT model has widely used in more than 40 studies. Those studies include mobile devices and services, e-government, workplace e-learning, social media adoption, and others although UTAUT model is only establish less than a decade. (Anatoliy Gruzd, 2012).

In UTAUT that developed by Venkatesh et al. (2003), has proposed that there are four elements that influence usage of information and influence intention (Anatoliy Gruzd, 2012) which is performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating condition. The elements in UTAUT, performance expectancy, effort expectancy and social influence will have a significant impact toward individual intentions of behavior to use technology while facilitating condition and behavioral intention of individual will influence the person behavior adoption directly (Min, Ji, & Qu, 2008). Venkatesh et al. (2003) have said that UTAUT model has the accuracy of 70% in explaining intention behavior.
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Figure 2.1 UTAUT Framework

2.3 Proposed Conceptual Framework

In our research, we found out that trust can be used as an element into our framework as trust can help the interaction between users of f-commerce. Other than that, trust also is a key reason influencing the customers’ intention to purchase through f-commerce. The businesses in f-commerce between buyers and sellers cannot interact face to face with each other (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Gefen, 2000; Jones & Leonard, 2008); therefore trust is an important component that helps both parties to deal each other. According to D.J. Kim (2008) users need safe and secure on privacy and value while interacting through f-commerce; with a modern web technology, there is a lot of information included texts, pictures, videos, graphic, term and others to show the reliability of a company which using f-commerce. Moreover, f-commerce allows both parties interact to get information and feedback in real time (Lee et al, 2008). It means that trust can be made because there must be someone replies or response the demander while communicating. Furthermore, the reliability will increased when other people spread their words in f-commerce to the others consumers, there will be rating, comments and reviews. Those reviews can clarity the reliability of the products of the company.
2.4 Hypotheses Development

2.4.1 Performance Expectancy

Performance expectancy is clarified as extent to individual trusts that by using the particular system could support to achieve good performance in a task (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Performance expectancy has shown that have significant impact towards the adoption of particular system due to user is trusts there is significant relationship among performance and uses (Agarwal & Karahanna, 2000).

Besides, perceived positive usefulness of performance will enhance consumers’ preferences in using a certain technology system (Agarwal & Karahanna, 2000). Therefore, consumers could easy to interact with e-commerce websites, to search information when they consider the online shopping is usefulness (Wen, Prybutok & Xu, 2011).

According to past research, there has significant relationship reveals among performance expectancy and behavioral intention in Malaysia (Ndubisi & Jantan, 2003; Ramayah & Suki, 2006; Amin, 2007). Performance expectancy is main point toward users in order to adopt the online technology (Luo et al., 2010; Riffai, Grant, & Edgar, 2012). Value from social commerce to consumers can greater than internet brick-and-mortar services such as satisfaction, economic, convenience, and much more (Rogers, 1995; Taylor & Tood, 1995). Online shopping is more convenience; consumers can easy compare the price, browsing information quickly, all is considers pertain to performance expectancy (Lian & Yen, 2014). Hence, the following hypothesis is shows that:

**H1:** Performance expectancy has significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.
2.4.2 Effort Expectancy

Effort expectancy has positive relationship with behavioral intention in the e-learning situation (Chiu & Wang, 2008). Bugembe (2012) explained that it has significant impact of effort expectancy towards acceptance of user towards information technology. It’s also supported by past researches (Muk, 2007, Dickinger & Kleijnen, 2008; Venkatesh, Thong & Xu, 2012) explaining that effort expectancy able to influence behavioral intention in using technology. Hence, it can explain that students' acceptance towards F-commerce are following the effort expectancy’s level which based on UTAUT model. As the effects of EE towards the intention of using F-commerce are significant, therefore the hypothesis can be formulated as below:

**H2:** Effort expectancy has significant relationship with the behavioral intention towards F-commerce among University students.

2.4.3 Social influence

Venkatesh et al., has said that social influence is the level of a person’s conscious about the perception of important people thinks that he or she should use the new system. Social influence normally comes from family members, friends, relatives, peers, superior, and community members (Gruzd et al., 2012; Lopez-Nicolas et al., 2008). Individual will be influence by these people and may have effect on the individual’s behavioral intention (Gruzd et al., 2012). Individual will use on F-commerce when friends, family or peers also using it and they think that he or she should also use it as well. Social interactions with member of community greatly influence the relationship of customer with, and attitude toward the brand (E.Zaglia, 2013). In Facebook, there is also having social community in virtual
which will also influence an individual intention when individual received positive feedback from community (Lin, 2008).

**H3:** Social influence has significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

### 2.4.4 Facilitating Condition

According to Triandis, facilitating conditions is a kind of support given to consumers that influence their use of the technology. Facilitating conditions of f-commerce allow consumers to search their needed information through network by visualize the products, and make the services more objectivity. F-commerce allows people more interactive to each other, and it ease to both parties earn information and feedback in real time (Lee et al, 2008). Facilitating conditions created professionally but users can use f-commerce without Information technology knowledge.

**H4:** Facilitating condition has significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce University students.

### 2.4.5 Trust

Trust is an important factor for loyalty. According to Goncalves &Sampalo, 2012, customer satisfaction has direct impact on intention to purchase. In f-commerce, people interfacing each other in the web pages of the social network websites. However, there is no physical contact between customers and company in f-commerce. So, trust may reduce as doubt the quality of the sellers (Gefen & Straub, 2004). According to Liang, many customers visit the company Facebook
pages to gather more information before they make purchasing decisions. On the other hand, f-commerce allows customers to share information of certain brands (Cvijikj & Michahelles, 2013). In this nature, customers will gain more trust while there is more information of certain company in the websites.

**H5:** Trust has significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

### 2.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, element that construct in UTAUT as well as trust will have a significant relationship toward the behavioral intention of F-commerce.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter is about methodologies that used to gain information and data for the research. It includes data collection methods, scales of measurement and statistical analysis methods.

