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Abstract

Background: For years companies have been using SMI$s$ to communicate their brands and influencer marketing has become a thriving concept in this social-media era. Beauty retailing industry, as a global business with the third biggest follower base on social media, makes itself qualified and valuable for the study of influencer marketing.

Purpose: The aim of the thesis is to investigate which type of influencers would be more influential in promotion of beauty product categories. Furthermore, the study intends to research on consumers’ review habits, preferred traits of influencers and reasons behind the actions.

Method: To accomplish the purpose of this study, we conducted an abductive approach by the aid of both qualitative and quantitative data. The data was gathered through a questionnaire and a focus group, primarily among students in international universities. This in order to reach out to young people with different nationalities since it is an international study.

Conclusion: Top influentials and narrative experts are shown to be more efficient for influencer marketing in the beauty industry especially when they are perceived trustworthy. Additionally, we found that the influencers have an impact on the consumers most when it comes to information search and the evaluation of alternatives.
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1. Introduction

In this part of the thesis we aim to give a general introduction of the topic. When summarizing the background and the fundamental knowledge, it will become clear for the motivation to this research. The section will include the problem and purpose of the thesis, along with the delimitations and the important definitions related to social media influencer and influencer marketing.

1.1 Background

Influencer Marketing has become a trend and gradually reached into every aspect of daily life, whether people realised it or not. Nowadays, it serves as a rather common way for firms to communicate their brands via social media influencers (SMIs) (Freberg, Graham, McGaughey & Freberg, 2011).

"Social media influencers (SMIs) represent a new type of independent third-party endorser who shape audience attitudes through blogs, tweets, and the use of other social media." (Freberg, Graham, McGaughey & Freberg, 2011)

The market value of a charismatic influencer cannot be overstated, and Huda Kattan is a good case. She started as a beauty blogger in 2010 and she has now built up her own blog-to-brand beauty empire. With more than 23 million followers on Instagram, her influences even surpass lots of Hollywood A-listers (Forbes, 2017). Her own makeup line, Huda Beauty, became successful in 2017, reaching a sale of roughly 100 million US dollar (Women Wear Daily, 2017). Huda herself was also crowned by Time Magazine (2018) as one of “The 25 Most Influential People on the Internet”. She and nine other beauty influencers on the top list have reached out to 135 million individuals in 2017, ranking the third place among twelve categories according to Forbes (2017).
In general, the process in influencer marketing can be divided into two chains, interactions between firms and influencers and between influencers and end-customers (Fill & Turnbull, 2016). While the firm only take an active part in the first chain, the performance of a marketing tool is measured by the quality and the quantity of the customer reach. This paper will consequently emphasize on and try to sort out the issues within the first chain, but with the help of investigations of consumers. The issues involved in this paper, in brief, are how a firm can identify relevant influencers and use them for the right product in a successful way. This paper primarily will evaluate three types of influencers; superspreaders, top influentials and narrative experts, who differ from each other in individual capital and social capital.

However, consumer’s preference on types of SMIs probably vary from one industry to another, which drives the topic to be further limited to the beauty retailing industry. It is a global business where virtually the same products are supplied to consumers worldwide. It can be argued that generalised research may lack validity due to the broad product assortment within beauty industry. Kumar (2005) categorised the cosmetic industry into five segments - makeup, skincare, haircare, fragrance and personal care. In this paper we will mainly investigate the first four categories mentioned which covers approximately 88% market share in cosmetic market (Statista, 2018). According to Kumar (2005), in the year 2001 the global cosmetic market had $124 billion in market share, making it an interesting market to investigate further.

![Global cosmetic industry overview](image_url)

**Figure 1.** Global cosmetics industry overview, adapted from Kumar (2005).
1.2 Problem discussion

Unlike most of popular marketing tools, Influencer marketing, as a thriving concept in recent few years, is still an unexplored research field. Even though there are an increasing number of studies aiming at it, they mostly revolve around some basic topics. For example, to identify and categorize SMIs (Wiedmann, Hennigs & Langner, 2010) and the benefits of influencer marketing in such a social media era (Khamis, Ang & Welling, 2016). While some of them also endeavoured to illustrate how SMIs can develop a follower base and take advantage of it (More & Lingam, 2017). However, it has not been elucidated in which way a firm can leverage influencer marketing.

The research will concentrate on the selection of influencers within the beauty retailing industry. Not only because it lacks research, but also because it is believed to be valuable for firms to boost marketing efficiency, especially those in beauty retailing industry. Since this industry involves lots of global businesses who spend a vast amount of money on marketing each year and as aforementioned, SMIs play an active role in it. Moreover, successful influencers within the beauty industry, usually requires expertise and knowledge. It distinguishes beauty influencers from other types, such as fashion bloggers, and makes this topic even more interesting to study.

Ohanian (1991) argues that to be able to be effective in communicating a message depends largely on the credibility and the considered characteristics of the source. Therefore, it is important to understand the factors underlying the credibility of the source. To be able to gain insight into the nature of the SMIs, we will use the source credibility theory when identifying the appealing attributes of SMIs.

This paper will strive for recognising the more rational choices of the type of influencers for each beauty categories by investigating consumer behaviour. It is anticipated to turn influencer marketing into a powerful tool for firms by integrating previous findings and empirical findings. In other words, the study will generate further knowledge and a deeper
understanding of the different types of influencers and their respective impact on consumers.

1.3 Purpose

The aim of the thesis is to investigate which type of influencers would be more influential in promotion of beauty product categories. Furthermore, the study intends to research on consumers’ review habits, preferred traits of influencers and reasons behind the actions.

1.4 Delimitations

The research will be delimited within four categories of beauty products which are; makeup, skincare, haircare and fragrance. Given that young people are the main demographic group turning to social media regarding following beauty influencers, rendering them the focus of our study. Therefore, we have limited the study to the age of 16-35.

1.5 Definitions

Social media
According to Oxford Dictionary of English (2015) social media is defined as “Websites and applications that enable users to create and share content or to participate in social networking”.

Social Media Influencers
Social Media Influencers refer to a type of an independent third party endorser who use social media networks to ”shape audience” (Freberg, Graham, McGaughey & Freberg, 2011).

Influencer marketing
Influencer marketing is the art and science of engaging people who are influential online to share brand messaging with their audiences (Sammis, Lincoln, Pomponi, Ng, Gassmann Rodriguez & Zhou, 2016).
2. Theoretical framework

This section includes a literature review for the discussion of the influencer marketing and typology of influencer, in combination with the concepts buyer decision process, the source effect and elaboration likelihood model.

2.1 Influencer Marketing

As early as in 1998 The Economist has put forward the concept of word of mouse, which is well known as Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM). Gelb and Sundaram (2002) called for adapting to word of mouse since they spotted the transformation that potential buyers tend to seek out information from electronic consumer forums. It is essentially the same as word of mouth (WOM) marketing, an informal way of exchanging information among consumers about the characteristics, usage, and ownership of particular products or services (Li & Du, 2011). However, instead of one’s own circle of acquaintances, potential buyers now are able to consult a larger number of independent evaluators (Gelb & Sundaram, 2002). They get connected owing to some common interests and do not necessarily know each other personally (Dellarocas, 2006). Among them, a group of the opinionated and the passionate have gradually gained more popularity than others and thus became opinion leaders, also known as the influential. Therefore, they are normally blessed with higher social standing and stronger online social networks, making them more influential when delivering product information, providing recommendations, giving personal comments and supplementing professional knowledge that help firms to promote their products (Li & Du, 2011).

Influencer marketing in essence, as described in the definition, is to make use of the influential in eWOM communication to communicate brand messages. In short, the biggest merit of employing influencer marketing is that, as long as businesses could succeed in identifying and reaching out to the influential in that community, the message
would be circulated in the group spontaneously and thought highly by group members. Moreover, there is a wide range of social media channels and a huge pool of influencers available for firms to cooperate with, no matter which type of content firms wish for (Sammis et al., 2016). The concept can be further broken down into two elements for a deeper understanding: referral marketing and social media in marketing.

2.1.1 Referral marketing

Referral marketing, as its name indicated, is a marketing strategy that encourages individuals to make recommendations on their own initiative (Berman, 2016). The most common practice is word of mouth referrals, but part of public relation activities also counts. For instance, when the brand gives out free samples to editors or reporters, with the hope that they would volunteer to make recommendations if they found the products worthy to try (Sammis et al., 2016). Owing to the trust issues, a recommendation from a friend or a family member, or even whoever seems not to get paid for the referral, would be more highly valued compared to paid media outlet directed at a prospect (Berman, 2016; Turcotte, York, Irving, Scholl & Pingree, 2015). In this case, as many studies stressed, WOM marketing has been proven to be cost-effective and efficient in affecting consumer purchase decisions (Godes & Mayzlin, 2004; Herr, Kardes & Kim, 1991) and building customer loyalty (Trusov, Bucklin & Pauwels, 2009; Buttle, 1998). However, the trust between the referrer and consumers would be at stake if consumers found the referrer is not being helpful and honest anymore (Berman, 2016; Turcotte et al., 2015).

2.1.2 Social Media in Marketing

The proliferation of social media as a marketing tool has revolutionised how businesses communicate the brand with customers (Parsons & Lepkowska-White, 2018). It has activated a two-way conversation between businesses and customers (Drury 2008; Felix, Rauschnabel & Hinsch, 2017), so consumers are not passive recipients of marketing activities anymore, but active participants through the whole process (Parsons & Lepkowska-White, 2018). Besides, they normally constitute an online social community based on shared interests or attitudes, which makes it easier for businesses to identify and
reach their target customers (Huang, 2010). No matter for WOM marketing, or for any other marketing strategies, social media can help firms in a way that further facilitates the customer engagement and the dissemination of referrals (Araujo, Neijens, and Vliegenthart 2015; Castronovo & Huang, 2012).

