Determination of a Model Regarding Customer Satisfaction Perception for Textile Consumers

Ikilem Gocek
Textile Engineering Department
Istanbul Technical University
Faculty of Textile Technologies and Design
Gumussuyu-Beyoglu, Istanbul
Turkey

Yesim Iridag Beceren
Textile Engineering Department
Istanbul Technical University
Faculty of Textile Technologies and Design
Gumussuyu-Beyoglu, Istanbul
Turkey

Abstract

Since customer satisfaction (CS) is crucial for the textile industry, the purpose of this research is determination of the factors influencing CS in the textile industry, creation of a CS model and offering solution suggestions for improving CS. CS is a comprehensive and detailed subject influenced by various factors however; in this study perceived service quality, perceived product quality, brand image and perceived value are considered as the factors that influence CS. After the consumer survey was applied on survey respondents and the data gained from the questionnaires was inserted in SPSS program, the data was analyzed statistically to determine the factors influencing CS. In the light of the information gained after the analysis process, solution suggestions to the problems that the textile industry faces were expressed and the effects of this research to the textile industry and literature were described.

Keywords: customer satisfaction, perceived service quality, perceived product quality, brand image, perceived value, textile industry, textile consumers.

1. Introduction

The crucial questions that should be considered by marketing managers in a very competitive world as today are which factors provide customer satisfaction (CS), which variables affect CS in what ways and how these variables can be controlled, for which segments which activities can be designed. Particularly, obtaining the answers to these questions is vital for the companies when it is considered that having new customers create four times more costs than preventing existing customers from leaving. Lately, the relationship marketing, a very familiar topic of today, is defined as maintaining the relationship with customers, ensuring the sustainability of the relationship and contributing to the content of the relationship, whereas the main point of this approach is providing CS for the company to achieve its goal (Grönroos, 1996).

The expectation before purchasing process is beliefs of the customers on the performance of the products besides; the expectation of post-purchase process is the opinion of the customers on the performance of the products. Satisfaction is the expression indicating that the performance and benefits of the products surpass the expectations of the customers (Peter & Olsan, 2005). CS improves the existing customer loyalty, repurchase process and awareness of the people about the company, diminishes the price flexibility and the cost of having incoming customers and keep the customers from being influenced by the competitive enterprise. A company, satisfying their customers against its competitors, creates advantage so that its medium and long-term period profitability increases (Peter & Olsan, 2005). In addition to this, satisfied customers are easily communicated customers, so that the firm can easily and intensively learn the expectations of this kind of customers. In spite of the firm's high pricing, satisfied customers concur to give higher price for purchasing its products.

The goal of this research is to determine the relations and the factors influencing the CS in textile industry and to obtain and offer alternative solutions for assuring CS. In this respect, perceived service quality (PSQ), perceived product quality (PPQ), brand image (BI) and perceived value (PV) were considered as the factors to be studied. As a first step the fundamental concepts of the study were explained before the field and analysis processes of this research were studied. SPSS statistical package program was utilized for the statistical analysis of the survey.

1.1. Customer satisfaction

Dissatisfaction of the customer causes one of the biggest problems for the companies. Owing to the fact that the customer dissatisfaction affects the relationship between the customer and the company in a negative way and the word of mouth can be used as a tool for the expression of dissatisfaction to the colleagues and the people close by the dissatisfied customer, it will be inevitable that the company is influenced by this situation negatively. Because of this, CS for the textile industry involves great importance and relevance as CS for the other industries involves. The companies in the textile industry, as being aware of this situation, must give relevant importance to CS and consider it when they are creating their marketing strategies.

1.2. Definition and content of customer satisfaction

Every company's greatest assets are its customers, because without customers there is no company. If the customers were thought as if they were assets, then they could provide financial assurance for the company's future. Many researchers claim that the cost of having incoming customers varies between one-fifth and one-tenth of cost of keeping existing customers. Since the existing customers make word of mouth and as this word of mouth costs no money, then not only free word of mouth results in zero cost but also this results in increase of the company efficiency. According to Dawkins and Reichheld, the companies must develop their strategies for keeping the existing customers, because keeping existing customers means high level of profitability (Ahmad & Buttle, 2001). According to Hunt, satisfaction is not only getting pleasure by the consumption experience, but it is also satisfying customers' hope of the consumption experience. Because satisfaction is one of the fundamental subjects of marketing concepts, it generates a relation between purchase and consumption processes and post-purchase phenomenon. If the positive application of this relation is obtained, it results in not only satisfying the customers' demands but also the profitability of the company (Hicks, 2005).

Before becoming a measurable component of the marketing concept, satisfaction was known as only a philosophical statement for a long time. Anderson, Cardozo, Olshavsky, Miller and Pfaff were the early researchers who tried to find the methods of measurability of CS. As a result of these researches, fundamentals of theoretical testing and empirical research based on CS were obtained (Hicks, 2005). Satisfaction with store personnel, with special store sales, with products and services purchased at the store, with store environment and also with value price relationships offered by the store are the factors influencing CS in the order of importance which were mentioned in Westbrook's research (Westbrook, 1981). During the consumption experience, the total of affecting factors creates satisfaction or dissatisfaction of feelings of the customers about the store (Warrington, 2002). Bearden et al. explain that satisfaction of the customers is very important for the marketers, since repetitive sales, customer loyalty and positive word of mouth can be achieved only by satisfaction. In addition to this, satisfaction is an important phenomenon for individual consumer (Didier, 2003). The product and service quality (SQ) causing CS are crucial for the producers, since the experience of purchasing the offered product influences the behavior of the customer as repeated buying and brand loyalty (Dubrovski, 2001).

1.3. Customer satisfaction and importance of customer satisfaction for the textile industry

Customers' perceived importance of store attributes in shopping centers and in apparel retail setting can be associated with shopping orientations. Furthermore, in some studies store attributes and shopping orientations were discovered to be the significant predictors of apparel store patronage behaviors. The patronage criterion in purchasing apparel products is related with merchandising, price, service, location and advertisement (Ma & Niehm, 2006). The most significant factors that have both negative and positive effects on CS in the textile industry are fashion, fit of the garment, and retail environment (Otieno et. al., 2005). Size availability, pricing, colors, style selection and fit are found to be the most influential points that dissatisfy the large size groups (Kind & Hathcote, 2000). In the study of Shim and Bickle it was found that when the ready-to-wear garments are purchased from home shopping catalogs, older women usually get dissatisfied with the fit of these garments. Moreover, according to the study of Choudhary and Beale, fit and sizing are mainly the most dissatisfying factors for large size women.