3.1 Research Design

It is a framework that describes ways in obtaining information and analyzes data (Burns & Bush, 2010). It includes methods of data collection, how it’s implemented and purpose of analyzing these data.

3.1.1 Quantitative Research Design

Quantitative research design involves collecting measurable data and numerical analysis through using statistical procedures. It is usually implemented to generate results from a larger sample size (Babbie, 2010). This research design is used to measures how large respondents on how they feel or think towards purchasing intention by using social commerce in Malaysia.
3.1.2 Descriptive Research Design

According to Burns & Bush (2010), descriptive research design can be used to explain the population’s characteristic. It can be used to explain things such as consumer’s behaviors or attitudes towards particular product or service and also market potential (Armstrong & Kotler, 2006). This method is implementing in this study in determining behavioral intention toward F-commerce among University students.

3.2 Data Collection Methods

Here involves collecting information and relevant data which consisted of primary data and also secondary data sources.

3.2.1 Primary Data

According to Hox & Boeije (2005), information or data gathered for certain research issue, implementing process and methods that tailored to that particular issue is defined as primary data. It is collected from first-hand sources such as observations or surveys. In this research, questionnaire is being used. This is because of the big coverage size of peoples which allow data to be collect based on a representative sample unlike some other methods, thus it able to generalize as a population (Kelley, Clark, Brown & Sitzia, 2003). Questionnaires will be given to target respondents for data collection. Hybrid of self-administered and person-administered will be conduct to ensure respondents able to understand the questions. Assistance will be given to those respondents who might face
difficulties during answering question. And if they understand and answer the questionnaire, we get back to them later to collect the questionnaires from them.

3.2.2 Secondary Data

Secondary data is the data which is gathered prior to research purposes besides the problems at hand (Malhotra, 2010). This research uses it to support and clarify the constructs of the proposed framework. We had acquired many relevant data from various sources such as online journal databases from Science Direct, ProQuest, EBSCOhost and others.

3.3 Sampling Design

3.3.1 Target Population

Total population is accumulation of object or person which possesses relevant info required by researcher in conducting their research (Malhotra & Peterson, 2006). To be more specific, target population is a group of individuals which researchers want to obtain a conclusion from (Lavrakas, 2008). In our research, our target population is focusing on university students who may get involved with Facebook commerce which located in Kampar, Perak, Malaysia. This is due to university students are mostly Gen-Y and very familiar with the social media especially Facebook to connect with people and the world.
3.3.2 Sampling Location

This research is focusing at University Tunku Abdul Rahman (Perak Campus), as it is one of the largest private universities in Perak, Malaysia. According to Tan, Ooi, Sim & Phusavat (2011), it has a number of over 12,000 University students, which able in constituting to Malaysian context. As UTAR students were came from different state of Malaysia, so it’s sufficient to collect data from them.

3.3.3 Sampling Elements

Foundation, undergraduate and postgraduate students in UTAR Kampar who aged between 18-30 years old, familiar with internet and Facebook will be taking part in this research.

3.3.4 Sampling Techniques

Non-probability sampling technique is being used for this research as a measurement in determines respondents as a sample. It is used to reduce biasness and sampling error in collecting data which will lead to better accuracy and consistency of the result generated. Judgmental sampling method is adopted as those target respondents are mainly consisting of students from UTAR, Kampar with the age range from 18 to 30 years old. The data gain from this method allows researcher to use statistical measurement to interpret the result which lead to higher consistency and accuracy. Also, this method is easy to implement and cost efficient compared to other sampling method. We will distribute questionnaires to those respondents who
familiar with Facebook commerce by asking them simple question to confirm with our assumption.

### 3.3.5 Sampling Size

Number of elements to be included is defined as sample size (Malhotra, 2004). The sample size for this research is 380 respondents from the population of 12,000. It is best suit when sample proportion falls in between ± .05 of the population and level of confidence which is 95 per cent (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Majority of respondents will be target based on our own judgment and criteria of respondents.

### 3.4 Research Instruments

#### 3.4.1 Purpose of using questionnaire

Questionnaire is a manner to use for collects the data. By conducting questionnaire, it is easier to enable researcher to collecting data regarding personal knowledge, attitude, and also behavior (Oppenheim, 1992).

#### 3.4.2 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire design is necessary and essential because the quality of the final research outcomes relies highly upon the quality of the questionnaire (Bernard & Makienko, 2012). Closed questions are used within quantitative
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approach and it also easy to be administered, analyzed, compared, and quantified (Sarantakos, 2005).

Basically, questionnaire has separates into 2 sections which are section A and section B. In section A, there are demographic profile to examine respondents’ age, gender, purchase frequency, and likeability.

In section B, there are designed based on independent variables (IVs) where includes performance expectancy (PE), effort expectancy (EE), social influence (SI), facilitating condition (FC) and Trust (T); whereas dependent variable (DV) which is behavioral intention (BI) is where we have to appraise the factors that influencing preferences for F-commerce. Besides, in order to increase respondents’ understandings and capability to answer questions, the short heading of questions is essentially and usefully (McGuirk & O’Neill, 2005).

3.4.3 Pilot Test

Conducted this test is need to figure out unaware mistake and inaccuracy of questionnaire to ensure the credibility and also validity of outcome. To examine the reliability and validity of questionnaire’s content, 20 respondents are most sufficient (Monette, Sullivan & DeJong, 1996). So, we have completely to conduct a pilot test on 25 respondents and to take in their feedbacks to correct and improve the questions.