There is a wide range of social media platforms to choose from when cooperating with influencers and on the whole, they can be categorised into five groups - microblogging, social networking sites, photo sharing, video sharing and social blogging. Microblogging enables users to make a post with the limitation of 140 characters. It is considered to be advantageous for customer engagement and conversation propagation (Hennig-Thurau, Malthouse, Friege, Gensler, Lobschat, Rangaswamy & Skiera, 2010; McNealy, 2010). Social networking sites, with the emphasis on contacting, has developed lots of derived functions, such as advertising and life sharing, as time went by. With probably the largest-scale of active users, they are ideal places to develop a loyal community (McNealy, 2010). Photo sharing and video sharing, as their names indicated, refer to platforms that allow users to share photos and videos, for instance Instagram and YouTube. Owing to the nature of photos and videos that is able to contain more information, they are commonly used for embedding content and sharing life (Castronovo & Huang, 2012). Social blogging is different from microblogging based on the fact that a blog is usually on an independent website with its own address and there are no restraints regarding length, design, forms of the post. It is viewed as a medium where drives WOM recommendations and builds meaningful relationships (Castronovo & Huang, 2012). Although up to the present, lots of them has integrated with several functions together, like aforementioned social networking sites, we suppose the user’s experience and the emphasis still vary from one to another.
Table 2.1. Our own interpreted summary of social media tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microblogging</td>
<td>Posting short posts on what the user find interesting Weibo, Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networking Sites</td>
<td>Used to communicate with others, to find and to share similar interests with people Facebook, WeChat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo sharing</td>
<td>The user posts photos that can be shared with others Instagram, Pinterest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video sharing</td>
<td>The user posts videos that can be shared with others YouTube, Bilibili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social blogging</td>
<td>The blogger posts anything she/him wants. For example opinions, articles, stories or links to other websites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Typology of Social Influencers

Wiedmann, Hennigs & Langner (2010) identified eight types of influencers and the three representative ones are top influentials, narrative expert and superspreaders. They differ from each other primarily in individual capital and social capital. According to Wiedmann et al. (2010), individual capital concerns involvement, expertise & knowledge, innovativeness, Machiavellianism, satisfaction, risk aversion and demographics. While social capital takes into account integration, gregariousness, personality strength and empathy.

![Diagram of Personal WOM Capital of Referral Behaviour](image)

**Figure 2.1. Personal WOM capital of referral behaviour**

Adapted from Wiedmann et al. (2010)

Top influentials refer to those who rank high in both individual and social capital dimensions (Wiedmann et al., 2010). They have a lot of followers and knowledge in the
given field. Usually, they will interact with the followers and update referrals or tutorials based on their knowledge and involvement quite frequently.

Narrative experts refer to those who excel in individual capital dimension but does not stand out in social capital dimension (Wiedmann et al., 2010). They do not have as many followers as the other two types do, but they are the most skilled and knowledgeable ones in comparison to the other two. Taking beauty industry as an example, narrative experts will most probably be makeup artist and skin care specialist who have a certain amount of followers.

Superspreaders refer to those who have fair social capital, but lack individual capital compared to the other two types (Wiedmann et al., 2010). In general, influencers of this type excel in one or few specific field(s) and thus enjoy a solid and large-scale follower base, but they are not as professional as the other two in the given subject. Therefore, when it comes to fields that they are not specialised in, their referrals may still work well but mainly owing to reputation and/or trust from their followers (Wiedmann et al., 2010).

![Figure 2.2 Typology of Influencers. Adapted from Wiedmann et al. (2010).](image-url)
2.3 Buyer decision process

Marketing is a vital strategy for companies to be able to reach their target groups. Therefore, it is important to understand the process behind consumer’s buying decisions. According to Kotler, Wong, Saunders and Armstrong (2005) the buyer goes through five different stages before making a purchase and consumes can always skip or turn back to some of these stages.

**Figure 2.3 Buyer decision process (Kotler et al., 2005).**

Need recognition is the first step in the buying decision process and it is when the buyer recognises a problem or need. There are two ways to trigger the need, by internal stimuli or by external stimuli. Internal stimuli is when the buyer feel a need to satisfy one of the normal needs which can be hunger, thirst or sex (Kotler et al., 2005). The external stimuli can be for example, when a consumer watches a television commercial for a Cuba vacation, or when admiring a friend’s new mobile phone. The external stimuli can be useful for marketers since it is about the consumer being exposed to a product or service that triggers the need recognition. The marketer should research what factors behind the consumers need recognition to be able to know what brought them here and how they came to the particular product (Kotler et al., 2005).

The second step in the buying decision process is information search. The consumer often reacts on two ways, either buys the product directly or puts the need in memory. If the product is close at hand and if it satisfies the need, the consumer normally will buy it without hesitation. If the consumer decides not to buy the product but instead to undertake an information search linked to the need, then there are two levels of information search which is heightened attention and active information search (Kotler et al., 2005). Heightened attention means that the consumer is more aware of for example, mobile phone ads, conversations about mobile phones and mobile phones used by friends. However, active information search is when the consumer gathers information in other
ways than described in heightened attention (Kotler et al., 2005). The information can come from personal, commercial, public and experiential sources. It depends on the consumer and can vary. Nonetheless, the most effective sources are often from a personal source. Kotler et al., (2005) claims that commercial sources usually informs the buyer, but personal sources legitimises or evaluate products for the buyer.

The third step in the buying decision process is evaluation of alternatives. In this step, the consumer choose among the brands and it can be either a simple, single process or an ongoing complex process. The process can be easier explained through understanding the consumers need. Assuming that each consumer is trying to fulfil a certain need through looking for certain benefits that can be obtained from buying a product or service. Then the consumers will look for services or products most connected to their needs. When deciding which attributes are relevant, it can be salient attributes, which are those that come to a consumer’s mind, when asked about a product’s characteristic. However, at the same time it is important to recognise the importance of product’s characteristics that are forgotten by the consumer. Furthermore, the consumer may develop brand beliefs about the brands available. The beliefs from a consumer, is based on his or her experience, which may vary from true attributes since it is the effects from a selective perception (Kotler et al., 2005).

2.4 Ohanian’s Model of Source Credibility

The credibility source is a term often used when illustrating a communicator’s positive characteristics that affect the receiver’s positive perception of a message. Based upon these theories, Ohanian (1991) found three factors that add to the credibility of the source. The first factor is trustworthiness which can be described as if the message is perceived valid of the audience. Expertise is the second factor and it is when the spokesperson is perceived as “professional”, “expert” or qualified. The last factor is known as the source attractiveness, which in this case is regarding the message and how it is perceived. For example, if the message has an elegance, style and beauty (Serban, 2010). The source attractiveness can be further explained through dividing the concept into three parts;
similarity, familiarity and likeability. Likeability is the perception of the source and can be defined in terms of physical appearance and behaviour (McGuire, 1985). However, McGuire (1985) states that attractiveness is more complex due to the perception of attractiveness is in the eyes of the receiver. Characteristics such as personality, lifestyle and intellectual skills can affect a perception (McGuire, 1985).

![Diagram of Source Credibility](image)

**Figure 2.4. Our simplified Model of the Source Credibility (Ohanian, 1991).**

### 2.5 Elaboration Likelihood Model

Petty and Cacioppo (1983) developed the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) which describes two ways to persuasion: the central and peripheral routes. They represent two different ways for an audience to process a message and results of the attitude change, depending on whether the product is perceived as low- or high involvement, in order to increase the effectiveness of a marketing message (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). Elaboration is the amount of effort a person used for processing and evaluating a message, in order to decide whether to accept or reject it. If experiencing high elaboration likelihood, which means high involvement, then the individuals will pass through the central route where they are likely to engage and process an informational message (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). They are more willing to be persuaded by argument quality. However, when elaboration likelihood is low, the information processing will occur through the peripheral route (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984). The individuals are more likely to have little or no interest in processing the message but when doing so it has been observed that the source effects of the communicator have a higher influence in the peripheral cues than under high involvement (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984).
3. Method

In this part of the thesis, we will reveal the whole progression for collecting information and the reasons underlying the decisions, which includes research philosophy, approach, strategy and the limitations of the methodology.

The following sections in this part of thesis will be structured with the guide of the research onion (figure 3.1). It is an effective tool for researchers to design their research step by step and the one presenting below is developed and modified by Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill in 2012. Carrying out the whole progression enables researchers to form a systematic view of the research and to make a more informed decision on the design (Saunders et al., 2012). A well-designed research is argued to be beneficial to the reliability and the validity of the results (Bryman, 2012; Saunders et al., 2012).

![Figure 3.1 The Research Onion from Saunders et al. (2012).](image)

3.1 Research Philosophy

Research philosophy refers to a series of beliefs and assumptions about formation and evolution of knowledge. It concerns the ways in which data about a phenomenon ought
Management and business research comprises five main philosophies: positivism, critical realism, interpretivism, postmodernism and pragmatism. They essentially differ from each other in terms of ontology, epistemology, axiology, which in other words are assumptions on the nature of reality, constitutions of acceptable knowledge and the role of values (Saunders et al., 2012).

Pragmatism research philosophy was selected to fulfil this research. For pragmatists, the research question is the prime mover of the entire research. In order to contribute practical solutions that inform future practices (Saunders et al., 2012), they also assert that concepts are only relevant if they support actions (Kelemen & Rumens, 2008). It indicates the importance will be attached to practical meaning and consequences of knowledge in specific contexts rather than abstract distinctions. The pragmatist emphasis of practical outcomes is precisely the reason why we consider it to be the proper choice of our research philosophy.

Pragmatic research is allowed to integrate more than one research approaches and research strategies within the same study, the choice of which is driven by the specific nature of the research question. As a rule, pragmatism research philosophy will lead to the employment of assorted research strategies and mixed method, albeit it does not imply pragmatists always use multiple methods. Instead, they are suggesting being cautious about the choice in order to render data to be collected credible, well-founded, reliable and relevant (Kelemen & Rumens, 2008).

3.2 Research Approach

According to Saunders et al. (2012), there are three approaches to how a design of a research can be and they are inductive, deductive and abductive. The choice of approach depends on the literature, data collection and theory of the research (Saunders et. al., 2012). The deductive research approach explains the beginning of this research since it is based on the existing literature. However, when gathering of data in the later part of the thesis, it is an inductive approach (Saunders et. al., 2012). The abductive approach is to
explore a phenomenon, identify themes and explain patterns for theory generation or modification (Saunders et. al., 2012). The approach can be further explained as a blend of the deductive and inductive approach while it goes back and forth between theory and data. We have chosen an abductive approach since we consider it is the best option for the thesis. This is on account of that we are using existing theory from previous literature which we want to further build on by analysing both theory and data (Saunders et. al., 2012).

3.3 Research Design

3.3.1 Research Purpose

Depending on the nature of the research project, the research purpose can vary as well. There are four common types of motivation behind a research design - exploratory, descriptive, explanatory and evaluative - each of which serves a different end purpose (Saunders et al., 2012). Descriptive studies are merely used to gain a description of events, persons or situations and normally require researchers to “have a clear picture of the phenomenon on which you wish to collect data prior to the collection of the data” (Saunders et al., p.171, 2012). While explanatory studies aim to establish and explain relationships between variables, evaluative studies intend to assess the effectiveness of a business strategy or process. Consequently, the exploratory has been chosen to be the purpose of our research design. Exploratory refers studies when researchers try to understand and define a problem. It can be when a researcher has an idea or an interesting observation and intends to get a deeper of understanding of it. It is usually conducted by open-ended questions to make it easier for researchers to increase knowledge of the topic (Saunders et al., 2012).