Lately, the influence of retail environment, pricing, sales people and merchandise on dissatisfaction has been investigated in recent studies (Otieno et. al., 2005). Even though norms for garment fit are provided and guaranteed by size charts, even within a same store in the same size code a variation may occur in the actual measurement. Apart from this, more size variations also exist in the size charts of garments in different stores and brands (Otieno et. al, 2005). As it is mentioned in the study of Babin and Darden, since negative feelings may have more impressive effect on human mind, people that have negative feelings about a place avoid being in that environments making them dissatisfied. According to the findings of Babin and Darden, the most influential factors in retail environments are fashion, availability, fit, comfortable fitting rooms, admiration for cloths, personnel attitudes and body size characteristics, pricing perceptions and product exhibit (Babin & Darden, 1995). When the components and impacts of CS are taken into account, it is obvious that CS is crucial for the textile industry as it is crucial for the other industries. For providing and improving CS in the textile industry firstly, the results obtained from the data of the studies on CS should be considerably evaluated. After this, the points leading to dissatisfaction and the solution suggestions to this problem should be stated.

2. Conceptual framework and determination of the research hypotheses

2.1. The customer satisfaction research variables

The causality in the marketing studies regarding the cause and effect relations is provided by the factor variable that is defined as independent variable and the variable that is affected is defined as dependent variable (Özdamar, 2004). Therefore, the variables of this study can be classified in two groups: dependent variable is the variable which can be affected by the other variable or variables and independent variable is the variable which affects the other variable or variables. In this study CS is the dependent variable and the independent variables are PSQ, PPQ, BI and PV.

2.1.1. The perceived service quality

Although measurement and conceptualization of SQ could not be agreed and decided obviously by the researchers, in this paper SQ is defined as the level of perfection and excellence of SQ perception. As usual, SQ is known as the most important and the basic factor that forms profitability and achievement of the firm. The important effects of SQ are based on two different causes: One of them is that SQ creates service differentiation and competition advantage that help to gain customers by affecting the market share. The other one is; SQ makes the customers repurchase, purchase the new services, purchase with the lower price flexibility and use positive word of mouth (Aydın & Özer, 2005). If the customer makes positive evaluation about SQ of the firm, then the relationship between the firm and the customer becomes stronger. On contrary, if the customer makes negative evaluation about SQ of the firm, then the relationship between the firm and the customer becomes weaker. SQ is the probability of recommendation of the products or the services (Sivadas & Baker-Prewitt, 2000). The higher level of SQ means higher level of CS and results in better customer loyalty and high level of profitability (Ghobadian et. al.1993). To transfer the quality to service means satisfying customers' requirements. So that the firms aspiring to adopt the customer oriented approach should determine the customer requirements and associate the customer requirements with service design and capabilities (Chow-Chua & Komaran, 2002).

To resolve the conceptual dilemma, the causal order of satisfaction and quality are empirically tested in many studies in service literature. Although some scholars have supposed that satisfaction is a super-ordinate concept to quality, others have stated that satisfaction is an antecedent of quality. According to Cronin and Taylor's research in four different service industries, it is found that quality has a direct and positive effect on CS, but no other inverse causal effect could be proved (Warrington, 2002). According to Jones' research in 2000, each employee is a potential customer service representative (Jones, 2000). Also sales persons in a company are frontline company representatives (Sirdeshmukh et. al., 2002). Well-trained, knowledgeable and named sales persons are very important for customers to deal with their concerns and orders. Companies want to know the level of the relationship between their customers in contact and sale persons. Impression, impact and image of a company are firmly related with the satisfying communication between their customers and their employees (Mascarenhas et. al., 2004; Mascarenhas et. al., 2006). According to Kennedy and Schneider, products' features and prices, speed of delivery, friendliness, experience of personnel are the identifiers of CS (Didier, 2003). The positive attitudes of sales personnel, availability of advertised product and the suitableness of store lay-out are very important points of CS (Burke, 1994).

Kim et. al. and Ma and Koh state that as sale personnel's services; introducing new products and seasonal trends, suggesting advise on purchase alternatives for the preferred goods of the customers, explaining fabric care, presenting promotions and as service aspects; expertise, appearance, polite manner, low pressure selling tactics have significant impact on CS and loyalty (Ma & Niehm, 2006).

2.1.2. Perceived product quality

According to Didier, considering a marketing perspective, quality denotes a product's ability to satisfy a customer's requirements. On this wise, this definition focuses entirely on the customer and how the customer thinks a product will fit that purpose (Didier, 2003). Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry mentioned on the necessity of distinguishing product quality (PQ) from SQ as the aspects which must be assessed differently. Consumers use product's specific intrinsic cues to evaluate PQ. Intrinsic cues like flavor or color etc. are an inseparable and highly integral part of the product. Simultaneously, consumers also trust the relevant extrinsic product cues such a price, brand name and store name as indicators of PQ. In other words, cues associated with, but not belonging to, the actual physical product are used signals to imply overall PQ (Zeithaml, 1988). Shoppers care about merchandise related aspects like assortment, brand names and prices in order to infer about the stores' merchandise quality. For instance, in their research Mazursky and Jacoby found that the most important thing to make an impression on PQ is brand name. (Warrington, 2002).

2.1.3. Brand image

Brands are used by consumers to identify the source or market of a product and to give responsibility to the particular manufacturer or distributor for delivery of the product. Brand gives assurance to customers by providing consistent quality and superior value. Branding is an evident promise to the consumer by giving assurance that the products will be delivered to them with all of the characteristics described. Branding means reliability, understanding, communication and satisfaction (Didier, 2003). Nowadays, the formal introduction of the company, what it stands for, and the product it provides to the consumer are denoted by branding. Brand informs the consumers about what the company's commitments are. Companies are identified by brands and brands bring specific value to the market. As defined by the American Marketing Association, a brand is a name, term, sign, symbol, design or a combination of them, intended to identify goods and services of one seller, or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competition (Didier, 2003). When the company, on the basis of its view of the market, creates brand and translates this brand into the BI as perceived by customer, this strategy develops greater CS furthermore greater brand loyalty (Royle et. al., 1999). As mentioned in researches, merchandise quality and image are related with store brands and they have a significant effect on store image (Dodds et.al., 1991; Baker et. al., 1994; Sirgy et. al., 2000).

2.1.4. Perceived value

Value has a very complicated structure that has various meanings in marketing and consumer behavior researches. As it is stated in Warrington's study, Rokeach in his work in 1973 explained that the exact meaning of value can be expressed quite easily, since it is closely related with the concepts, quality and satisfaction. Value has many different meanings for the customers. Zeithaml in his work in 1988 classified the responds of an explanatory study into four different groups of the definition of value made by the customers. These are:

* Value is the low price.
* Value is the benefits and the serviceability expected by the customers from the product.
* Value is the quality compared to the paid price (quality vs. paid price).
* Value is the sum of all the benefits that are acquired versus all the costs (expenses) (Warrington, 2002).