3.4.4 Data Collection Procedure

We distributed the questionnaire at 10am to 6pm in cafeteria, lecture hall, classroom, and hostel. Then, we leave the questionnaire to respondents and collect
the questionnaire after the respondents have completed it. Respondents can understand and able answer the questions without any assistance from interviewer, so the self-administered questionnaire is feasible (Hair, Bush & Ortinau, 2006). This can avoid the interviewer to influence the respondents to provide biased data. Total up 380 questionnaires are distributed and collected and there are 340 set of questionnaire is qualified to apply in the research whereas there are 40 set of questionnaire are not complete. The percentage of 340 set usable questionnaires is approximately 92%.
3.5 Constructs Measurement

3.5.1 Sources of Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Adopted from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>Venkatesh et al., 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>Venkatesh et al., 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>Venkatesh et al., 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating condition</td>
<td>Venkatesh et al., 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Oliveira, Faria, Thomas &amp; Popović, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Table 3.1 shown the past studies questions are adopted by those variables and adapted into questionnaire content to validate the scale.
3.5.2 Scale Management

3.5.2.1 Nominal Scale

Actually, the nominal scale is for labeling that unable to be quantified (Stevens, 2012). So, nominal scale is normally used to classify gender and others. In section A, there are consists 4 questions (Q1, Q4, Q5, and Q7). The example of question that used nominal scale is:

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

3.5.2.2 Ordinal Scale

According to Malhotra (2010), the ordinal scale indicates whether an item possesses less or more of attributes compare to other item. In section A, there are consists 3 questions (Q2, Q3, and Q6). The example of ordinal scale question is:

2. Which is your age group?
   - 12-18
   - 19-25
   - 26 and above
3.5.2.3 Likert Scale

Likert scale is a non-comparative scale, and to measure attitudes by answer a sequences of statements regarding the degree of point that respondents consent with them. In section B, 5-point likert scale used ranging. The example of likert scale question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I: Performance Expectancy

| PE1 | Using Facebook commerce is very useful in the purchasing process.        | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| PE2 | Using Facebook commerce enables me to accomplish the purchasing process faster. | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| PE3 | Using Facebook commerce increases my efficiency in the purchasing process. | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| PE4 | Using Facebook commerce improves the performance in the purchasing process. | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
3.6 Data Processing

Data processing is to ensure collected data is able create high standard of quality research project. There are consists five steps which are data checking, data editing, data coding, data transcribing and also data cleaning of questionnaire (Malhotra, 2010).

3.6.1 Data Checking

Data checking to ensure there is no mistakes or error such as inappropriate wording in questions, incomplete sentence, standard form and layout of questions. Therefore, mistake and error could be detect early and able correct it as well.

3.6.2 Data Editing

The data editing is to make sure the accurate of the questionnaire (Malhotra, 2007, p.415). The respondents who do not respond to main variables are filtered out from our research.

3.6.3 Data Coding

The data coding is using code and normally is symbols and numerals to answers, and able put into various categories. Therefore, this is able grant researcher to turn the collected data or information into form to analyze it (Buckley, 1997).
3.6.4 Data Transcribing

The data transcribing is coded data from questionnaire and these data directly keypunched into the Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) software for analysis (Malhotra, 2010).

3.6.5 Data Cleaning

The data cleaning is to verify and inspect the error from collected data and processing the omitted responses in order to increase the consistency of data. So, run SAS program is need to figure out the variables’ outliers.

3.7 Data Analysis

Data analysis is used to describe facts, test hypothesis, develop explanations and detect patterns (Levine, 1996). After data and information has been collected from respondents, it will be analyze using SAS Enterprise Guide 5.1. The result will be form into tables and graphic display such as diagrams and chart in order to interpret the information better.

3.7.1 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics are summarizing and interpreting information and value from raw data to gain better understanding by researchers (Zikmund, 2003). Burns and Bush (2010) also stated that it is a sample data matrix which portrays respondent and also discover general pattern of responses. Frequency distribution
and percentage distribution will be used in this research and information acquired will be displayed in the form of tables.

3.7.2 Scale Measurement

3.7.2.1 Reliability Test

Malhorta and Peterson (2006) stated that measurement on level of consistency and accuracy about the result for the constructs is reliability test. It is used in determining construct steadiness being measured. Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient is being used as a measurement tools in determining the reliability test. According to Joppe (2000), Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient able to testify the similarity of independent variables and dependent variables to determine whether they were related. Matkar (2012) stated the rules of thumb of Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient as the following table:
Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient is ranges from 0-1. Any variables that unable to meet the value of 0.6 are considered not reliable and the values that are more than 0.9 are considered the best and very reliable results. The nearer the value to 1.0, the better its reliability will be.

### 3.7.3 Inferential Analysis

It is use in determining reliability of our research in analyzing the relationship between variables. In this research, Pearson Correlation Coefficient analysis and multiple regressions was used in determining the variables’ reliability.
3.7.3.1 Pearson Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis is defined as statistical measurement about strength of association and co-variation between independent and dependent variables (Zikmund, 2003). According to Coakes and Steed (2007), Pearson correlation ranges from -1 to +1, where a positive and negative sign (+ or -) shows the direction of the relationship and coefficient value shows the strength of relationship. Hair, Bush and Ortinau (2003) provided guidelines in determining strength of correlations as following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Strength of Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>±0.81 to ±1.00</td>
<td>Very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.61 to ±0.80</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.41 to ±0.60</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.21 to ±0.40</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>±0.00 to ±0.20</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The ranges of correlation coefficient are in between -1 and 1. High value of correlation coefficient indicates that it has strong correlation between two variables. It shows two variables have positive correlation when the value is positive. In other hand, it shows two variables have negative correlation when the value is negative. Two variables have no correlation when the value is 0.
3.7.3.2 Multiple Regressions

Multiple regressions refer to statistical method in evaluating linear relationship between independent and dependent variable. It allows researchers to investigate effect of more than one independent variable on one dependent variable simultaneously (Zikmund, 2003). The formulae equation to evaluate the correlation between the variables is showed as following:

\[ Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + \ldots + b_kX_k \]