Consequently, this paper will conduct the research from an exploratory perspective, since we have intention to understand how influencer marketing can work for cosmetic enterprises. Due to the lack of information, we conducted a questionnaire first in order to have an overall picture of the problem. The questionnaire presents a quantitative view at
it, while the focus group will explain further the reasons and factors behind the findings from the questionnaire. A quantitative study will not be enough to explain the phenomenon of social media influencers and how they influence the consumer. The focus groups will contribute with an in-depth understanding of the complex phenomenon. By applying both, focus groups and questionnaires, it will provide us a possibility to recognise and understand the consumers’ preference, impact of different types of influencers and how a firm can make use of them.

3.3.2 Research strategy

Saunders et al. (2012) state that a plan of actions, which in this case is called research strategy, is significant for a researcher to know how to go with the process of answering the research question. The fundamental concept of a research strategy is to build the ground for the rest of the research layout. The purpose of this, is to answer the stated research question investigated and by doing so the previous stated ideas are supporting the research questions, objectives, approach and purpose (Saunders et al. 2012).

According to Creswell (2003) there are three ways in which research methods can be examined; quantitative, qualitative and mixed method. A quantitative strategy is built on the interests of the investigator as a post-positivist which can, for example, be when using certain variables as measurements and observations to test theories. Furthermore, the investigator wants to expand the knowledge by using experiments and questionnaires on predetermined instruments that would give result in statistical data (Creswell, 2003). A qualitative research is generally more exploratory in nature, searching to contribute insight into describing a phenomenon in a deep comprehensive manner. This is usually done through interviews, open-ended questions or focus groups. A mixed method, according to Hesse-Biber (2010), enables different approaches to complement each other and it is generally used when a researcher wants to have a fuller and deeper understanding of the topic in question.
This thesis will implement a quantitative approach through the questionnaire and a qualitative approach through focus groups. By combining both approaches, the research has been carried out by a mixed method since one approach would not cover all the aspects for this research. Firstly, we have conducted our research in a quantitative questionnaire to gain a more general understanding of the research and the opinions of the respondents based on a large extent of samples. Additionally, a qualitative approach by means of focus groups can be helpful as well to support the propositions and obtain a deeper understanding for the overall problem.

3.3.3 Time Horizon

This research has chosen to be a time sectional study owing to its nature and the time constraint. It presents during this particular period, what types of influencers or what traits are preferred by consumers for each beauty category. Consumer preference might change as time goes by and this is the reason why the timeliness of information is key to businesses. We were aware that it might also be good to conduct a longitudinal study to examine the consistency of consumers preference, but the time is limited and a cross-sectional research is in fact sufficient to fulfil our research purpose for now.

3.4 Data collection

3.4.1 Primary data

According to Saunders et al. (2012) the definition on primary data is when data is gathered specifically for the purpose of the research. There are several ways for researchers to collect primary data and it can be through interviews, questionnaires and observations. Interviews can be used when answering the research questions while questionnaires are to serve as a general and common tool to help the researchers to collect primary data (Saunders et al. 2012). In this study a wide range of the primary data is collected, focusing on in-depth perspective. Consequently, this research conducts both a quantitative questionnaire and a qualitative semi-structured focus group. By collecting the data through these two ways, we expect to collect a large extent of data to analyse, in order to be able to get a broad perspective of the topic as much as possible.
3.4.2 Secondary data

Secondary data can be described as “data that have already been collected for some other purpose” (Saunders et al., 2012, p.304). By obtaining already existing literature it can further help when developing, analysing and providing new or different interpretations as well as additional or different knowledge (Bulmer, Sturgis and Allum, 2009). The secondary data was collected through academic databases but also from social media platforms. To gain insight in SMIs we have collected data from several influencers to be able to establish the ground for questions asked under the conducted quantitative survey.

3.4.3 Literature search

In this study the data for the frame of reference has mainly been collected from the online databases such as Primo and Google Scholar. Primo is the database provided by the University and it was the main used database in this study in consideration of the wide range of articles and books. Google Scholar enables us to see how many times a source has been cited, which was helpful for the further research on articles in Primo, since we lack access to articles in Google Scholar compared to Primo. From the library of Jönköping University, we collected books that were relevant for thesis and through the online databases we accessed peer reviewed articles. The reason to use peer reviewed literature was the high quality, which is beneficial to the reliability and validity of the study. The key words used to start the literature search was “influencer” and “influencer marketing” which helped us to find other keywords narrowing down the search since it offered a wide collection of articles.

3.4.4. Sampling

Sampling is when researchers investigate a portion or sample of a group of participants and use the data to make statements that can imply to a broader group or population (Fritz & Morgan, 2010). Since Saunders et al. (2012) states that the effectiveness of using the whole population would be impractical due to the size, the cost and the time necessary for reaching out to the whole population. Using a sample to make a statement regarding
A whole population within research can be reliable if the sample is representative enough to the whole population (Saunders et al., 2012).

According to Saunders et al. (2012) there are two types of sampling techniques and they are probability- and non-probability sampling. The probability sampling is the most common survey strategy and is known as being the 'representative sampling'. The strategy is based on the fact that every member of a population has an equal opportunity of being chosen (Saunders et al., 2012). Therefore, the findings from such sampling should be reliable and similar as results from the whole population. Furthermore, a probability sampling allows the researcher to estimate unknown parameters and/or make valid statistical assumptions about the population (Saunders et al., 2012).

Nonetheless, in this thesis a non-probability sampling has been chosen and one type of such sampling is convenience sampling (Saunders et al., 2012). It can be explained as where the first accessible primary data source will be used for the research (Sedgwick, 2013). In other words, it is where we can find participants and what is normally convenient (Sedgwick, 2013). However, the non-probability sampling approach has been selected for both the questionnaire and the focus group, in an effort to get a representable sample in consideration of the age and nationality among the participants (Saunders et al., 2012). According to Central Limit Theorem, if there is a sample with 30 or more observations, it would be considered to be sufficiently large enough to assume the distribution of the sampling means is normally distributed (Hogg & Tanis, 2006). Therefore, we aimed to collect at least 120 responses, considering we have four categories to examine, and we ended up with 190 responses.

### 3.5 Questionnaire

#### 3.5.1 Questionnaire design

The questionnaire starts with a concise introduction and motivation of the research and embodies a succinct explanation of SMI and beauty influencer, in order to articulate our
ideas and increase the validity of responses. The questionnaire is constituted by four blocks, covering the demographic background, involvement in beauty products and SMI, preferences on type of SMI and preference on traits of posts for four categories of beauty products.

The first part of the questionnaire (Question 1 - 4), demographic background, concerns respondents’ gender, age, education level and nationality. This information primarily serves as a base for generalisation of the sample during the analysis stage. Besides, it offers us a chance to explore how respondents’ choices vary from one demographic group to another.

The second part of the questionnaire (Question 5 - 12) describes the respondents’ involvement in SMI and beauty products. It includes the amount of influencers followed, the platforms used, the frequency of purchase and habits of review. The options for platforms used for following influencers cover five main types of social media, social media networking sites like Facebook, microblogging sites like Twitter and Weibo as well as photo sharing, video sharing and blogging sites. We took into account differences in the usage of platforms in different countries. Considering social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram and YouTube are still not officially available in China, we add few Chinese special platforms such as Weibo, WeChat subscription and Bilibili in options as well.

The third part of the questionnaire (Question 13 - 16), was drawn from the theory on typology of influencers. We examined the respondents’ preference on the type of influencers for each category of beauty products in this part. Taking makeup category as an example, top influential was described as “Someone who is skilled and experienced in makeup and has lots of followers”, Superspreaders was presented as “Someone who has more followers but is not specialised in makeup, like a famous fashion blogger”, Narrative experts was portrayed as “Someone who is professional in makeup, most likely working as a makeup artist, but only has a certain amount of followers, like Wayne Goss”. Besides,
we included “it makes no difference” as the fourth option because we were aware that for different categories or part of respondents, it might not matter which type of influencer is used to promote the products.

The fourth part of the questionnaire (Question 17 - 20), was derived from Ohanian model of source credibility, investigating the perceived importance of three traits described in the model - expertise, attractiveness and trustworthiness - for each category of beauty products respectively. With a scale of 6, from least important to most important, respondents are required to choose one for each trait for each product category to describe the significance attached to it.

When designing the questionnaire, we changed several questions with five scales into with six scales to avoid some of respondents from always going for the middle option. In this case, we anticipated to obtain a normal distribution of responses and increase the validity of them. Additionally, we made the questionnaire available in both English and Chinese and used a simple linguistic level of languages in the questionnaire in order for respondents to understand the questions better and decrease the inaccuracy and confusion.

3.5.2 Questionnaire distribution

To fulfil the purpose of this study, a self-administered online questionnaire was designed (Appendix 1 & 2). The questionnaire has been sent forth by the authors in a form of anonymous survey link and QR code to participants through online platforms. We first posted it in the Facebook groups of several majors of Jönköping International Business School and also turned to friends to answer it and spread it out. Besides, we left comments below beauty influencers’ posts, such as YouTube videos and Weibo posts, with the link of our questionnaire. In order to acquire more international respondents, we joined a couple of exchange students Facebook groups of different countries to disseminate the questionnaire. The survey has basically circulated only among young people.
The reason behind the way how we distributed the questionnaire lies in its rationality and convenience. As aforementioned, the major target group of influencer marketing in beauty industry is most likely to be young people. Therefore, we argue that the dissemination of the questionnaire among our peers could be viewed as a good start. Due to the fact that the study is restricted to beauty industry and is expected to be a borderless research, we made efforts to get followers of beauty influencer and respondents from different countries involved in.

3.6 Focus group

3.6.1 Focus group design

The focus group is an interview with a limited number of people. This is to be able to observe, guide and probing all participants so that all information can be discovered (Saunders et al., 2012). The focus group is structured in a semi-structured way, meaning that the questions are open and that they can change when adapting to the situation. The interviewer will ask questions depending on what the focus groups says. These types of questions will let the participants to answer in their own words and will have a less biasing influence on the response compared to structured questions (Malhotra & Birks, 2007). The interview will be recorded to be certain that the interviewer does not ask bias questions and also used when drawing conclusions based on what the participants said.