As it is stated in Warrington's work, many researchers studied on value concept and defined PV in different ways having different perspectives. Zeithaml in 1988 defined PV as the total evaluation of the consumer about the benefit acquired from the product based on the perceptions related with what is gained and what is expended. PV was defined by various researchers as the subjective evaluation of the trade between all the things expended and all the things acquired in the time-being of using anything related with consumption such as product, store, service. Apart from this comprehensive notion, some of the other researchers examined PV as the quality for price by focusing on Zeithaml's definition in his study in 1988 (Warrington, 2002). So to speak, the variable PV covers the evaluations of customers related with the quality of products and services in post-purchase process versus the price and the price paid versus the quality or the price paid versus the performance of product or service.

At this point, value becomes a concept that is directed by the customer which means while enterprises are offering their value suggestions, they need to take into consideration the customer's point of view and their perceptions. PV affects satisfaction whereas it is affected by customer expectations and perceived quality. Generally it is known to be more effective in the first purchase transaction.

PV is one of the hardest concepts to be expressed and measured. Simply, PV is the difference between the perceived benefits and the costs. Besides, PV is personal, meaning changes from person to person and individual to individual (McDougall and Levesque, 2000). While PV can be price/performance ratio, it can be also assessed as perceived quality/price ratio. In both of the situations PV has a positive effect on satisfaction (Grewal, Prasuraman and Voss, 1998).

2.2. Questions of customer satisfaction

In this study, four research questions based on the relations between the dependent and the four independent variables were prepared as one for each independent variable.

* Does any relation exist between CS and PSQ?
* Does any relation exist between CS and PPQ?
* Does any relation exist between CS and BI?
* Does any relation exist between CS and PV?

2.3. Analysis procedure & research hypotheses

Research hypotheses were created based on the relations of CS and the independent variables, and the difference in the independent variables considering customer age groups (CAG), customer educations (CE), total monthly personal incomes (TMPI), gender of the respondents and employment status (ES).

$H1_0$: No relation exists between CS and PSQ. / $H1_1$: There is a relation between CS and PSQ.
As shown in Table 1, when the relation between PSQ and CS was analyzed, the value of the significance level was found as "0.000". Since the significance value is less than 0.05 for 95% confidence interval, there is no sufficient evidence to reject $H1_1$ hypothesis which implies that a relation exists between PSQ and CS according to the customers. As a result of this analysis, there is a relation between PSQ and CS. The other results that were acquired by applying paired samples t-test are as follows (Table 1):

$H2_0$: No relation exists between CS and PPQ. / $H2_1$: There is a relation between CS and PPQ.
There is no sufficient evidence to reject $H2_1$, thus there is a relation between PPQ and CS.
$H3_0$: No relation exists between CS and BI. / $H3_1$: There is a relation between CS and BI.
There is no sufficient evidence to reject $H3_1$, thus there is a relation between BI and CS.
$H4_0$: No relation exists between CS and PV. / $H4_1$: There is a relation between CS and PV.
There is no sufficient evidence to reject $H4_1$, thus there is a relation between PV and CS.
To analyze the hypotheses based on CAGs, as the number of age groups is more than two, ANOVA test was used.

Then, firstly it was tested if the variances were scattered homogeneously or not. To do this, hypotheses related with homogeneity of variances were created.

$H5_0$: No difference exists in PSQ considering CAG.
$H5_1$: There is a difference in PSQ considering CAG.
H_0: The variances of hypothesis 5 are scattered homogeneously.
H_1: The variances of hypothesis 5 are not scattered homogeneously.

According to Table 2, the significance level of "PSQ according to CAGs" is "0.079" which is greater than 0.05 for the confidence interval 95%. Therefore, it can be said that there is no sufficient evidence to reject H_0 and it can be accepted that the variances belonging to hypothesis 5 are scattered homogeneously. Since the variances are scattered homogeneously, Scheffe test can be used as post-hoc test in ANOVA analysis. As shown in Table 3, the significance level of "PSQ according to CAGs" is "0.219" greater than 0.05 for 95% confidence interval. As a result, there is no sufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis $H5_0$. Thus, there is no difference in PSQ according to CAGs. Finally, in addition to ANOVA test to control if there is any difference between CAGs related with PSQ, Scheffe test was applied. Also, according to Scheffe statistics, since all the significance levels of the variables are greater than 0.05 for 95% confidence interval, there is no difference in PSQ according to CAGs (Table 4).

The hypotheses following below were analyzed with ANOVA test and assessed as explained in H5 (Table 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7).

$H6_0$: No difference exists in PPQ considering CAGs.
$H6_1$: There is a difference in PPQ considering CAGs.
$H7_0$: No difference exists in BI perception considering CAGs.
$H7_1$: There is a difference in BI perception considering CAGs.
$H8_0$: No difference exists in PV considering CAGs.
$H8_1$: There is a difference in PV considering CAGs.

In the analysis of these hypotheses (H6, H7 and H8) right above, since the variances are scattered homogeneously, Scheffe test was used (Table 2). In ANOVA test, as the significance levels obtained are 0.849 for H6, 0.705 for H7 and 0.727 for PV which are greater than 0.05 (%95confidence interval), there is no sufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis $H6_0$, $H7_0$ and $H8_0$ (Table 3). Thus, there is no difference in PPQ, BI perception and PV according to CAGs. Also, these obtained results were proved by Scheffe statistics (Table 5, 6 and 7).

In the analysis of the hypotheses H9, H10, and H12 since the variances are scattered homogeneously, Scheffe test was used (Table 2). In ANOVA test, as the significance levels obtained are 0.157 for H9, 0.429 for H10 and 0.715 for H12 which are greater than 0.05 (%95confidence interval), there is no sufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis $H9_0$, $H10_0$ and $H12_0$ (Table 3). Thus, there is no difference in PSQ, PPQ and PV according to CE. Also, these obtained results were proved by Scheffe statistics (Table 8, 9 and 10).

$H9_0$: No difference exists in PSQ considering CE.
$H9_1$: There is a difference in PSQ considering CE.
$H10_0$: No difference exists in PPQ considering CE.
$H10_1$: There is a difference in PPQ considering CE.
$H11_0$: No difference exists in BI perception considering CE.
$H11_1$: There is a difference in BI perception considering CE.
$H12_0$: No difference exists in PV considering CE.
$H12_1$: There is a difference in PV considering CE.

In the analysis of hypothesis H11, since the variances are scattered homogeneously, Scheffe test was used as well (Table 2). In ANOVA test, as the significance level obtained is 0.011 which is less than 0.05 (%95confidence interval), there is no sufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis $H11_1$ (Table 3). Therefore; there is a difference in BI perception according to CE. Apart form this, in Scheffe statistics for two groups significance levels are less than 0.05 (Table 11). These are: "High school graduate/student" (HSG/S) and "Master graduate/student" (MG/S). Since the significance level for these two groups are less than 0.05 (0.008), there is a difference in BI between these two groups. As shown in Table 11 (Scheffe test), difference of means between "HSG/S" and "MG/S" is 0.5139, but in adverse difference of means between "MG/S" and "HSG/S" is -0.5139. Thus, it can be said that since BI perception affects "HSG/S" more than "MG/S", the respondents in "HSG/S" education level care about BI more than the respondents in MG/S.