The equation in our research will be as followed:

\[ BI = a + b_1(PE) + b_2(EE) + b_3(SI) + b_4(FC) + b_5(T) \]

Whereby,

\[ BI = \text{Behavioral Intention} \]

\[ a = \text{constant} \]

\[ PE = \text{Performance Expectancy} \]

\[ EE = \text{Effort Expectancy} \]

\[ FC = \text{Facilitating Condition} \]

\[ SI = \text{Social Influence} \]

\[ T = \text{Trust} \]

This equation will help researcher in finding out which independent variables has impact on the dependent variable.
3.8 Conclusion

It explains about methods in obtaining data, processing data, and also analyzing data. Data collected will be used in coming chapter for interpretation by using SAS Enterprise Guide 5.1.
4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the analysis of descriptive analysis, scale measurement analysis and inferential analysis is presented.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

4.1.1 Respondent’s Demographic Profile

4.1.1.1 Gender

Table 4.1 Respondent’s Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>40.29</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>40.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>59.71</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Table 4.1 has shown that there are 137 male respondents had responded our research that contain 40.29 percent whereas female responded more which resulted 203 respondents that get a percentage of 59.71. From the table, it has shown that the research questionnaires are distributed female more than male.
4.1.1.2 Age Group

**Table 4.2 Respondent’s Age Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years old</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23 years old</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>59.41</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>86.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 24 years old</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Developed for the research*

The outcome of the respondent’s age group is shown in the table above. The most contributed respondents come from 21 to 23 years old with a result of 202 respondents (59.41%). Followed by the 18 to 20 aged group with 93 respondents (27.35%) and aged group which above 24 years old with 45 respondents (13.24%).

4.1.1.3 Likeability

**Table 4.3 Respondent’s Likeability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likeability</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>50.59</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>50.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>49.41</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Developed for the research*
From table 4.3, among 370 respondents, 172 respondents (50.59%) do like using F-commerce to do their purchase, which mean 168 respondents (49.41%) do not prefer to use F-commerce to do their purchase.

### 4.1.1.4 Purchase Frequency

**Table 4.4 Purchase Frequency (Month)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Frequency (Month)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>89.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Developed for the research*

Table 4.4 has shown that there are more respondents only do purchase through Facebook 1 to 2 times in a month with the figure of 169 respondents, 49.71 percent. Then, there are 136 respondents that have a percentage of 40 have purchased about 3 to 4 times at Facebook within a month. Next, there are 18 respondents with the percentage of 5.29 have bought their desire items about 5 to 6 times. Moreover, there are 17 active respondents who obtained 5 percent of the research, have purchased more than 6 times at Facebook.
4.1.2 Central tendencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.373529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>3.167647</td>
<td>3.604706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>2.938235</td>
<td>3.455882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td>3.255882</td>
<td>3.458824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.658824</td>
<td>3.314706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>3.170588</td>
<td>3.405882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Table above shows the measurement of all variables in term of central tendencies. The means values of range of all constructed variables are start from 2.6588 to 3.6647 while range of standard deviation is 0.8510 to 1.1104. The overall mean of variables are categorized as trust (2.975), social influence (3.2183), performance expectancy (3.2205), facilitating condition (3.3838), effort expectancy (3.4463). The overall standard deviation of variables is social influence (0.6858), facilitating condition (0.7746), trust (0.7904), performance expectancy (0.8526), and effort expectancy (0.8443).
4.2 Scale Measurement

4.2.1 Internal Reliability Test

Table 4.6 Cronbach Coefficient Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach Coefficient Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0.881769</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.896618</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>0.895856</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>0.900238</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0.901236</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>0.893425</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>0.910915</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Table above illustrates that all independent variables have a constant and reliable value due to the value of Cronbach Coefficient Alpha are all above 0.8. Each independent variables value is ranked accordingly with trust (0.901236), facilitating condition (0.900238), social influence (0.895856), effort expectancy (0.896618), and performance expectancy (0.881769). The Cronbach Coefficient Alpha for dependent variable, behavioral intention has a value of 0.893425. For the value for overall model is 0.910916. Therefore, the result indication satisfactory internal consistency reliability due to all variables and overall model values are above 0.8.
4.3 Inferential Analysis

4.3.1 Pearson Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7 Pearson Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.71202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

4.3.1.1 Test of Significant

H1: Performance Expectancy

The value of correlation of performance expectancy toward behavioral intention of F-commerce adoption is 0.73617 which the p-value is less than 0.01. The value has recognized that has a significant relationship with behavioral intention. Based on Hair, Bush & Ortinau (2003), the value 0.73617 is a strong coefficient range.
H2: Effort Expectancy

According to Hair, Bush & Ortinau (2003), the value of correlation between effort expectancy and F-commerce adoption in behavioral intention is 0.55552. The value has shown there is a relationship between independent and dependent variable. Therefore, effort expectancy is supported. The value is 0.55552 which is inside range of strong coefficient (Hair, Bush, & Ortinau, 2003).

H3: Social Influence

Based on table, social influence and behavioral intention toward F-commerce adoption is 0.60689 (p<0.001) in correlation coefficient. This confirmed that social influence has a significant impact toward behavioral intention of F-commerce adoption. Hence, social influence is proven there is a significant relationship. The value of 0.60689 is categorized in strong coefficient relationship.

H4: Facilitating condition

The value of correlation between facilitating condition and behavioral intention is 0.62109. This showed that facilitating condition has a significant relationship with F-commerce in behavioral intention. Consequently, facilitating condition is supported. Facilitating condition is under strong coefficient range because the value is 0.62109 (Hair, Bush, & Ortinau, 2003).
H5: Trust (T)

According to the table, the correlation is 0.66953 (p<0.01) between trust and behavioral intention toward F-commerce adoption. This proven that trust has a significant association with behavioral intention in F-commerce adoption. Thus, T is supported. T of 0.66953 falls under range of strong coefficient.