Furthermore, the questions for the focus group will be focused to gain further knowledge and a deeper understanding of the findings from the questionnaire. The first questions asked are to gain a general idea of the participants’ main preferences in SMIs’ traits and if there is a source effect. The second part answers to, which social media platforms they prefer to follow them on and the reasons behind it. The third part is regarding reviews and recommendations from beauty SMIs. Lastly, we investigate the influence of SMIs and the source effect in buyer decision process.
3.6.2 Focus group sampling

For this research we have constructed one focus group that consists of four persons that are between ages 21-26. The duration of the interview was 30 minutes and it was held in the Jönköping’s International Business school on the 12th April 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 – Overview of the focus group.

3.7 Data Analysis

The use of Qualtrics, an online survey provider, enabled us to collect and document all data from participants digitally, before importing and analysing them with a statistical program. The imported data set was analysed with help of the Excel. First, we checked the amount of valid data and the missing values. Subsequently we made analysis of frequencies and checked means, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis as well. Finally, to get a deeper understanding of the data, a couple of cross tabulations was executed and accordingly chi-square tests have been carried out for each cross-tabs. In order to ensure the distribution difference is statistically significant, we have also conducted Friedman tests for few specific questions. The reason behind the choice is that the sample data are neither normally distributed nor independent. Therefore, the Friedman test, as a non-parametric test for testing the difference between several related samples, has been chosen.

During the focus group, the interview was recorded and then transcripted, which is recommended by Saunders et al. (2012). Saunders et al. (2012) further suggest that the common approach to conduct a qualitative analysis of data from an inductive nature, is by the researchers own interpretation. The transcript was analysed and cross checked from
both of us, this is to be able to recognise differences and connections to develop propositions, both negative and positive findings (Saunders et al., 2012).

3.8 Limitations of the Methodology

Although we strived to carry out a global study, with aim of the presence of international respondents, our sample was unfortunately mainly constituted by Chinese and Swedish. Meanwhile, due to the time and budget restraints, the survey was mainly distributed in Facebook groups and to our friends and families. To some extent, we supposed that it might decrease the reliability of this study.

When analysing the data, we realised it would be better if we could have made some small adjustments to the questionnaire. Instead of a category, we should have asked about preference of the type of influencers on specific products and chosen three products for each category. In that way, we would have had the chance to examine whether respondents would be consistent on their choice for each category.

We also realised that participants of the focus group have riveted attention upon makeup and ignored other categories to some extent. It would have been better if we could organise few focus groups with focuses on different categories. In that case, we probably would gain some more insights on consumers’ habits and preference when it comes to different categories.

3.9 Quality of the study

Saunders et al. (2012) states that reliability and validity are two important elements within a research. Reliability can be explained as the examination of the data consistency, under several repeated research carried by different researchers. To be able to replicate the research process, it is vital that the way the data has been collected and how the results have been implemented, are replicable and transparent. Validity can be defined as the appropriate research approach for the data collection and it measures the accurateness of the method selected whether it will provide the intended result (Saunders et al., 2012).
There are several aspects on how to obtain reliable and valid data and they can be implemented when preparing for the quantitative and qualitative approaches. Saunders et al. (2012) argue that the approach to questioning, the use of different types of questions and the way to record the data should be taken into consideration and which approach is the most accurate for the intended result.

In this study the aim has been to be as transparent as possible, thus to ensure reliability and to provide other researchers the possibility to replicate the study. We have taken the stated aspects of the planning process by Saunders et al. (2012) to make certain that this study is valid throughout this thesis, both when designing the questionnaire and when planning the interviews. Furthermore, we have read upon Saunders et al. (2012) stated advices and guidelines when we planned and evaluated the research process.

Cronbach’s alpha is one of the most common method to examine the reliability of the research by testing its internal consistency (Duignan, 2016). If the Cronbach’ alpha value of a research is between 60%-70%, then the research will be questionable and most likely need to be redesigned. If it is between 70%-80%, it means the internal consistency is acceptable. If it is between 80-90% or 90-100%, then it shows the internal consistency is good or excellent.

At first, we ran the test with the data of block 3 and block 4 and we got a Cronbach’ alpha value of 0.804. Secondly, we ran the test with the data of block 2, 3, 4, except data of questions on social media platforms, and then we got a Cronbach’ alpha value of 0.836. Therefore, we would argue that our study, at least our questionnaire, showed a strong reliability.
Table 3.2. Reliability test (Block 3&4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Valid</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's Alpha | 0.804
Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | 0.802
N of Items | 16

Table 3.3. Reliability test (Block 2&3&4, except questions on platforms).

Before sending out the questionnaire, we asked the tutor and few of our friends to have a look at it and try it out, making sure the questionnaire is easy to understand and follow. Based on their suggestions, first we changed the scale from six to seven, avoiding participants always going for the middle option. Secondly, we added the purchase frequency question for each category, just as we did for other questions. It is because it could be different from one category to another, in terms of frequency of purchase. Besides, we added examples in the options for the type of influencers as one of trial respondents suggested, in order to help the participants to get and understand the clear and straightforward picture on the type of influencers we were referring to.
4. Empirical findings

This part of the thesis illustrates our findings from the research we have conducted. Firstly, with the help of figures and tables, the results of the questionnaire will be presented and it will be followed by the findings from the focus group.

4.1 Findings from the questionnaire

In the method part we mentioned that the questionnaire was posted in online forums that involved lots of students, aiming to get hold of the young generation. We started sending out the questionnaire on the 27th of April and closed it on the 4th of May. During the week, we got 190 participants responding to the questionnaire in total. However, only 121 of them can be used, since the other 69 participants do not follow any social media influencers or beauty influencers, making them irrelevant for the further research. In the following sections, we used Before or After to refer the data that is before or after we exclude the invalid one. The results of significance tests will be included in Appendix 3.

4.1.1 Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female%</td>
<td>75.26%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Gender Results

As shown in Table 4.1, the proportion of female changed from 75.26% into 90.91%, increasing by 15.65%. It indicated that the target group of influencer marketing in beauty industry should be female.
4.1.2 Age

As portrayed in Table 4.2, the majority of the respondents were in the age range of 16 - 25 years old. Even after the removal of unqualified data, the age of 16 - 25 was still the biggest age group, with occupation of 86.78% of the sample, increasing by about 2% compared to before. There were five participants over 36 years, but they did not follow any social media influencer or beauty influencer. Meanwhile, both the mean and the standard deviation turned out to be smaller after the exclusion, which implies that the sample overall was getting younger and more concentrated. It further indicated that target group of influencer marketing in beauty industry should be young female at age of 16 - 25.

![Table 4.2. Age results](image)

4.1.3 Education

From the responses, we found out that only one respondent, 0.53% of sample, has not completed an education yet, while 9.47% have at least finished high school and 90% have finished or will soon be finishing the university. It could be ascribed to the fact that we distributed the questionnaire in varied university groups for the most part.
4.1.4 Nationality

The nationality results were composed of a variety of countries in general, 27 before the exclusion and 20 after it. In addition, China and Sweden unexpectedly accounted for 80.99% of the sample.

4.1.5 Involvement in beauty and social media influencers

![Figure 4.1 “Do you follow any influencer”](image)

To separate the target group from others, the participants were asked to answer whether they follow any social media influencers and further, whether they follow any beauty influencers. If the answer was no to either of these two questions, then the questionnaire would automatically come to an end for them since we supposed that they did not have enough experience to answer further questions. The findings showed that the most...
popular answer is to follow 1-5 social media influencers and so did it when it comes to beauty influencers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 20</th>
<th>More than 20</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>121.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Gender x “Do you follow any beauty influencer”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>7.164</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>10.875</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5.132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Chi-square test for Gender x “Do you follow any beauty influencer”.

When making a cross analysis of gender and the number of influencers that respondents were following, we found out practically 70% male respondents that followed social media influencers did not follow any beauty influencer and the rest of them were following no more than 5. By contrast, the majority of female respondents who followed SMI also followed beauty influencer and nearly 40% of them follow more than 11 beauty influencers at the same time. However, the chi square value was 7.164 and p value was 0.067, suggesting there was no statistical significance between the gender and the level of involvement in cosmetic field. But the chi square test also suggested that the value might be underestimated due to the three cells with expected count less than 5.
Figure 4.2. “Which social media platforms do you follow them on?”

By observing the responses retrieved from the questionnaire, we could see that Instagram, Facebook and blog portals were the most popular alternatives when it comes to following social media influencers. However, in regards of following beauty influencers, the most popular platforms are Instagram, YouTube and Weibo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Instagram</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Blog</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>Pinterest</th>
<th>Podcast</th>
<th>Weibo</th>
<th>WeChat</th>
<th>Bilibili</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-25</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excl. China</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-25</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>35.04%</td>
<td>9.65%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>10.10%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Age group x platforms used for following beauty influencers

From the cross analysis of age group and platforms used for following beauty influencers, we found the responses kind of spread over all the platforms. However, after taking a closer look, we found out essentially all the responses account for Weibo, WeChat and Bilibili were from Chinese respondents. That lead us to repeating the analysis with the exclusion of responses from Chinese. This time we found out that Instagram and YouTube achieved dominance among people at the age of 16 - 25. However, among respondents aged 26 - 35, although Instagram was still the most popular one, the percentage of individuals who also used Blog portals to follow beauty influencers went up by about
13% all at once. It indicated for a better access to consumers who are over 25 years old, blog portals could be as much important as Instagram and YouTube for influencer marketing campaigns.

4.1.6 Purchase Habits

![Graph showing beauty product purchase frequency](image)

**Figure 4.3.** “Which of the following describes your beauty products purchase frequency best?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skincare</th>
<th>Makeup</th>
<th>Haircare</th>
<th>Fragrance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>1.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>-.412</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>1.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.7.** “Which of the following describes your beauty products purchase frequency best?” (Once in a year (1) ---> Once in three days (6)).

The participants were asked to choose the option that was most likely to be their purchases frequency of beauty products. The findings from the questionnaire showed that the 54% of the participants usually bought fragrances once in a year, while for the other three categories, respondents made the purchase much more often, mostly once in three months at least. 38% of respondents bought skincare products once in three months and for hair
care the number was 46%. What is more, 33% of the participants bought makeup products once in a month. Since kurtosis of makeup category is negative, we also argued that the distribution of makeup purchase frequency was not as concentrated as other categories did. However, the results overall indicated that in terms of the frequency of purchase, makeup is the most frequent category and fragrance is the least frequent one.