In the analysis of hypotheses H13, H14 and H16, since the variances are scattered homogeneously, Scheffe test was used (Table 2). As the significance levels obtained are 0.367 for H13, 0.192 for H14 and 0.693 for H16 which are greater than 0.05 (%95confidence interval), there is no sufficient evidence to reject the hypotheses $H13_0$, $H14_0$ and $H16_0$ (Table 3). Thus, there is no difference in PSQ, PPQ and PV according to TMPIs. Also, these obtained results were proved by Scheffe statistics (Table 12, 13 and 14).

$H13_0$: No difference exists in PSQ considering TMPIs.
$H13_1$: There is a difference in PSQ considering TMPIs.
$H14_0$: No difference exists in PPQ considering TMPIs.
$H14_1$: There is a difference in PPQ considering TMPIs.
$H15_0$: No difference exists in BI perception considering TMPIs.
$H15_1$: There is a difference in BI perception considering TMPIs.
$H16_0$: No difference exists in PV considering TMPIs.
$H16_1$: There is a difference in PV considering TMPIs.

In the analysis of the hypothesis H15, since the variances are not scattered homogeneously, Scheffe test could not be used as post-hoc test (Table 2). Thus, Tamhane T2 test was decided to be used as post-hoc test.

In ANOVA, as the significance level obtained is 0.037, which is less than 0.05 (%95confidence interval), there is no sufficient evidence to reject the hypothesis $H15_1$ (Table 3). Therefore; there is a difference in BI perception according to TMPIs. Apart from this, Tamhane T2 statistics had to be used to find out which groups have differences. Unfortunately, from Tamhane T2 statistics differences in groups could not be determined since for none of the groups significance levels are lower than 0.05 (Table 15). So; to identify the differences between groups, the independent samples t-test was used. Since independent samples t-test can be used for only two groups, to perform the test, the binary combinations of five groups of TMPIs, which generated 10 groups, were formed. Independent samples t-test was applied on each of these 10 groups. According to independent samples t-test results, the groups which demonstrate differences between each other are "less than 500 TL and 1001 - 1500 TL", "1001 - 1500 TL and 1501 - 2000 TL" and "1001 - 1500 TL and greater than 2500 TL". As a result of this, by considering Table 16, the TMPI group "1001 - 1500 TL" cares about BI perception more than the other income levels.

$H17_0$: No difference exists in PSQ considering gender of respondents.
$H17_1$: There is a difference in PSQ considering gender of respondents.
According to independent sample t-test; since there are two groups, the variances between two groups must be controlled. Because the tests of the groups with equal variances and not equal variances are different, the significance levels obtained from these tests are also different. To test if the variances are equal or not for H17, hypotheses related with variance equivalence were formed such as:

H_0: The variances of the groups based on gender related to H13 are equal.
H_1: The variances of the groups based on gender related to H13 are not equal.

To identify if the variances equal or not, the Levene's test was considered (Table 17). If the significance level obtained from Levene's test is greater than 0.05 for 95% confidence interval then, it is obvious that there is no sufficient evidence to reject H_0 implying the equivalence of variances. Then in this condition; the line of "equal variances assumed (EVA)" is considered and this line's significance 2-tailed value is valid. Otherwise, if equal variances are not assumed, the line of "equal variances not assumed (EVNA)" is considered and this line's significance 2-tailed value is valid. As H17 is considered; the significance level of Levene's test was obtained as 0.149 which means equal variances are assumed and since the significance 2-tailed value is 0.035, then there is sufficient evidence rejecting the $H17_0$, so that $H17_1$ is accepted. As a result, there is a difference in PSQ according to gender of respondents. According to Table 18, as the mean value of the females is greater than the males, it can easily be concluded that female respondents care about PSQ more than male respondents.

As H18, H19 and H20 are considered; the significance levels of Levene's test are obtained as 0.687, 0.079 and 0.649 which means equal variances are assumed for all of the hypotheses and since the significance 2-tailed values are 0.523 for H18, 0.323 for H19 and 0,759 for H20, then there is no sufficient evidence to reject the $H18_0$, $H19_0$ and $H20_0$ so that $H18_0$, $H19_0$ and $H20_0$ are accepted (Table 17). As a result, there is no difference in PPQ, BI perception and PV according to gender of respondents.

$H18_0$: No difference exists in PPQ considering gender of respondents.
$H18_1$: There is a difference in PPQ considering gender of respondents.
$H19_0$: No difference exists in BI perception considering gender of respondents.
$H19_1$: There is a difference in BI perception considering gender of respondents.
$H20_0$: No difference exists in PV considering gender of respondents.
$H20_1$: There is a difference in PV considering gender of respondents.

As H21, H23 and H24 are considered; the significance levels of Levene's test were obtained as 0.132, 0.813 and 0.487, respectively which means equal variances are assumed and since the significance 2-tailed values are 0.949 for H21, 0.851 for H23 and 0.554 for H24, then there is no sufficient evidence to reject the $H21_0$, $H23_0$ and $H24_0$ so that $H21_0$, $H23_0$ and $H24_0$ are accepted (Table 17). As a result, there is no difference in PSQ, BI perception and PV according to ES of respondents.

$H21_0$: No difference exists in PSQ considering ES of respondents.
$H21_1$: There is a difference in PSQ considering ES of respondents.
$H22_0$: No difference exists in PPQ considering ES of respondents.
$H22_1$: There is a difference in PPQ considering ES of respondents.

$H23_0$: No difference exists in BI perception considering ES of respondents.
$H23_1$: There is a difference in BI perception considering ES of respondents.
$H24_0$: No difference exists in PV considering ES of respondents.
$H24_1$: There is a difference in PV considering ES of respondents.

As H22 is considered; the significance level of Levene's test is obtained as 0.801 which means equal variances are assumed and since the significance 2-tailed value is 0.033, then there is sufficient evidence rejecting the $H22_0$, so that $H22_1$ is accepted (Table 17). As a result, there is a difference in PPQ according to ES of respondents. According to Table 18, as the mean value of the employed respondents are greater than unemployed respondent, it can easily be concluded that employed respondents care about PPQ more than unemployed respondents.

3. Field process & data collection

To comprehend the importance of CS in the textile industry and to identify the factors affecting CS, the field process of this research includes the selection of sampling technique and data collection, handing out the prepared survey to the sample that is considered to respond, suppositions and constraints of the research and finally entering the data gathered from the respondents to SPSS program for determining the details of the sample.