4.3.2 Overall Significance of the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>176.26743</td>
<td>35.24149</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>100.8661</td>
<td>0.30199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>277.07353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

H₀: There is no relationship between all the independent variables and the dependent variable (Behavioral Intention).

H₁: There is relationship between at least one independent variable and the dependent variable (Behavioral Intention).
Table 4.8 shows the result of F value= 116.7 and significance value < 0.0001 < 0.05, thus H1 is accepted, which mean there is at least one of the independent variable has significant value with the dependent variable (Behavioral Intention).

The R-square is 0.636. The variation (63.6 %) in University students were intended towards Facebook commerce that clarified by the variation in performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating condition and trust.

Table 4.9 Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Intercep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
<td>0.32589</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.8351</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47124</td>
<td>0.05374</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.43035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.17512</td>
<td>0.08332</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>0.0363</td>
<td>-0.08109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16874</td>
<td>0.06319</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.0936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.28847</td>
<td>0.05347</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.24717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27959</td>
<td>0.05332</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.24445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

According to the table above, the linear regression equation of this study is:

BI = 0.0681 + 0.4712 (PE) + (-0.1751) (EE) + 0.1687 (SI) + 0.2884 (FC) + 0.2795 (T)

Table 4.9 has shown that the unit in performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating condition and trust, there will be increased of 0.4712, -0.1751, 0.1687, 0.2884, and 0.2795 units in universities students’ intentions respectively.
Performance expectancy (0.4712) has the strongest relationship with the students’ behavioral intentions and followed by facilitating condition (0.2884), trust (0.2795), social influence (0.1687), and effort expectancy is the lowest (-0.1751).

4.4 Conclusion

The demographic profiles of respondents are showed as the tests of consistency and validity are executed to the study. The total model is significant that showed all the factors were related to the behavioral intention.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.0 Introduction

A summary of the statistical analyses followed by the major results ‘discussion, implications, limitations and recommendations of the study will be presented in this chapter.

5.1 Summary of Statistical Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>40.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>59.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>18-20 years old</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-23 years old</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>59.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 23 years old</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>50.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>49.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase frequency (Monthly)</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
5.1.1 Descriptive Analysis

Refer to the analysis on respondent demographic in chapter four, we can summarize that female respondents have higher response percentage which is 59.71% compare to male respondent which only 40.29%. Most of the respondent fall into the age group of 21 to 23, followed by the age group 18 to 20 and the last is the age group above 23. The percentages of the age group are 59.41%, 27.35% and 13.24% respectively. The respondents do like using the F-commerce to do their purchase is slightly higher than the respondents that do not prefer using F-commerce to do their purchase which is 50.59% compare to 49.41%. There are 49.71% of respondent never purchase through F-commerce before followed by 40% of respondent have purchase about 1 to 3 times per month and then is 5.29% of respondent have purchase on Facebook 4 to 6 times per month and lastly is 5% of respondent have purchase more than 6 time through F-commerce per month.

5.1.2 Scale Measurement

Based on Internal Reliability test, both independent variables and dependent variables are consistent as they attain beyond 0.60 in Cronbach coefficient alpha. Among all independent variables, trust obtains the highest value (0.90124), while the lowest value comes from performance expectancy (0.88177). Dependent variable, behavioral intention gain 0.8934 in Cronbach Coefficient Alpha. The value of overall model is 0.9109. The validity test has been implemented by conducting pilot test on 25 respondents and also seeking supervisor’s advice.
5.1.3 Inferential Analysis

Table 5.2 Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: Performance expectancy has a significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce</td>
<td>0.47124</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Effort expectancy has a significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce</td>
<td>-0.17512</td>
<td>0.0363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Social influence has a significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce</td>
<td>0.16874</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Facilitating condition has a significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce</td>
<td>0.28847</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Trust has a significant relationship with the behavioral intention toward F-commerce</td>
<td>0.27959</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

5.1.3.1 Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Measurement that uses to measure the strength and co-variation of dependent and independents variable between variables (Performance expectancy, Effort expectancy, Social influence, Facilitating condition, Trust, and Behavioral intention) is Person Correlation Coefficient. All independents variables presented significant positive correlation with dependent variable. In Correlation test, performance expectancy indicated the soldest positive relationship with behavioral intention (0.73617); while effort expectancy has the weakest positive relationship thru behavioral intention (0.55552). The most important is that the independent variables p-value are <0.0001 which prove that all independent variables have substantial relationship toward behavioral intention.
5.1.3.2 Linear Regression Analysis

The linear regression table shows that the F-value is 116.7 with a significant table < 0.001. Based on the table, the 5 constructs (PE, EE, SI, FC, and T) are significant. Moreover, PE has appeared as the strongest relationship towards BI with the result is 0.4712. H1, H2, H3, H4, and H5 are supported to the result. The following multiple regression equation is created:

\[
BI = 0.0681 + 0.4712 (PE) + (-0.1751) (EE) + 0.1687 (SI) + 0.2884 (FC) + 0.2795 (T)
\]

According to the table of model summary, adjusted R\(^2\) of 0.6305 implies that around 63% of the variation in student’s purchase behavioral intention towards f-commerce in University has been explained by PE, EE, SI, FC, and T.

5.2 Discussion of Major Findings

\(H_0\): Performance expectancy has significant positive relationship on behavioral intention toward Facebook-commerce among University students.

Performance expectancy has significant relationship on behavioral intention toward adoption of any internet technologies (IT) systems due to many users trust that using IT systems will beneficial to them (Yu, 2012). Therefore, performance expectancy has presents a good relationship between Facebook commerce and performance to achieved marketing and transaction successfully. So, University students are pursues desirable Facebook-commerce performance. This mean the performance expectancy has proven that it able enhance the University students’ behavioral intention toward Facebook-Commerce.
H02: Effort expectancy has significant relationship on behavioral intentions towards Facebook-commerce among University students.