![Figure 4.4. Review habits; “Have you ever looked up reviews from beauty influencers before buying them?”](image)

![Table 4.8. Review habits](table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Skincare</th>
<th>Makeup</th>
<th>Haircare</th>
<th>Fragrance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>1.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-1.073</td>
<td>-9.82</td>
<td>-9.77</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Table 4.8. Review habits

Regarding the four questions asking if they have ever looked up reviews from beauty influencers before buying a beauty product, most of respondents claimed they looked up reviews when buying skincare and makeup products. Especially for makeup, 27.27% declared they always look up reviews before the purchase. On the other hand, the majority rarely or never looked up reviews when it comes to fragrances and hair care products. As the results of Friedman test verified, the distributions of review habits for four categories...
displayed the significant difference, in which the frequency of going for reviews before buying makeup was significantly higher than others and meanwhile skincare was significantly higher than haircare and fragrance.

According to the cross analysis of age group and results of review habits, there was no big difference in habits of review for each category between two age groups, except that for skincare products purchase. 56.19% of respondents in age group 16-25 tended to search for reviews of skincare products, but 62.50% of respondents in age group 26-35 only did it sometimes, rarely or even never. Besides, we found out 30.48% in age group 16-25 chose always as the frequency of looking up reviews for makeup products while the percentage is only 6% in age group 26-35. Yet for the same category, 25% of the recorded age group 26-35 chose never while only 8.57% of the recorded age group 16-25 chose never. To sum up, the results indicates that people turn to reviews less frequently as they age.

Additionally, we also observed that people who were in the habit of looking up reviews for one kind of product, tended to look up reviews for other kinds of products as well and vice versa. For instance, 82.61% of those who always looked up reviews when buying skin care products also always look up reviews when buying makeup products. 83.33% of those who never look up reviews when buying skin care products never look up review when buying hair care products and fragrance either. The results of chi square tests further showed the tendency had statistical significance.
Figure 4.5. “Have you bought any beauty products because of recommendations from beauty influencers?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skincare</th>
<th>Makeup</th>
<th>Haircare</th>
<th>Fragrance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>1.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-.738</td>
<td>-.781</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>-.314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. “Have you bought any beauty products because of recommendations from beauty influencers?”

The results showed that 33% of the participants *sometimes* relied on recommendations from beauty influencers when purchasing skincare or haircare products. However, when buying makeup products, 25.83% claimed that they *usually* bought products because of recommendations from beauty influencers. On the other hand, the participants went the other way on the scale when being asked if they have bought a fragrance because of recommendations from beauty influencers. Besides, 40.68% chose *never* when being asked that question. As the standard deviation and kurtosis of four categories shown, respondents’ choices were rather diverse. Despite this, the Friedman test still implied that the distributions of recommendation effectiveness for four categories displayed the significant difference, in which respondents valued recommendation for makeup significantly more than others and meanwhile recommendations for skincare and haircare were valued significantly more than fragrance.

Through a couple of cross analysis supported by chi square tests, we also detected that respondents who followed more beauty influencers tended to turn to reviews more often before purchases and respondents who had tendency to look up reviews tended to buy products due to influencer’s recommendations more often. In brief, we inferred that the target group of influencer marketing in beauty retailing businesses is rather stable and solid.
4.1.7 Preference in Type of Reviews and Influencers

Figure 4.6. “Which type of reviews do you prefer to follow most?”

As the observations retrieved from the questionnaire suggested, pictures and text were generally preferred by participants most, since 50 - 52% of participants preferred it for all categories other than makeup. For makeup, 25.62% of respondents favoured pictures and texts, while 38.84% preferred detailed video and 33.06% preferred short video instead. The standard deviations are lower than 1 for four categories, so we argued that participants’ preference on the type of reviews were relatively concentrated.
Figure 4.7. “Imagine you are about to buy a product and you are reading reviews of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?”

As depicted in the figure above, by observing the absolute numbers, we found out that for makeups, opinions of top influentials were preferred by respondents. For skin care products, opinions from experts were highly valued. But with regard to fragrance and haircare, the respondents seemed not to have a strong preference on the type of influencers to be used.

Table 4.11. “Whose opinion would you value more?”

To take a closer look at the data, we assigned superspreaders, top influentials and narrative experts respectively with value 1, 2, 3, in order of the level of required expertise from low to high and the level of spreading capacity from high to low. Additionally, the option, it makes no difference, was assigned with value 0. In this case, we found out that all standard deviations were lower than one, showing a rather uneven distribution for all the categories. The means indicated haircare and skincare were two categories which
participants valued expertise and disparaged spreading capacity most. Although the mean of haircare was even bigger than the one of skincare, the skewness, the mode and the kurtosis of skincare implied that compared to haircare products, a larger portion of respondents thought highly of narrative experts’ opinions. Moreover, the distribution differences among haircare, skincare and the other two categories were proved by the Friedman test to be significant.

4.1.8 Preference in The Source Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skincare</th>
<th>Makeup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-1.182</td>
<td>-.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Haircare</th>
<th>Fragrance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>1.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>-.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-.618</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12. “How important do you think of the trait for each category?”

With a scale of 6, number one means the least important while number six means the most important. For skincare, the data showed there were 55%, 31.67% and 60.50% of participants choosing 6 respectively for expertise, attractiveness and trustworthiness. While respondents’ choices of the importance of expertise and trustworthiness were rather concentrated, their choice for attractiveness spread out on the scale between value 4 and 6. Overall in terms of skincare products, respondents viewed trustworthiness as the most important trait, expertise as the second and attractiveness as the least important one. Chi-square tests for pairwise comparisons further verified the differences were statistically significant.
As for makeup, trustworthiness was still regarded as the most important trait, with 52.07% giving it the highest value on the scale. Furthermore, the results indicated that both expertise and attractiveness were important factors as well, but attractiveness seemed to be slightly more important than expertise. While 34.71% of the respondents gave expertise a 4, attractiveness got 61.16% on value 5 and 6 in total. In comparison of expertise, the mass of the distribution of attractiveness was slightly more concentrated on the right of the figure. Chi-square tests confirmed the difference between expertise and attractiveness and the difference between expertise and trustworthiness were statistically significant as well.

When it comes to haircare products, 37.19% marked trustworthiness with the most important and 32.25% did the same to expertise, while 34.71% gave a value five to attractiveness. Meanwhile, we found out recorded values for expertise was spreading out between value 4 and 6 with the precise percentage 28.93%, 26.45% and 32.25%. Chi-square tests validated every pairwise comparison had statistically significant difference.

On the subject of fragrance, trustworthiness was as usual valued by respondents most, with 31.40% choosing 6 for it, while the modes for attractiveness and expertise were respectively 5 and 4, with the exact percentage 28.93% and 25.83% separately. Besides, we could infer from the negative kurtosis values and relatively big standard deviation values that respondents did not come to an agreement on the importance of expertise and attractiveness for fragrance. Nonetheless it was also authenticated by Chi-square tests that every pairwise comparison had statistically significant difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makeup</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragrance</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skincare</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haircare</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13. Mean of each trait for each category
By extracting the average of each trait for each category from table 4.15, a more clear and straightforward table has been created to check the importance of a trait for different categories. As shown in table 4.16, trustworthiness was considered to be the most important trait for every category. Furthermore, among all four categories, fragrances was regarded as the one requires least expertise, attractiveness and trustworthiness. Meanwhile, expertise and trustworthiness were most valued for skin care products, while attractiveness is most valued for makeups. The differences were all proved to be statistically significant by both Chi-square tests and Friedman tests.

4.1.9 Comparison between China and Sweden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skincare</th>
<th>Makeup</th>
<th>Haircare</th>
<th>Fragrance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed video</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
<td>-0.96%</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short video</td>
<td>-8.87%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>-20.41%</td>
<td>-19.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures &amp; text</td>
<td>-0.75%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>10.79%</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain text</td>
<td>-2.46%</td>
<td>-2.46%</td>
<td>-0.43%</td>
<td>-1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14. Difference (China % - Sweden %) in preference in types of review

In general, Chinese sample had a strong preference in detailed video and pictures & text when it comes to types of review, while Swedish respondents seemed to prefer short video instead.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skincare</th>
<th>Makeup</th>
<th>Haircare</th>
<th>Fragrance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top influentials</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
<td>22.65%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>25.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superspreaders</td>
<td>-2.46%</td>
<td>-5.66%</td>
<td>-3.53%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Experts</td>
<td>-12.93%</td>
<td>-12.71%</td>
<td>-20.83%</td>
<td>-11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>-4.27%</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>-18.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15. Difference (China % - Sweden %) in preference in types of influencers.

For four categories, no matter which country, the preference was obvious that respondent generally prefer top influentials and narrative experts. But if we took a closer look at each type of influencer, countries' preferences were slightly different from each other,
especially for aforementioned two types. Top influentials was apparently preferred by Chinese respondents for all four categories, while narrative experts were commonly preferred by Swedish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skincare</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td>22.20%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeup</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>18.41%</td>
<td>-4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haircare</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>14.32%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragrance</td>
<td>15.96%</td>
<td>24.38%</td>
<td>-3.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16. Difference (China % - Sweden %) in mean of each trait.

As shown in the table 4.8, attractiveness seemed to be much more important for Chinese than Swedish, since there was a positive percentage in presence of every category. Expertise could be argued to be more important to Chinese respondents as well for the same reason. However, trustworthiness by contrast seemed less important for Chinese respondents in comparison to Swedish respondents, with a few negative percentages presenting in the column. But overall the table mainly consisted of positive percentages, which perhaps indicate that Chinese people tend to have a higher requirement when it comes to influencer marketing of beauty products.

4.2 Findings from the focus group

4.2.1 Influencers and traits

The focus group started by discussing influencers. Participant C said that she followed different influencers, depending on what type of influencer she was looking for. In other words, she followed different influencers for lifestyle, travel, and makeup. Furthermore, she followed several influencers from various countries. Participant B followed two beauty influencers regularly named, Benny Bitch and Jeffree Star. The other two participants, A and D, said that they did not follow any influencers consistently, but participant A claimed that humour was a big factor when deciding whom to follow. Participant D could not recognise any big beauty influencers from Sweden at first but
then mentioned a famous beauty influencer named, Linda Hallberg. Both participants A and B followed influencers that not only discussed beauty but also shared their lives in their channels. The way to find influencers was searching through keywords in social media platforms and through recommendations from friends or YouTube.