3.1. Sampling technique

The sampling technique used in this research is nonprobability sampling. Convenience sampling, one of the nonprobability sampling technique, was chosen for this study. Since the application of convenience sampling is easy, and does not require a lot of time, while gathering the data convenience sampling was preferred and as a requirement in the collection of the survey the desired minimum number of the survey respondents was 100.

3.2. Data collection procedure

When applying the previously prepared survey forms, both face to face and e-mail techniques were used. The data collection method was determined by considering the factors such as sampling technique, sampling size and characteristics, number of questions and the time constraint.

3.3. Data analysis

3.3.1. Paired samples t-test

To identify the relationship hypotheses between four independent variables and the dependent variable the paired samples t-test was used.

3.3.2. ANOVA test

ANOVA test was used for the examination of some of the differences in the means of independent groups' hypotheses. In other words, by the help of ANOVA analysis; it was tested if there was any difference between different groups or categories in the independent variable affecting the dependent variable which is CS. After ANOVA analysis was performed, to identify which groups' means were different from the others and which groups made the differences, post-hoc tests were used. In this study, for the conditions that equal variances are assumed; Scheffe test was used and for the conditions that unequal variances are assumed, Tamhane T2 test was used.

3.3.3. Independent samples t-test

The hypotheses of each independent variable, based on only two independent different groups, were tested by independent samples t-test in this study.

4. Results and discussions

The results, received after the analysis process of the hypotheses, were assessed independently per two different hypothesis groups. A CS model was determined for the textile industry in accordance with the results received in this study.

4.1. The hypotheses between the independent variables and the dependent variable

When the results of this study are considered, it is crystal clear that BI perception, PSQ, PPQ and PV variables should not be ignored by the textile companies in their marketing and also sales strategies since BI perception, PSQ, PPQ and PV have direct effect on CS per the perception of the textile consumers.

Therefore, BI, SQ, PQ and V should be considered by the companies in order to increase the number of customers and create loyal customer profile. As a result, since BI, PSQ, PPQ and PV are the factors influencing CS, they are included in the CS model created in this study and the strategies of the textile companies are required to be based on these four factor variables.

4.2. The mean difference hypotheses between the independent groups

It is proven by the help of this analysis that no differences exist in PSQ, PPQ, PV and BI perception when the age of the survey respondents are considered. Thus, for these four independent variables the age of the consumers are not required to be taken into account by the textile companies when creating marketing strategies. In other words, textile companies in the market do not need to make distinct segmentations with respect to PSQ, PPQ, PV and BI perception in their marketing activities considering the ages of their customers.

No differences were found to exist in PPQ, PV and BI perception in accordance with genders of the survey respondents. However, there is a difference in PSQ considering genders of the respondents. For this reason, according to genders of the respondents, textile companies should think of different strategies for PSQ whereas they do not need to ponder different strategies for neither PPQ nor BI and PV. Since PSQ is taken into consideration by females more than males, SQ in marketing strategies needs to be emphasized more by the textile companies when females are considered, whereas it is not required to be highlighted when males are under consideration.

No differences were discovered to exist in PSQ, PV and PPQ while a difference was discovered to exist in BI perception considering the educations of the respondents. The difference in BI perception exists between the groups "HSG/S" education level and "MG/S" education level. According to the survey data, BI perception of the respondents belonging to the "HSG/S" group is higher than the respondents belonging to the "MG/S" group. Hence, if BI is preferred to be used as a marketing strategy, educations of the targeted consumers, particularly the difference between the BI perception of "HSG/S" and "MG/S" groups, should be considered by the textile companies.

In the analysis according to the TMPI of respondents, also it is found that there is no difference in PSQ, PV and PPQ but there is a difference in BI perception. These differences occur in the groups of "less than 500 TL and 1001 - 1500 TL", "1001 - 1500 TL and 1501 - 2000 TL" and "1001 - 1500 TL – greater than 2500 TL". In addition to this according to the survey data, BI perception of the respondents belonging to the "1001 – 1500 TL" income level is higher than the other income levels. Thus, the BI perception according to these TMPI groups should be considered when marketing and sale strategies are needed to be created.

The final result obtained in this analysis according to the ES of survey respondents is that there are no differences in PSQ, PV and BI perception however; there is a difference in PPQ. Since the employed consumers care about PQ more than unemployed consumers, textile companies have to consider the ES of the consumers based on PPQ when they are creating their marketing strategies.

5. Conclusions

The independent variables, PSQ, PPQ, BI and PV were found to have influence on CS in the textile industry. For reaching customers and identifying marketing and sales strategies, it is useful for the textile companies to find out if the independent variables that influence CS show differences according to consumer age, gender, education, TMPI and ES. So that, the requirements for the consumer profile that is targeted to be satisfied can be discovered by the textile companies. As a conclusion, the results of this study can be used to provide CS for the textile industry and by including new independent variables to this study, the research can be improved to have a better and comprehensive CS model.

Acknowledgement

References

Ahmad, R. and Buttle, F. (2001). Retaining Business Customers Through Adaptation and Bonding: a Case Study of HdoX, *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 16, No. 7, 553-573.

Aydın, S. and Özer, G. (2005). The Analysis of Antecedents of Customer Loyalty in the Turkish Mobile Telecommunication Market, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 39, No. 7/8, 910-925.

Babin, B.J. and Darden, W.R. (1995). "Consumer self-regulation in a retail environment", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 71, pp. 47-70.

Baker, J., Grewal, D. and Parasuraman, A. (1994). "The influence of store environment on quality inferences and store image", *The Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 22, pp. 328-39.

Burke, B.F. (1994). Satisfaction of women over 65 years of age with a fit-modified garment, *PhD Thesis*, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas.

Chow-Chua, C. and Komaran, R. (2002). Managing Service Quality by Combining Voice of the Service Provider and Voice of Their Customers, *Managing Service Quality*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 77-86.

Didier, S.M. (2003). The marketing function and consumer satisfaction online, *PhD Thesis*, Capella University.

Dodds, W.B., Monroe, K.B. and Grewal, D. (1991). "The effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluation", *Journal of Marketing Research,* Vol. 28, pp. 307-19.

Dubrovski, D. (2001). The role of customer satisfaction in achieving business excellence, Total Quality Management, Vol. 12, No. 7-8, 920-925.

Ghobadian, A., Speller, S. and Jones, M. (1993). Service quality : concepts and models, *International Journal of Quality&Reliability Management,* Vol.11, No.9, 43-66.

Grewal, D., Parasuraman, A. and Voss, G.B. (1998). The Roles of Price, Performance, and Expectations in Determining Satisfaction in Service Exchanges, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 62, No. 4, 46-61.

Grönroos, C. (1996). Relationship Marketing: Strategic and Tactical Implications, *Management Decision*, Vol. 34, No. 3, 5-14.

Hicks, J.M. (2005). Delighted customers buy again: An investigation into the impact of consumer knowledge on consumer satisfaction and delight of flowering potted plants, *Master of Science*, Michigan State University.