Result of our research shows EE has significant relationship with behavioral intentions. This result is consistent with past studies (Muk, 2007; Dickinger & Kleijnen, 2008; Venkatesh, Thong & Xu, 2012) stated that EE will have positive effect towards behavioral intention towards new technology or system. They found that if it’s easy and understandable to use a particular technology, it will increase the intention of using technology. Thus, EE has a significant positive influence towards behavioral intentions towards Facebook-commerce.

H03: Social influence has significant positive relationship on behavioral intention toward Facebook-commerce among University students.

Social influence has proven there is a positive significant relationship toward behavioral intention of university student toward Facebook-commerce in Malaysia, which is consistent with past studies that showed social influence, will influence an individual behavioral intention in adopting new technology. According to Gruzd et al. (2012), social influence has a significant role in new technology adoption intention. So, it is undoubtedly that social influence is important in adopting F-commerce. Social influence can be generated from peers, friends and family member (Gruzd et al., 2012). The opinions of people that individual think is important to them has a great impact in their adopting new technology which those important people enable to change the intention of individual in using new technology.
H⁰⁴: Facilitating condition has a significant positive association with behavioral intention toward Facebook-commerce among University students.

Facilitating conditions is to gain a user trust about the technical infrastructure is always exists to support them in the system. According to Venkatesh, Morris, Davis & Davis (2003), facilitating conditions impacts use behavior by supporting the process of the system. Since, Facebook has provided basic functions of the transaction and communication to both parties in the Facebook, the flow of the f-commerce is perfectly smooth. Therefore, users believe that the facilitating conditions in Facebook can assist them to complete the transaction. Thus, University students are feel convenience to use Facebook commerce. This means that the facilitating condition is able to improve the University students’ behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce.

H⁰⁵: Trust has a positive relationship on behavioral intention toward Facebook-commerce among University students.

Jones and Leonard (2008) claimed that building trust is important for Facebook commerce firms and consumers, where trust performance is improved by the content that shared among in Facebook. Therefore, trust has a significant impact to the Facebook commerce in order to allow users to feel secure while in the transaction. So, University’s students will go for Facebook commerce when there is a lot of information such as comments, pictures, video and others about the products. In brief, trust performance is able to increase the University students’ behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce.
5.3 Implication of the study

5.3.1 Managerial Implication

The aim of our research is to examine how Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facilitating Condition and Trust able to affect University students’ intentions towards F-commerce. As the level of technology advancement is increasing rapidly, it’s vital for university students to understand and adapt Facebook commerce as this will enhance online shopping experiences.

Performance Expectancy has significant relationship with the university students’ intentions towards F-commerce. Online seller should create function that simplifies online purchases through Facebook, which able to assist University students improving the task performance and complete it faster.

Effort Expectancy has significant relationship with the university students’ intentions towards F-commerce. It is consistent with past studies as Bugembe (2012) found that effort expectancy has significant impact on acceptance of user towards information technology. Online seller by using Facebook should use simple and easy understandable wordings in their content to provide clearer and more detail information in order to let University students to respond accordingly.

A significant relationship has showed between social influence and the university students’ intention towards F-commerce. Past studies are consistent with the outcome of the result. In order to increase the adoption of F-commerce, it is necessarily for online seller to demonstrate the product or service is unique and attractive products description so that the person is willing to purchase the product or service and share the particular product or service to the people around them. As Gruzd et al. (2012) say that an individual behavioral intention will be
influence by others. When a student satisfies with the sellers in Facebook, he or she will recommend to his or her friends surrounding to do purchase as well.

A significant relationship has showed between facilitating condition and the university students’ intention toward F-commerce. The information and data provided by both sellers and buyers will influence the intention to use F-commerce. Therefore, sellers in Facebook should update information and data frequently so that buyers able to catch up with the latest news. It is also possible that Facebook may come out an application that allows buyers directly do transaction through their phone like Alibaba.

Trust has significant relationship with the university students’ intention toward F-commerce. Trust is able to generate loyalty which buyers can trust on sellers without physical contact. Thus, sellers should show more evidence to build up trust to attract buyers’ belief on the sellers. Successful transaction with other buyers and good feedback of product or service is the strongest evidence to build up trust. The seller may also come out membership card for buyers to make them become loyal customer and trust them with the product or service offered.

5.3.2 Theoretical Implication

This study able to provides an insight on the factors that influencing the university students’ intentions towards Facebook commerce. The study’s proposed conceptual framework used the extended version of original UTAUT model which consisted of Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facilitating Condition, with newly added variable which is Trust in examining relationship with behavioral intentions toward Facebook commerce. The new integrated framework able to provide an understanding on reasons impacting
university students’ intentions towards Facebook commerce in different viewpoint, rather than original UTAUT model.

The new extended model is believed to contribute to the knowledge bank and narrow down the research gap in determining the factors of university students’ intentions towards Facebook commerce as it’s verified through Statistical Analysis System (SAS). This enables future researchers able to gain a better understanding when conducting similar topic as this able to work as a foundation for them in future. Also, the study can be serving as guidelines for related academics purpose. This new model will able to provide better explanation about behavioral intention towards Facebook commerce.

5.4 Limitation of the Study

We have diagnose our research consists of several limitations. We had found out the result may not be generalized throughout Malaysia because the samples just collect on one area which is University Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR), Perak Campus. But, UTAR cannot represent the whole population in Malaysia.

Besides that, UTAR contain highest percentage of Chinese students as compare to other races such as Malay students. So, this will have difference perception and thinking regarding the behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce.

In additions, majority of the journals are mostly adopted overseas may inadequate adapt to Malaysia. Therefore, the variables conducted overseas may not accepted in Malaysia and this may affect the validity of our research result.
Furthermore, the questionnaire that we created and distributed may not be fully understood by all respondents. Some of the respondents might not read comprehend content and may randomly choose an answer in order to complete the questionnaire. Some more, some respondents will completed the questionnaire quickly due to time issue and they just hurry to fill in the questions. Moreover, judgmental from different people will have different views based on own understanding and perception on it.