Additionally, when discussing influencers, the participants pointed out the fact that beauty influencers often starts their own brand and then promotes it themselves. They talked about whether it was trustworthy or not. Honesty and trust were vital factors when it comes to traits of an influencer. For the participants A and D, the personality and being amused were important elements. They explained it further by stating that they would not follow any influencer only because of an influencer’s appearance, but rather because of an influencer’s expertise. For participant B it was more about an influencer’s knowledge and willingness to try new products, in order for her to know whether it would be a good purchase or not. Participant A agreed, adding that an influencer should review products that are newly released or products that are not easy to get. Even though he would not always buy them, it was still interesting to see. Participant D also argued that it was fun to try strange products, such as a bubbly sheet mask.

4.2.2 Review Preference

Overall makeup seemed to be the category that participants looked up in most cases. When talking about beauty influencers, all the participants seemed to equate them with makeup influencers more or less. Participant D stated, if a beauty influencer also makes reviews on skincare or haircare products, she would regard her/him as one who does extended reviews. They believed it rooted in the nature of the products. Since for skincare and haircare products, it could be hard to show the differences between before and after using products in a video. Besides, the effectiveness of a skincare or haircare product varies from one individual to another at a larger extent compared to makeup. Because it usually targets at a smaller segment with a particular skin or hair type and problem, making it less universal than makeup products.
The participants in the interview talked mostly about YouTube when referring to a social media platform. Blogs have also been mentioned, especially when discussing skincare and haircare reviews. When being asked about other social media platforms, participant A, B and D mentioned Instagram, since they could see both videos and pictures there. Additionally, participants B mentioned Facebook, Weibo, WeChat subscriptions and Redbook. The last three mentioned are social media platforms that are particularly popular among Chinese.

According to the participants, videos were generally preferred when it comes to types of reviews. Participants argued that it was because videos were logically more interesting than other forms and were able to display more details to audience. 5 to 10 minutes was viewed as the ideal duration for a video, although participant C preferred videos being a little bit longer, preferably 20 minutes, in order for her to watch it during the meals without switching to other videos. However, other types of reviews were also suggested in some special occasions. For example, participant B and C believed pictures and text like blogs would make things much easier for those who want to trace the progress of the skin or hair situation when reviewing a skincare or haircare product. Moreover, participant B stated she would like to go for pictures and text, when she was in a situation where video is not suitable, such as during a lecture and at midnight in a shared room and so on. Overall it showed that video was their first choice if possible, otherwise pictures and text was appropriate and acceptable as well.

4.2.3 Reasons behind looking up reviews

Although participants tended to agree on the preference of makeup and videos, the reasons why they usually went for a review vary from one to another. Participant A argued that he followed a lot of comedians on YouTube apart from beauty YouTubers, and thus watching a review or a tutorial there for him was also primarily for amusement. Participant D by contrast viewed reviews as a way for her to discover products and brands that were new to her. Once in the review, she found a product that seemed to be good but from a brand that she never heard about, she would go and do research on the brand and
keep it in mind for further usage. However, all of participants claimed that they would use reviews for keeping updated on newly released products. Because for one thing lots of influencers tended to get hand on a new product as soon as it had been launched and some of them were even able to receive the samples before the release. It thus accommodated participants with offering information on latest products and trendy products. For another, in spite of the advance in globalisation, there were still some products or brands that were not available in local stores, which means sometimes it could be hard for consumers to actually try out the products by themselves before the purchase. Therefore, to avoid bad investments, looking up reviews was viewed as a quite common way for information search. For the same reason, it was quite normal for participants to look up reviews and make assessments, when they were about to buy something but still have not decided which one was better.

4.2.4 Recommendations from influencers

The participants were asked if they would completely rely on an influencer’s recommendations. Participant D would keep them in mind, while participant B would always buy them. The participants agreed however, when talking about criticism on products, that they would use common sense since all products may not be suited for everyone. If an influencer makes a negative review of a skincare product, the participants would think about if it would be suitable for them and then decide whether to buy it or not. As long as the recommendations describe attributes of products clearly and honestly, participants would find it valuable.
5. Analysis

In the following section, we will analyse the empirical findings collected from our research in combination of the frame of reference, which will help us to understand the complex nature of the topic.

5.1 Influencer Marketing

In this study, trust was once again confirmed to be the most concerned factor when consumers turn to influencers for suggestions and opinion (Berman, 2016; Turcotte et al., 2015). No matter in questionnaire or in focus group, respondents chorused the great significance of trust or trustworthiness. Due to the virtually zero switch cost and the thriving community, it is easy and common, for consumers to change the influencers to follow, the moment they start losing interest or trust on the influencer. However, in spite of the fluidity of individual preference, the community, consisting of beauty influencers and followers, overall still represents the strong power of the influencer marketing to engage audience and disseminate the messages in our study (Li & Du, 2011). The argument is not only a result of the reviewing and buying frequency of questionnaire respondents, but also based on the fact that focus groups participants mentioned viral videos or interactions with other followers in the comments several times.

Besides, our study indicated that the target group of influencer marketing in beauty industry are quite concentrated and consistent. The most commonly used social media platforms for following beauty influencers, as our research implied, are Instagram and YouTube and among people over 25 years old, blog portals were also popular. Video sharing platforms like YouTube in particular stands out in regard to makeups, while microblogging and social blogging seem to be more suitable for recommending skincare and haircare products. Moreover, the research displays a tendency that those who often look up reviews for products of one category tend to turn to reviews when it comes to
products of other categories and tend to purchase the products on account of the recommendations in reviews. It suggests that the target group most like have been behaving consistently and made it a habit to following influencers.

5.2 The source effect

In the frame of reference, the Source Credibility Model was introduced and it included three source effects; trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness (Ohanian, 1991). The empirical findings from the research showed us that all traits were important and some of them seemed to be more valued by individuals than others for different beauty categories.

The findings from the research showed that expertise was a valued trait. Respondents from the research agreed, stating that the influencers should know what they are doing otherwise they would not have any followers. From the questionnaire, the results presented the fact that expertise was especially valued when it came to skincare products. The majority of respondents thought the trait ‘expertise’ should get the highest value on the scale. On the contrary, the findings also showed that expertise was not vital when it came to fragrance.

Trustworthiness is the most valued trait in all beauty categories, according to the results from the questionnaire and the focus group. Honesty, reliable and truthful are qualities that can be categorised into the component of trustworthiness. These qualities were described from respondents in the focus group. Nonetheless, the findings indicated that there is a fragile relationship between trustworthiness and influencers promoting their own brands. The main reason is the earning the influencer makes on products sold. The findings uncovered that attractiveness is an important element for all the beauty products. Physical appearance is not the only factor that the source attractiveness considers (McGuire, 1985). Respondents in the focus group, mentioned traits they looked for when choosing an influencer to follow. Personal traits such as humour and skin type but also
lifestyle characteristics were mentioned, which can be identified as components of attractiveness (McGuire, 1985).

Overall, our research suggested that the traits were valued differently within the four beauty categories. Furthermore, honest and trustworthiness appear to be highly valued traits therefore firms need to pay extra attention to them when selecting influencers to cooperate with.

Petty et al. (1983) states that the elaboration likelihood model (ELM) demonstrates that the source effects are valued differently dependent on how the consumer perceive the product whether it is low or high involvement. The empirical data shows a pattern that supports the idea of that the product involvement is of significance when taking the source effects in consideration. The findings from the questionnaire and from the focus group showed that expertise was an important trait when it came to skincare products but not important for fragrance. One can argue that skincare products are more high involvement since there are more factors to take into account such as skin type, different functions, ingredients etc. while for fragrance the involvement is low, considering that the primary intention is to find the desirable scent, which varies based on personal taste.

However, it was difficult to find enough findings to support the statement by Petty et al. (1983) since many of the respondents thinks about makeup products when talking about the beauty industry. Even when presented the categories, the products can be perceived differently depending on the consumer. For example, if a consumer has skincare issues then she/he will be more involved in the purchase compared to one that does not have any skincare issues. Furthermore, the beauty industry offers products within a wide price range meaning that the respondents, depending on their purchase habits, could have consider the product as either low- or high involvement when answering the questions. Therefore, the findings to support the ELM was limited since we could not distinguish which products the respondents saw as low- or high involvement. Consequently, we have
not enough findings to support or reject the relationship between the ELM and the source effects.

5.3 Typology of influencers

Three typical types of influencers have been examined in this study from the research conducted by Wiedmann et al. (2010), they are superspreaders, top influentials and narrative experts. Our research generally indicated when it comes to beauty products, consumers would think highly of opinions from top influentials and experts. As for superspreaders, no matter for which category, they were always least preferred. However, there were still few respondents valuing their opinions most and if taking their large-scale follower base into consideration, we would argue that superspreaders were still competitive with the other two types. Nonetheless, this study suggested that it would be more cost-effective and efficient if firms could choose top influentials or experts.

The suggested choices are unsurprisingly raised from the nature of cosmetic products. Unlike apparel and other purchases, they will be directly applied on the skin and thus safety and trust are of great significance in this sense. Therefore, superspreaders are at a disadvantage from the very start compared to the other two, since they lack some expertise and knowledge which usually are the sources of safety and trust. For the same reason, it is also suggested to give the chosen influencers some spaces to let them try it out in order to give their own sincere opinions on the product. Otherwise it could be a big lost for both the brand and the chosen influencer, if influencers are being money grubber and irresponsible for posts. Additionally, since skincare products are naturally more personal and serious than others, it makes sense that there was a strong preference on narrative experts.

5.4 Buyer decision process

Based on the work from Kotler et al. (2005), the three steps in the buyer decision process were used to describe which steps in the process the respondents were in. The empirical
findings indicated that the respondents mainly were in the second and third step when recognising the influence of influencers.

Although, the results from the conducted interviews showed that several of the participants was as well in the first step in the buyer decision process, since they looked at reviewed posts of beauty influencers with initially no purchase intentions. One participant also mentioned that she will keep the influencers’ reviews in mind when she needs to buy that kind of beauty product.

In the second step, the participants mentioned that they would look at several reviews when buying a product. One of them compared it to purchasing a phone, meaning that they would search information from many sources. The participants were mostly in an active information search in this stage (Kotler et al, 2005). The findings indicated that the participants were critical when looking at influencers’ recommendations since the influencers can be paid through collaborations or promoting their own brands.

This led the respondents to the third step in the buyer decision process, which is to evaluate influencers’ recommendations or reviews with critical thinking (Kotler et al, 2005). The participants from the focus group stated “they are using their common sense” when evaluating recommendations from influencers. In other words, the influence of an influencer may not always take the respondents to the purchase decision, since it does not legitimate the product for them every time.