Jones, C.A. (2000). "Extraordinary customer service management: the critical success factors", *Business Perspectives,* Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 26-32.

Kind, K.O. and Hathcote, J.M. (2000). "Speciality-size college females: satisfaction with retail outlets and apparel fit", *Journal of Fashion Marketing & Management*, Vol. 4, pp. 315-24.

Ma, Y.J. and Niehm, L.S. (2006). Service Expectations of Older Genaration Y Customers an Examination of Apparel Retail Settings, *Managing Service Quality*, Vol. 16, No. 6, 620-640.

Mascarenhas, O.A., Kesavan, R. and Bernacchi, M. (2004). Customer value-chain involvement for co-creating customer delight, *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* Vol. 21, No. 7, 486 – 496.

Mascarenhas, O.A., Kesavan, R. and Bernacchi, M. (2006). Lasting customer loyalty: a total customer experience approach, *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* Vol. 23, No. 7, 397 – 405.

McDougall, G.H.G. and Levesque, T. (2000). Customer Satisfaction with Services: Putting Perceived Value into the Equation, *The Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 14, No.5, 392-410.

Otieno, R., Harrow, C. and Lea-Greenwood, G. (2005). The Unhappy Shopper, a Retail Experience: Exploring Fashion, Fit and Affordability, *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 33, No. 4, 298-309.

Özdamar, K. (2004). Paket Programlarla İstatistiksel Veri Analizi I-II [Statistical Data Analysis with Package Programs I-II], Kaan Kitabevi, Eskişehir, Turkey.

Peter, J.P. and Olsan, J.C. (2005). Consumer Behaviour and Marketing Strategy, The McGraw-Hill Companies,Inc., New York.

Royle, J., Cooper, L. and Stockdale, R. (1999). The use of branding by trade publishers: an investigation into marketing the book as a brand name product, *Publishing Research Quarterly,* Winter, 1-13.

Sirdeshmukh, D., Singh, J. and Sabol, B. (2002). "Consumer trust, value, and loyalty in relational exchanges", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 66, January, pp. 15-37.

Sirgy, M.J., Grewal, D. and Mangleburg, T. (2000). "Retail environment, self-congruity, and retail patronage: an interactive model and a research agenda*", Journal of Business Research,*Vol. 49, pp. 127-38.

Sivadas, E. and Baker-Prewitt, J.L. (2000). An Examination of the Relationship between Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, and Store Loyalty, *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 73-82.

Warrington, P.T. (2002). Customer evaluations of e-shopping: the effects of quality-value perceptions and e-shopping satisfaction on e-shopping loyalty, *PhD Thesis*, The University of Arizona.

Westbrook, R. A. (1981). Sources of consumer satisfaction with retail outlets. Journal of Retailing. Vol.57, No.3, 68-85.

Zeithaml, V.A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing. ,*Vol.52, No.3, 2-22

Table 1. Paired samples t-test results referred to hypothesis 1, 2, 3 and 4

Paired Samples T-Test					
		Sig. 2-tailed			**Sig. 2-tailed**
C S	**PSQ**	0,000	**C S**	**BI**	0,017
	PPQ	0,038		**PV**	0,000

Table 2. Test of homogeneity of variances referred to hypothesis 5-16

Test of Homogeneity of Variances										
		Levene	**Sig.**		**Levene**	**Sig.**			**Levene**	**Sig.**
PSQ	**Age Groups**	1,762	0,079	**Education**	0,601	0,625		**TMPI**	1,489	0,222
PPQ		1,489	0,152		0,603	0,611			0,559	0,685
BI		1,223	0,278		1,997	0,125			3,647	0,015
PV		1,529	0,137		0,639	0,597			1,682	0,157

Table 3. ANOVA tests referred to hypothesis 5-16

ANOVA (Between Groups)						
		Sig.		**Sig.**		**Sig.**
PSQ	**Age Groups**	0,219	**Education**	0,157	**TMPI**	0,367
PPQ		0,849		0,429		0,192
BI		0,705		0,011		0,037
PV		0,727		0,715		0,693

Table 4. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 5

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Service Quality / Scheffe														
(I) Ages	**(J) Ages**	**Sig.**	**(I) Ages**	**(J) Ages**	**Sig.**	**(I) Ages**	**(J) Ages**	**Sig.**	**(I) Ages**	**(J) Ages**	**Sig.**	**(I) Ages**	**(J) Ages**	**Sig.**
Below 20 years	20 - 25	0,99	**26 – 30 years**	< 20	1,00	**36 – 40 years**	< 20	1,00	**46 - 50 years**	< 20	1,000	**56 – 60 years**	< 20	0,9
	26 - 30	1,00		20 - 25	1,00		20 -	0,99		20 - 25	0,970		20 –	0,9
	31 - 35	1,00		31 - 35	1,00		26 -	1,00		26 - 30	0,997		26 -	0,9
	36 - 40	1,00		36 - 40	1,00		31 -	0,99		31 - 35	0,992		31 -	0,9
	41 - 45	0,99		41 - 45	0,99		41 -	1,00		36 - 40	1,000		36 -	1,0
	46 - 50	1,00		46 - 50	0,99		46 -	1,00		41 - 45	1,000		41 -	1,0
	51 - 55	1,00		51 - 55	0,99		51 -	1,00		51 -55	1,000		46 -	1,0
	56 - 60	0,99		56 - 60	0,99		56 -	1,00		56 - 60	1,000		51 -	1,0
	over 60	1,00		over	1,00		over	0,99		over	0,982		over	0,9
20 - 25 years	< 20	0,99	**31 – 35 years**	< 20	1,00	**41 – 45 years**	< 20	0,99	**51 – 55 years**	< 20	1,000	**Over 60 years**	< 20	1,0
	26 – 30	1,00		20 - 25	1,00		20 -	0,95		20 - 25	0,960		20 -	1,0
	31 - 35	1,00		26 - 30	1,00		26 -	0,99		26 - 30	0,998		26 -	1,0
	36 - 40	0,99		36 - 40	0,99		31 -	0,97		31 - 35	0,981		31 -	1,0
	41 - 45	0,95		41 - 45	0,97		36 -	1,00		36 - 40	1,000		36 -	0,9
	46 - 50	0,97		46 - 50	0,99		46 -	1,00		41 - 45	1,000		41 -	0,9
	51 - 55	0,96		51 - 55	0,98		51 -	1,00		46 - 50	1,000		46 -	0,9
	56 - 60	0,96		56 - 60	0,97		56 -	1,00		56 - 60	1,000		51 -	0,9
	over 60	1,00		over	1,00		over	0,94		over	0,968		56 -	0,9