All of these limitations will decrease or lower down the accurateness and preciseness of the research result.

5.5 Recommendation for Future Research

There are several recommendations for other researchers which interested to conduct similar or relevant topic in the future. We recommended to conducts the research in whole country, for example, Malaysia. This is because the research result is more precise and valid instead of just one area or state. Different demographic such as different states have different perceptions or thinking regarding the topic or content.

Besides that, we suggest the future researcher could provide online and offline survey in order to get a better and precise researcher result. In term of offline, future research can conduct survey by interview. This able reduce and decrease the unfavorable survey due to respondents able to ask question regarding the questionnaire content and they can fully understanding about the survey question and the purpose of the research.

Lastly, we are using quantiative to conducted our research. So, future researcher could using qualitative to conduct their research. This is because qualitative consist the depth interview and focus group in order to obtain better and rich information. Therefore, it can
produce outstanding penetration regarding the behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce.

5.6 Conclusion

As a conclusion, this research successful reached research objective, which is to determine the factors that influencing the behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce among University students. The constructs framework which is performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, facilitating condition, and trust has significantly influence the behavioral intention toward Facebook commerce. This study has provides greater insight and beneficial to future researchers, business strategies purpose, government, and so on.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 3.1 Questionnaire

FINAL YEAR PROJECT

TITLE OF TOPIC:

Understanding factors that influencing University students’ intention toward Facebook-Commerce

Survey Questionnaire

Dear respondents,

We are undergraduate Year 3 students of Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR) presently pursuing our Bachelor of Marketing (Hons). Currently, we are conducting a research project entitled “Understanding factors that influencing University students’ intention toward Facebook-Commerce”.

The questionnaire consists of 2 sections. In Section A, it consist of respondent‘s demographic profile. In section B, it consists of the variables that influence the University students’ intention towards Facebook-Commerce.

All responses are kept private and strictly confidential. Thank you for your participation and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Cheong Shy Hong 1200063
Lim Kah Sin 1301375
Sei Wai Lun 1300549
Tan Guan Zhou 1301109
Determinants of Behavioral Intention Towards Facebook-Commerce

Please answer all the questions to the best of your knowledge. There are no wrong responses to any of these statements. All responses are kept strictly confidential. Thank you for your participation.

Instructions:
1. There are two (2) sections in this questionnaire
2. The contents of the questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential.

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

In this section, we are interested in your background in brief. Please tick your answer and your answer will be kept strictly confidential.

1. What is your gender?
   □ Male
   □ Female

2. Which is your age group?
   □ 18-20
   □ 21-23
   □ 24 and above

3. Do you like purchase using Facebook-Commerce?
   □ Yes
   □ No

4. How frequent do you purchase through Facebook-Commerce per month?
   □ 1-2 times
   □ 3-4 times
   □ 5-6 times
   □ Above 6 times
SECTION B: Factors that influence your intention towards Facebook-Commerce

This section is seeking your opinion regarding to the factors that influence your intention towards Facebook-Commerce. Respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement using 5 Likert scale [(1) = strongly disagree; (2) = disagree; (3) = neutral; (4) = agree; (5) = strongly agree] response framework. Please circle one number per line to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree towards the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I: Performance Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>Using Facebook-Commerce is very useful in the purchasing process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>Using Facebook-Commerce enables me to accomplish the purchasing process faster.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>Using Facebook-Commerce increases my efficiency in the purchasing process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>Using Facebook-Commerce improves the performance in the purchasing process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**II: Effort Expectancy**

| EE1  | Using Facebook-Commerce is simple to me.                                  | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| EE2  | Using Facebook-Commerce is an activity that I consider myself skillful.  | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| EE3  | Using Facebook-Commerce is easy for me.                                  | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| EE4  | Using Facebook-Commerce implies little effort for me.                    | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |

**III: Social Influence**

| SI1  | People whose opinions I value think that using Facebook-Commerce is useful. | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| SI2  | People around me consider it appropriate to use Facebook-Commerce.        | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| SI3  | People who are important to me agree that I should use Facebook-Commerce. | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
| SI4  | My friends think that I should shop through Facebook-Commerce.            | 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
### IV: Facilitating conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FC1</td>
<td>I have the resources necessary to use Facebook-Commerce.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC2</td>
<td>I have the knowledge necessary to use Facebook-Commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC3</td>
<td>I feel comfortable using the Facebook-Commerce.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC4</td>
<td>I have no problems to use the Facebook-Commerce.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V: Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Facebook-Commerce appears dependable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Facebook-Commerce appears secure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Facebook-Commerce is reliable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Facebook-Commerce can help the users.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VI: Behavioral Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BI1</td>
<td>I have intention to use the Facebook-Commerce to make purchase in future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>I will plan to use Facebook-Commerce to make purchase on next time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>I will try to use the Facebook-Commerce to make purchase.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>I have decided to use Facebook-Commerce to make purchase.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End of Questionnaire**
## Appendix 3.2 Operational Definitions of Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Operational Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectancy (PE)</strong></td>
<td>1. Using Facebook-Commerce is very useful in the purchasing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Using Facebook-Commerce enables me to accomplish the purchasing process faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Using Facebook-Commerce increases my efficiency in the purchasing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Using Facebook-Commerce improves the performance in the purchasing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort Expectancy (EE)</strong></td>
<td>1. Using Facebook-Commerce is simple to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Using Facebook-Commerce is an activity that I consider myself skillful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Using Facebook-Commerce is easy for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Using Facebook-Commerce implies little effort for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Influence (SI)</strong></td>
<td>1. People whose opinions I value think that using Facebook-Commerce is useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. People around me consider it appropriate to use Facebook-Commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. People who are important to me agree that I should use Facebook-Commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. My friends think that I should shop through Facebook-Commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitating Conditions (FC)</strong></td>
<td>1. I have the resources necessary to use Facebook-Commerce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I have the knowledge necessary to use Facebook-Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. I feel comfortable using the Facebook-Commerce.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Determinants of Behavioral Intention Towards Facebook-Commerce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Trust (T)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Behavioral Intention (BI)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I have no problems to use the Facebook-Commerce.</td>
<td>1. I have intention to use the Facebook-Commerce to make purchase in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Facebook-Commerce appears dependable.</td>
<td>2. I will plan to use Facebook-Commerce to make purchase on next time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facebook-Commerce appears secure.</td>
<td>3. I will try to use the Facebook-Commerce to make purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Facebook-Commerce is reliable.</td>
<td>4. I have decided to use Facebook-Commerce to make purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facebook-Commerce can help the users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.1 Respondents’ Demographic Profiles