Overall, the research indicated that it is vital that reviews should make the consumer have a feeling of experiencing it and that the recommendation is sincere. By doing so, we could see that it increased the influential power from a beauty influencer and that it led to purchases from consumers more often. Furthermore, the findings demonstrated that the influencers show different influential power depending on the beauty category. For example, skincare recommendations from influencers are not that influential since a
certain skincare product is not suited for everyone. It means that the influencers have an influential power in some sense.
6. Conclusion

This part connects the findings and the analysis with the purpose. It summarises the conclusions drawn from the study, aiming to provide a concise but clear picture of our key findings.

Regarding the preference of the typology of influencer we could clearly observe that superspreaders were least preferred in all the beauty categories. Consumers favoured top influentials and experts when it came to beauty products. In support of the data, we suggest that firms should choose top influentials for makeups, narrative experts for skincare products, and either of them for fragrance and haircare products.

Video and photo sharing platforms such as Instagram and YouTube were most commonly used when following beauty influencers in particular when the posts are regarding makeup products. However, blog portals were popular among the respondents that was over 25 years old and especially when influencers post about skincare and haircare products. Moreover, the research showed that those who look up reviews often, usually do this for several product categories and they tend to be more prone to purchase since they rely on recommendations of influencers.

Overall, we could see that all traits were valued highly but the most valued trait was trustworthiness. However, when researching if these traits would influence the consumers, we needed to distinguish which products were considered as low- or high involvement. It was difficult to identify since there were many general assumptions from respondents, such as all beauty products are makeup products but also since it was difficult to recognise it in the findings from the questionnaire. From the ELM, the findings were not enough to support or reject the theory.
Furthermore, we would argue that the respondents were mainly in the second and third step of the buyer decision process. The research indicated that influencers were more influential in the third step which is evaluation of alternatives. This is because many of the respondents have acted on an influencer’s recommendation and purchased the actual product.

This study has contributed to existing theories about social media influencers within the beauty industry and thus providing businesses and marketer’s a deeper understanding into the interactions between consumers and influencers.
7. Discussion

This part of the thesis consists of a discussion of our own reflections, including implications of the findings, contributions to the academia and suggestions for future research.

7.1 Implications

7.1.1 Theoretical implications

Even though a certain amount of studies have already carried out for exploration on influencer marketing from different aspects, little research has been conducted on investigation of how to make good use of it from a firm’s perspective. In other words, after being informed with all the benefits of influencer marketing, firms still do not have a clear picture of what the target group’s preferences are and how they can use it in an efficient manner. Consequently, this thesis might be the first study regarding consumers’ preference on review types, influencer types and influencers’ personal traits in a specific industry. The results can be served as a start point for future research, for whoever aims to go deeper and more detailed in the same industry or has interest in usage of influencer marketing in other industry. Based on the results, the traits were valued differently. Yet the previous studies have not pointed out the difference in importance of factors.

7.1.2 Managerial Implications

For cosmetics businesses who aspire to leverage influencer marketing, three following points deserve closer attention. Firstly, the large scale of the follower base renders the industry appealing and profitable. Most of them are from 16 to 35 years old, concentrating on those few popular social media platforms, such as YouTube and Instagram, and it is part of their daily life to watch or read related feed. However, there are two adds-on to the target group. If businesses are targeting consumers from 25 to 35 years old, blogging
platforms are also important. In addition, if the target group are consumers over 35 years old, influencer marketing probably is not an efficient way to reach them. Besides, if targeting consumers from China where lots of services are banned, businesses should be aware of the power of local social media platforms.

Another implication could be a warning that it is time for cosmetic businesses to stop the blind faith in the power of superspreaders. Consumers get educated by a variety of tutorials and review available online and thus nowadays they tend to respect and value those who are expert and knowledgeable on what they do, in particular when it comes to beauty products. Therefore, when choosing influencers to collaborate with, businesses should carefully examine their professional competence but still need to pay attention to the difference from one region to another.

Lastly, it can be a quite cost-effective way for cosmetics businesses to launch and promote new products with the help of influencers, given that consumers would mostly take initiative in searching new releases and information there. However, the effectiveness might not be as good as expected, unless the products are either makeup or eye-catching in away.

7.2 Contributions

The value of this study lies in the research gap within the field of social media influencers. We added previous literature, such as the typology of influencers, the Source Credibility Model, ELM and the Buyer Decision Process, to help when evaluating the consumers’ perception of an influencer. This study recognises that there is a difference between China and Sweden. Furthermore, by the support of our research we claim that a social media follower of a beauty influencer, is a typical young female between the ages of 16 - 35.

Through observations, we identified a relationship between the respondents from China and the attractiveness effect. The source attractiveness was in general much more important for the participants from China than from the rest of the participants.
Furthermore, the participants from Sweden in the focus group, stated that they would not follow an influencer simply because of the influencer’s appearance. The results from the empirical findings also presented a difference between their choices of an influencer. Respondents from China preferred top influentials while respondents from Sweden favoured narrative experts. Additionally, we could see in both the findings from the questionnaire and the focus group the differences in types of reviews. Detailed video and picture were more popular among respondents from China while Swedish respondents preferred short videos.

7.3 Suggestions for future research

As we mentioned in the introduction part, beauty is the industry where influencers possess the third biggest customer reach altogether, so we would first suggest similar exploration within other industries for future research. However, we also realised cosmetic industry still lacks research when searching information on it, where most of them are related to ethical issues such as animal testing. As a consequence, it would be good if there will be more research on this industry in the future. Additionally, as our research showed that there were differences between Chinese and Swedish consumers’ preference towards the type of influencers and reviews, we would suggest future research to conduct regional studies in order to further investigate the customer’s preference in a specific area. Meanwhile, it would be also interesting to repeat the research a while later, with a bigger sample if possible, to examine whether the conclusions still hold true.
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Appendix 1 Questionnaire (English)

Hello! We are two students from Jönköping University that are currently doing our bachelor thesis regarding influencer marketing. The questions will be about your experience and view of influencers, especially directed to the beauty industry. It will be anonymous and will take about 2-5 minutes to answer. Thank you and we wish you have a nice day!

Lena Phung and Qin Luning.

(Block1)
1. Gender
   - Female (173)
   - Male (47)

2. Age _______<br>

3. Education (latest finished degree)
   - No schooling completed (1)
   - Elementary school (0)
   - High school (18)
   - College/university (171)

4. Nationality _______

(Block2)

Social media influencers (SMIs) are those who have a lot of followers on social media platforms, such famous instagrammers, youtubers, bloggers etc. Beauty influencers are SMIs who provide information and make referrals on makeup, skincare, haircare and fragrance etc.

5. Do you follow any social media influencers?
   - No (29)
   - 1-5 (60)
   - 6-10 (35)
   - 11-20 (18)
   - More than 20 (48)
   (If No is selected, then skip to the end of survey.)

6. Which social media platforms do you follow them on? (You can fill in several).
   - Instagram (101)
   - Facebook (46)
   - Blog portals (16)
   - YouTube (79)
   - Twitter (22)
   - Pinterest (7)
   - Weibo (77)
   - Bilibili (34)
   - Wechat subscription (41)
   - Other ________
7. Do you follow any beauty influencers?
   □ No (40)  □ 1-5 (76)  □ 6-10 (23)  □ 11-20 (8)  □ More than 20 (14)

   (If No is selected, then skip to the end of survey.)

8. Which social media platforms do you follow them on? (You can fill in several).
   □ Instagram (66)  □ Facebook (16)  □ Blog portals (14)
   □ YouTube (54)  □ Twitter (8)  □ Pinterest (7)
   □ Weibo (60)  □ Bilibili (27)  □ Wechat subscription (32)
   □ Other________

9. Which of following describes your beauty products purchase frequency best?
   Once in three days / a week / a month / three months / half a year / a year
   Skin care  (5 / 6 / 36 / 45 / 21 / 4)
   Makeup    (6 / 11 / 38 / 30 / 16 / 15)
   Hair care  (3 / 7 / 29 / 54 / 18 / 6)
   Fragrance  (1 / 2 / 8 / 13 / 28 / 61)

10. Have you ever looked up reviews of beauty products from beauty influencers before buying them?
    Never/ Rarely / Sometimes / Usually / Often / Always
    Skin care  (12 / 18 / 26 / 24 / 18 / 23)
    Makeup    (13 / 12 / 17 / 25 / 21 / 33)
    Hair care  (27 / 24 / 27 / 16 / 14 / 13)
    Fragrance  (45 / 21 / 20 / 16 / 4 / 15)

11. Have you bought any beauty products because of recommendations from beauty influencers?
    Never/ Rarely / Sometimes / Usually / Often / Always
    Skin care  (24 / 12 / 40 / 22 / 15 / 8)
    Makeup    (17 / 9 / 28 / 31 / 21 / 14)
    Hair care  (28 / 19 / 40 / 19 / 10 / 4)
    Fragrance  (48 / 24 / 26 / 12 / 7 / 1)

12. Which types of review do you prefer to follow most?
    Detailed video / Short video / Pictures&text / Plain text / Audio
    Skin care  (24 / 32 / 63 / 2 / 0)
    Makeup    (47 / 40 / 31 / 2 / 2)
13. Imagine you are about to buy a makeup product and you are looking at a review of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?

- Someone who is skilled and experienced and has lots of followers, like Linda Hallberg, Huda Kattan, Pony, Michelle Phan; (65)
- Someone who has way more followers but is not specialised in makeup, like famous fashion bloggers, Chiara Ferragni, Kenza; (17)
- Someone who is professional in makeup, most likely working as a makeup artist, but only has a certain amount of followers, like Wayne Goss; (23)
- It makes no difference. (16)

14. Imagine you are about to buy a fragrance and you are looking at a review of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?

- Someone who is knowledgeable and experienced and has lots of followers; (32)
- Someone who has way much more followers but is not specialised in fragrance; (10)
- Someone who is professional in fragrance, most likely working as a perfumer, but only has a certain amount of followers; (33)
- It makes no difference. (46)

15. Imagine you are about to buy a skincare product and you are looking at a review of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?

- Someone who is knowledgeable and experienced and has lots of followers; (48)
- Someone who has way more followers but is not specialised in skincare; (3)
- Someone who is professional in skincare, most likely working as a beautician, but only has a certain amount of followers; (60)
- It makes no difference. (10)

16. Imagine you are about to buy a hair care product and you are looking at a review of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?