Table 5. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 6

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Product Quality / Scheffe														
(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.
Below 20 years	20 -	1,000	26 – 30 years	< 20	1,00	36 – 40 years	< 20	0,98	46 - 50 years	< 20	1,00	56 – 60 years	< 20	1,
	26 -	1,000		20 -	1,00		20 -	0,99		20 -	1,00		20 –	1,
	31 -	0,998		31 -	0,99		26 -	0,99		26 -	1,00		26 -	1,
	36 -	0,988		36 -	0,99		31 -	1,00		31 -	1,00		31 -	1,
	41 -	1,000		41 -	1,00		41 -	0,99		36 -	0,99		36 -	1,
	46 -	1,000		46 -	1,00		46 -	0,99		41 -	1,00		41 -	1,
	51 -	0,999		51 -	1,00		51 -	1,00		51 -	1,00		46 -	1,
	56 -	1,000		56 -	1,00		56 -	1,00		56 -	1,00		51 -	0,
	over	1,000		over	1,00		over	0,99		over	1,00		over	1,
20 - 25 years	< 20	1,000	31 – 35 years	< 20	0,99	41 – 45 years	< 20	1,00	51 – 55 years	< 20	0,99	Over 60 years	< 20	1,
	26 –	1,000		20 -	1,00		20 -	1,00		20 -	1,00		20 -	1,
	31 -	1,000		26 -	0,99		26 -	1,00		26 -	1,00		26 -	1,
	36 -	0,996		36 -	1,00		31 -	0,99		31 -	1,00		31 -	1,
	41 -	1,000		41 -	0,99		36 -	0,99		36 -	1,00		36 -	0,
	46 -	1,000		46 -	1,00		46 -	1,00		41 -	1,00		41 -	1,
	51 -	1,000		51 -	1,00		51 -	1,00		46 -	1,00		46 -	1,
	56 -	1,000		56 -	1,00		56 -	1,00		56 -	0,99		51 -	1,
	over	1,000		over	1,00		over	1,00		over	1,00		56 -	1,

Table 6. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 7

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Brand Image / Scheffe														
(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.
Below 20 years	20 -	1,00	26 – 30 years	< 20	1,00	36 – 40 years	< 20	1,0	46 - 50 years	< 20	1,00	56 – 60 years	< 20	1,00
	26 -	1,00		20 -	1,00		20 -	1,0		20 -	1,00		20 –	1,00
	31 -	0,99		31 -	0,98		26 -	1,0		26 -	1,00		26 -	1,00
	36 -	1,00		36 -	1,00		31 -	0,9		31 -	1,00		31 -	1,00
	41 -	0,99		41 -	1,00		41 -	1,0		36 -	1,00		36 -	1,00
	46 -	1,00		46 -	1,00		46 -	1,0		41 -	1,00		41 -	1,00
	51 -	0,98		51 -	0,97		51 -	0,9		51 -	1,00		46 -	1,00
	56 -	1,00		56 -	1,00		56 -	1,0		56 -	1,00		51 -	1,00
	over	1,00		over	1,00		over	1,0		over	0,99		over	1,00
20 - 25 years	< 20	1,00	31 – 35 years	< 20	0,99	41 – 45 years	< 20	0,9	51 - 55 years	< 20	0,98	Over 60 years	< 20	1,00
	26 –	1,00		20 -	0,99		20 -	1,0		20 -	0,99		20 -	1,00
	31 -	0,99		26 -	0,98		26 -	1,0		26 -	0,97		26 -	1,00
	36 -	1,00		36 -	0,99		31 -	1,0		31 -	1,00		31 -	1,00
	41 -	1,00		41 -	1,00		36 -	1,0		36 -	0,99		36 -	1,00
	46 -	1,00		46 -	1,00		46 -	1,0		41 -	1,00		41 -	1,00
	51 -	0,99		51 -	1,00		51 -	1,0		46 -	1,00		46 -	0,99
	56 -	1,00		56 -	1,00		56 -	1,0		56 -	1,00		51 -	1,00
	over	1,00		over	1,00		over	1,0		over	1,00		56 -	1,00

Table 7. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 8

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Value / Scheffe														
(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.	(I) Ages	(J) Ages	Sig.
Below 20 years	20 - 25	1,0	26 – 30 years	< 20	1,000	36 – 40 years	< 20	0,99	46 - 50 years	< 20	1,00	56 – 60 years	< 20	1,00
	26 - 30	1,0		20 -	1,000		20 -	1,00		20 -	1,00		20 –	1,00
	31 - 35	0,9		31 -	1,000		26 -	1,00		26 -	1,00		26 - 30	1,00
	36 - 40	0,9		36 -	1,000		31 -	1,00		31 -	1,00		31 - 35	1,00
	41 - 45	1,0		41 -	0,942		41 -	0,90		36 -	1,00		36 - 40	1,00
	46 - 50	1,0		46 -	1,000		46 -	1,00		41 -	0,99		41 - 45	0,99
	51 - 55	1,0		51 -	1,000		51 -	1,00		51 -	1,00		46 - 50	1,00
	56 - 60	1,0		56 -	1,000		56 -	1,00		56 -	1,00		51 - 55	1,00
	over 60	1,0		over	1,000		over	1,00		over	1,00		over	1,00
20 - 25 years	< 20	1,0	31 – 35 years	< 20	0,997	41 – 45 years	< 20	1,00	51 – 55 years	< 20	1,00	Over 60 years	< 20	1,00
	26 – 30	1,0		20 -	1,000		20 -	0,95		20 -	1,00		20 - 25	1,00
	31 - 35	1,0		26 -	1,000		26 -	0,94		26 -	1,00		26 - 30	1,00
	36 - 40	1,0		36 -	1,000		31 -	0,95		31 -	1,00		31 - 35	1,00
	41 - 45	0,9		41 -	0,957		36 -	0,90		36 -	1,00		36 - 40	1,00
	46 - 50	1,0		46 -	1,000		46 -	0,99		41 -	0,98		41 - 45	1,00
	51 - 55	1,0		51 -	1,000		51 -	0,98		46 -	1,00		46 - 50	1,00
	56 - 60	1,0		56 -	1,000		56 -	0,99		56 -	1,00		51 - 55	1,00
	over 60	1,0		over	1,000		over	1,00		over	1,00		56 - 60	1,00

Table 8. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 9

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Service Quality / Scheffe					
(I) Education	(J) Education	Sig.	(I) Education	(J) Education	Sig.
High school student or graduate (HSS/G)	UGS/G	0,268	Master student or graduate (MS/G)	HSS/G	0,295
	MS/G	0,295		UGS/G	0,988
	DS/G	0,486		DS/G	0,997
Under graduate student or graduate (UGS/G)	HSS/G	0,268	Doctoral student or graduate (DS/G)	HSS/G	0,486
	MS/G	0,988		UGS/G	0,979
	DS/G	0,979		MS/G	0,997