Respondent’s Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>40.29%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>40.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>59.71%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Determinants of Behavioral Intention Towards Facebook-Commerce

Respondent’s Age

Table 4.2 Respondent’s Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years old</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23 years old</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>59.41</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>86.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 24 years old</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Age of Respondents (Frequency)

![Bar chart showing age distribution](image)

Source: Developed for the research

Age (Percentage)

![Pie chart showing age distribution](image)

Source: Developed for the research
Determinants of Behavioral Intention Towards Facebook-Commerce

Respondent’s Likeability

Table 4.3 Respondent’s Likeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likeability</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>50.59%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>50.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>49.41%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research

Likeability (Frequency)

Likeability (Percentage)

Source: Developed for the research
Determinants of Behavioral Intention Towards Facebook-Commerce

Respondent’s Purchase Frequency (Month)

Table 4.4 Purchase Frequency (Month)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Frequency (Monthly)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49.71%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>49.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>89.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Appendix 4.2 Central Tendencies Measurement of Constructs

Central Tendencies Measurement - Simple Statistics for Each Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>3.3735294</td>
<td>0.9113538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>3.2294118</td>
<td>0.974764</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>3.1794118</td>
<td>0.9563572</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.9322159</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>3.6647059</td>
<td>0.9833068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>3.1676471</td>
<td>1.0773125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>3.6647059</td>
<td>1.0215617</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>3.2882353</td>
<td>1.0749946</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI1</td>
<td>3.4029412</td>
<td>0.8515075</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI2</td>
<td>3.4558824</td>
<td>0.978136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI3</td>
<td>2.9382353</td>
<td>0.9741541</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI4</td>
<td>3.0764706</td>
<td>1.1104382</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9337968</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC2</td>
<td>3.4588235</td>
<td>0.9382459</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC3</td>
<td>3.2558824</td>
<td>1.0025605</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC4</td>
<td>3.4205882</td>
<td>0.9575902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>3.1411765</td>
<td>0.97947</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>2.6588235</td>
<td>0.9782646</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>2.7852941</td>
<td>0.945922</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>3.3147059</td>
<td>0.9915967</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI1</td>
<td>3.3617647</td>
<td>0.925711</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>3.2970588</td>
<td>0.9670029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>3.4058824</td>
<td>1.0131703</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>3.1705882</td>
<td>1.0045705</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Central Tendencies Measurement - Simple Statistic for mean variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.373529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>3.167647</td>
<td>3.664706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>2.938235</td>
<td>3.455882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td>3.255882</td>
<td>3.458824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.658824</td>
<td>3.314706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>3.170588</td>
<td>3.405882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Appendix 4.3 Reliability Test

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>0.909574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized</td>
<td>0.910916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deleted Variable</th>
<th>Raw Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation with Total</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>0.841638</td>
<td>0.87937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>0.73583</td>
<td>0.895435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>0.745026</td>
<td>0.895437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Condition</td>
<td>0.716981</td>
<td>0.897825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.708691</td>
<td>0.898981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour Intention</td>
<td>0.761765</td>
<td>0.892382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
### Appendix 4.4 Pearson Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean IV 1</th>
<th>Mean IV 2</th>
<th>Mean IV 3</th>
<th>Mean IV 4</th>
<th>Mean IV 5</th>
<th>Mean DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV 1 Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71202</td>
<td>0.73351</td>
<td>0.6032</td>
<td>0.68172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV 2 Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>0.71202</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63279</td>
<td>0.69652</td>
<td>0.51317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV 3 Social Influence</td>
<td>0.73351</td>
<td>0.63279</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56252</td>
<td>0.59335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV 4 Facilitating Condition</td>
<td>0.6032</td>
<td>0.69652</td>
<td>0.56252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean IV 5 Trust</td>
<td>0.68172</td>
<td>0.51317</td>
<td>0.59335</td>
<td>0.53515</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean DV Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>0.73617</td>
<td>0.55552</td>
<td>0.60689</td>
<td>0.62109</td>
<td>0.66953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research
Appendix 4.5 Multiple Regression Analysis

Anova

Table 4.8 Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>176.20743</td>
<td>35.24149</td>
<td>116.7</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>100.8661</td>
<td>0.30199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>277.07353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Root MSE | 0.54954 | R-Square | 0.636 |
Dependent Mean | 3.30882 | Adj R-Sq | 0.6305 |
Coeff Var | 16.60832 |

Source: Developed for the research

Parameter Estimates

Table 4.9 Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Parameter Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt;</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
<td>0.32689</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.8351</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expecta</td>
<td>Expectancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.47124</td>
<td>0.05374</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.43035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.17512</td>
<td>0.08332</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>0.0363</td>
<td>-0.08109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16874</td>
<td>0.06319</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.0990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28847</td>
<td>0.05347</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.24717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27559</td>
<td>0.05332</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>0.24445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for the research