Table 9. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 10

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Product Quality / Scheffe					
(I) Education	(J) Education	Sig.	(I) Education	(J) Education	Sig.
High school student or graduate (HSS/G)	UGS/G	0,940	Master student or graduate (MS/G)	HSS/G	0,996
	MS/G	0,996		UGS/G	0,861
	DS/G	0,590		DS/G	0,522
Under graduate student or graduate (UGS/G)	HSS/G	0,940	Doctoral student or graduate (DS/G)	HSS/G	0,590
	MS/G	0,861		UGS/G	0,750
	DS/G	0,750		MS/G	0,522

Table 10. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 12

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Value / Scheffe					
(I) Education	(J) Education	Sig.	(I) Education	(J) Education	Sig.
High school student or graduate (HSS/G)	UGS/G	0,846	Master student or graduate (MS/G)	HSS/G	0,979
	MS/G	0,979		UGS/G	0,992
	DS/G	0,785		DS/G	0,967
Under graduate student or graduate (UGS/G)	HSS/G	0,846	Doctoral student or graduate (DS/G)	HSS/G	0,785
	MS/G	0,992		UGS/G	0,981
	DS/G	0,981		MS/G	0,967

Table 11. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 11

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Brand Image / Scheffe							
(I) Education	(J) Education	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	(I) Education	(J) Education	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
High school student or graduate (HSS/G)	UGS/G	0,2532	0,175	Master student or graduate (MS/G)	HSS/G	-0,5139	0,008
	MS/G	0,5139	0,008		UGS/G	-0,2672	0,164
	DS/G	0,4263	0,199		DS/G	-9,5342E-02	0,988
Under graduate student or graduate (UGS/G)	HSS/G	-0,2532	0,175	Doctoral student or graduate (DS/G)	HSS/G	-0,4263	0,199
	MS/G	0,2672	0,164		UGS/G	-0,1722	0,835
	DS/G	0,1722	0,835		MS/G	9,5342E-02	0,988

Table 12. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 13

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Service Quality / Scheffe					
(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.	(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.
Below 500 TL	501 – 1000	0,965	1001 - 1500 TL	below 500	0,986
	1001 - 1500	0,986		501 - 1000	0,997
	1501 - 2000	1,000		1501 - 2000	0,722
	over 2500	1,000		over 2500	0,923
501 - 1000 TL	below 500	0,965	1501 - 2000 TL	below 500	1,000
	1001 - 1500	0,997		501 - 1000	0,533
	1501 - 2000	0,533		1001 - 1500	0,722
	over 2500	0,854		over 2500	1,000
Over 2500 TL					
	below 500	1,000		1001 - 1500	0,923
	501 - 1000	0,854		1501 - 2000	1,000

Table 13. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 14

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Product Quality / Scheffe					
(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.	(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.
Below 500 TL	501 – 1000	0,292	1001 - 1500 TL	below 500	0,292
	1001 - 1500	0,292		501 - 1000	1,000
	1501 - 2000	0,580		1501 - 2000	0,895
	over 2500	0,595		over 2500	0,997
501 - 1000 TL	below 500	0,292	1501 - 2000 TL	below 500	0,580
	1001 - 1500	1,000		501 - 1000	0,898
	1501 - 2000	0,898		1001 - 1500	0,895
	over 2500	0,996		over 2500	1,000
Over 2500 TL					
	below 500	0,595		1001 - 1500	0,997
	501 - 1000	0,996		1501 - 2000	1,000

Table 14. Scheffe tests referred to hypothesis 16

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Perceived Value / Scheffe					
(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.	(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.
Below 500 TL	501 – 1000	0,993	1001 - 1500 TL	below 500	0,983
	1001 - 1500	0,983		501 - 1000	0,999
	1501 - 2000	0,908		1501 - 2000	0,942
	over 2500	1,000		over 2500	0,993
501 - 1000 TL	below 500	0,993	1501 - 2000 TL	below 500	0,908
	1001 - 1500	0,999		501 - 1000	0,862
	1501 - 2000	0,862		1001 - 1500	0,942
	over 2500	0,997		over 2500	0,899
Over 2500 TL					
	below 500	1,000		1001 - 1500	0,993
	501 - 1000	0,997		1501 - 2000	0,899

Table 15. Tamhane tests referred to hypothesis 15

Multiple Comparisons / Dependent Variable: Brand Image / Tamhane					
(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.	(I) TMPI	(J) TMPI(TL)	Sig.
Below 500 TL	501 – 1000	0,992	1001 - 1500 TL	below 500	0,991
	1001 - 1500	0,991		501 - 1000	1,000
	1501 - 2000	0,997		1501 - 2000	0,132
	over 2500	1,000		over 2500	0,384
501 - 1000 TL	below 500	0,992	1501 - 2000 TL	below 500	0,997
	1001 - 1500	1,000		501 - 1000	0,630
	1501 - 2000	0,630		1001 - 1500	0,132
	over 2500	0,418		over 2500	0,904
Over 2500 TL					
	below 500	1,000		1001 - 1500	0,384
	501 - 1000	0,418		1501 - 2000	0,904

Table 16. Independent samples t-tests referred to hypothesis 15

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means	
		Independent Samples Test								
		(less than 500 TL and 1001 – 1500 TL TMPI)			(1001 - 1500 TL and 1501 – 2000 TL TMPI)			(1001– 1500 TL and higher than 2500 TL TMPI)		
		Sig.	Sig. 2-tailed	Mean Difference	Sig.	Sig. 2-tailed	Mean Difference	Sig.	Sig. 2-tailed	Mean Difference
BI	EVA	0,490	0,028	-0,7973	0,272	0,033	0,3046	0,713	0,015	0,6475
	EVNA		0,354	-0,7973		0,011	0,3046		0,050	0,6475

Table 17. Independent samples t-tests referred to hypothesis 17-24

			Levene's	T-test For Equality of		Levene's	T-test For Equality of
			Independent Samples Test				
			Sig.	Sig. 2-tailed		Sig.	Sig. 2-tailed
PS	EVA		0,149	0,035		0,132	0,949
	EVN			0,044			0,937
PP	EVA	Gender	0,687	0,523	ES	0,801	0,033
	EVN			0,536			0,035
BI	EVA		0,079	0,323		0,813	0,851
	EVN			0,289			0,841
PV	EVA		0,649	0,759		0,487	0,554
	EVN			0,741			0,581

Table 18. Independent samples t-test groups statistics referred to hypothesis 17-24

			Mean			Mean				Mean			Mean
			Independent Samples T-Test (Group Statistics)										
PSQ	Gender	Male	4,0856	ES	Yes	4,2020	**BI**	Gender	Male	3,9078	ES	Yes	3,9753
		Female	4,2533		No	4,2079			Female	4,0021		No	3,9678
PPQ		Male	4,1142		Yes	4,2322	**PV**		Male	4,5746		Yes	4,6113
		Female	4,1687		No	4,0655			Female	4,6033		No	4,5623