- Someone who is knowledgeable and experienced and has lots of followers; (42)
- Someone who has way more followers but is not specialised in hair care; (6)
Someone who is professional in hair care, most likely working as a hairstylist, but only has a certain amount of followers; (41)
It makes no difference. (32)

(Block 4)

17. When you see a post from a beauty influencer of makeup products, how important do you think the following traits are?

Least important ___1-6___ Most important
Expertise (0 / 3 / 8 / 42 / 33 / 35)
Attractiveness (2 / 3 / 15 / 27 / 37 / 37)
Trustworthiness (0 / 1 / 4 / 19 / 34 / 64)

18. When you see a post from a beauty influencer of skincare products, how important do you think the following traits are?

Least important ___1-6___ Most important
Expertise (0 / 1 / 3 / 19 / 31 / 66)
Attractiveness (4 / 3 / 18 / 31 / 26 / 38)
Trustworthiness (0 / 1 / 1 / 13 / 32 / 72)

19. When you see a post from a beauty influencer of fragrances, how important do you think the following traits are?

Least important ___1-6___ Most important
Expertise (11 / 5 / 26 / 31 / 27 / 20)
Attractiveness (13 / 3 / 13 / 24 / 35 / 33)
Trustworthiness (7 / 1 / 16 / 27 / 32 / 38)

20. When you see a post from a beauty influencer of hair care product, how important do you think the following traits are?

Least important ___1-6___ Most important
Expertise (0 / 3 / 12 / 35 / 32 / 39)
Attractiveness (4 / 4 / 18 / 29 / 42 / 24)
Trustworthiness (1 / 1 / 8 / 25 / 41 / 45)
你好，我们是两位来自延雪平大学的学生，目前正在做有关博主营销的毕业论文。以下问题将询问你对此的看法，特别是美妆领域。问卷会是匿名的，大约耗时4-8分钟。非常感谢你的回复，祝你有个愉快的一天！

Lena Phung and Qin Luning.

(模块一)

1. 性别
   - 女性 (173)
   - 男性 (47)

2. 年龄 _______

3. 教育程度
   - 无 (1)
   - 小学 (0)
   - 初高中 (18)
   - 大学及以上 (171)

4. 国籍 _______

(模块二)

博主 (Social media influencers, SMIs) 是指活跃在社交媒体上并具有一定影响力的人。某种程度上，各路网络红人，不论是微博大 v，微信订阅号大号，还是知名游戏主播时装博主都能算作博主。

美妆博主 (Beauty influencers) 是指经常提供美妆方面的信息，并做出使用或购买建议的一类博主。美妆产品包括但不限于香水、彩妆、护肤品及护发用品。

5. 你有关注任何博主吗？
   - 没有 (29)
   - 1-5个 (60)
   - 6-10个 (35)
   - 11-20个 (18)
   - 超过20个 (48)

   (If No is selected, then skip to the end of survey.)

6. 请选择你通常在以下哪些平台关注这些博主？（可多选）
   - 图享 Instagram (101)
   - 图书 Facebook (46)
   - 个人博客 Blog portals (16)
   - 油管 YouTube (79)
   - 推特 Twitter (22)
   - 缤趣 Pinterest (7)
   - 微博 (77)
   - 哔哩哔哩 (34)
   - 微信订阅号 (41)

   - 其他________

7. 你有关注任何美妆博主吗？
   - 无 (40)
   - 1-5个 (76)
   - 6-10个 (23)
   - 11-20个 (8)
   - More than 20个 (14)
(If No is selected, then skip to the end of survey.)

8. 请选择你通常在以下那些平台关注这些美妆博主？（可多选）
- □ 图享 Instagram (66)
- □ 脸书 Facebook (16)
- □ 个人博客 Blog portals (14)
- □ 油管 YouTube (54)
- □ 推特 Twitter (8)
- □ 缤趣 Pinterest (7)
- □ 微博 (60)
- □ 哔哩哔哩 (27)
- □ 微信订阅号 (32)
- □ 其他 ________

9. 以下哪个选项最好地描述了你的美妆产品购买频率？
   - 三天一次/一周一次/一个月一次/三个月一次/半年一次/一年一次
   - 护肤产品 (5 / 6 / 36 / 45 / 21 / 4)
   - 彩妆产品 (6 / 11 / 38 / 30 / 16 / 15)
   - 护发产品 (3 / 7 / 29 / 54 / 18 / 6)
   - 香水香氛 (1 / 2 / 8 / 13 / 28 / 61)

10. 在购买美妆产品前，你是否会查阅一下美妆博主们的点评？
    - 从不/几乎从不/有时/通常/几乎每次/总是
    - 护肤产品 (12 / 18 / 26 / 24 / 18 / 23)
    - 彩妆产品 (13 / 12 / 17 / 25 / 21 / 33)
    - 护发产品 (27 / 24 / 27 / 16 / 14 / 13)
    - 香水香氛 (45 / 21 / 20 / 16 / 4 / 15)

11. 你是否会因为美妆博主的推荐，而购买过一些美妆产品？
    - 从不/几乎从不/有时/通常/几乎每次/总是
    - 护肤产品 (24 / 12 / 40 / 22 / 15 / 8)
    - 彩妆产品 (17 / 9 / 28 / 31 / 21 / 14)
    - 护发产品 (28 / 19 / 40 / 19 / 10 / 4)
    - 香水香氛 (48 / 24 / 26 / 12 / 7 / 1)

12. 你更偏好那种形式的点评？
    - 详细的长视频/小视频/图文说明/纯文字/音频
    - 护肤产品 (24 / 32 / 63 / 2 / 0)
    - 彩妆产品 (47 / 40 / 31 / 2 / 2)
    - 护发产品 (16 / 33 / 61 / 11 / 0)
    - 香水香氛 (9 / 28 / 63 / 21 / 0)

(模块 3)

13. 假设你现在打算购买一件彩妆产品，现在正在浏览一些关于该产品的评论。以下几人中，你会更看重谁的意见？
    - □ 一个在彩妆方面有经验有技术，还有很好的粉丝基础的博主，比如 Pony.
一个有着比前者多很多粉丝，但并非彩妆专业人士的博主，比如宇博 Chiara、papi 酱、gogoboi 等等；
一个在彩妆方面十分专业，通常是由职业化妆师，但粉丝数量和传播力远不及前二者的博主，比如 Wayne Goss、小 P 老师等等；
对我而言，没有差别。

假设你现在打算购买一件香水，现在正在浏览一些关于该产品的评论。以下几人中，你会更看重谁的意见？
一个在香水方面有经验有见解，还有很好的粉丝基础的博主；
一个有着比前者多很多粉丝，传播力和影响力很广，但对香水的经验见解较为欠缺的博主；
一个在香水方面十分专业，通常是职业调香师，但粉丝数量和传播力远不及前二者的博主；
对我而言，没有差别。

假设你现在打算购买一件护肤产品，现在正在浏览一些关于该产品的评论。以下几人中，你会更看重谁的意见？
一个在护肤方面有经验有知识，还有很好的粉丝基础的博主；
一个有着比前者多很多粉丝，传播力和影响力很广，但对护肤的经验见解较为欠缺的博主；
一个在护肤方面十分专业，可能是职业美容师，或者取得过相关学位，但粉丝数量和传播力远不及前二者的博主；
对我而言，没有差别。

假设你现在打算购买一件护发产品，现在正在浏览一些关于该产品的评论。以下几人中，你会更看重谁的意见？
一个在护发方面有经验有知识，还有很好的粉丝基础的博主；
一个有着比前者多很多粉丝，传播力和影响力很广，但对护发的经验见解较为欠缺的博主；
一个在护发方面十分专业，通常是职业发型师，但粉丝数量和传播力远不及前二者的博主；
对我而言，没有差别。

当你看见美妆博主发布了一条彩妆产品的新内容，你觉得以下三个特质分别有多重要？
完全不重要 ___1-6___ 极其重要
专业性 ___(0 / 3 / 8 / 42 / 33 / 35)___
吸引力 ___(2 / 3 / 15 / 27 / 37 / 37)___
信赖感  

18. 当你看见美妆博主发布了一条护肤产品的新内容，你觉得以下三个特质分别有多重要？

完全不重要 ___1-6___ 极其重要

专业性  （0 / 1 / 3 / 19 / 31 / 66）
吸引力  （4 / 3 / 18 / 31 / 26 / 38）
信赖感  （0 / 1 / 1 / 13 / 32 / 72）

19. 当你看见美妆博主发布了一条香水的新内容，你觉得以下三个特质分别有多重要？

完全不重要 ___1-6___ 极其重要

专业性  （11 / 5 / 26 / 31 / 27 / 20）
吸引力  （13 / 3 / 13 / 24 / 35 / 33）
信赖感  （7 / 1 / 16 / 27 / 32 / 38）

20. 当你看见美妆博主发布了一条护发产品的新内容，你觉得以下三个特质分别有多重要？

完全不重要 ___1-6___ 极其重要

专业性  （0 / 3 / 12 / 35 / 32 / 39）
吸引力  （4 / 4 / 18 / 29 / 42 / 24）
信赖感  （1 / 1 / 8 / 25 / 41 / 45）
Appendix 3 Results of Significance Tests

Table 1. Friedman test for review habits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Subset</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever looked up reviews from beauty influencers before buying them? – Fragrance</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever looked up reviews from beauty influencers before buying them? – Haircare</td>
<td>2.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever looked up reviews from beauty influencers before buying them? – Skincare</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you ever looked up reviews from beauty influencers before buying them? – Makeup</td>
<td>3.112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistic | 2.983 | <2 | <2
Sig. (2–sided test) | .084 | <2 | <2
Adjusted Sig. (2–sided test) | .161 | <2 | <2

Homogeneous subsets are based on asymptotic significances. The significance level is .05.

* Each cell shows the sample average rank.

Unable to compute because the subset contains only one sample.

Table 2. Friedman test for recommendation/purchase conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Subset</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you bought any beauty products because of recommendations from beauty influencers? – Fragrance</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you bought any beauty products because of recommendations from beauty influencers? – Haircare</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you bought any beauty products because of recommendations from beauty influencers? – Skincare</td>
<td>2.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you bought any beauty products because of recommendations from beauty influencers? – Makeup</td>
<td>3.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistic | 4.881 | <2
Sig. (2–sided test) | .027 | <2
Adjusted Sig. (2–sided test) | .054 | <2

Homogeneous subsets are based on asymptotic significances. The significance level is .05.

* Each cell shows the sample average rank.

Unable to compute because the subset contains only one sample.

Table 3. Friedman Test for preference of influencer type
### Table 4. Makeup_expertise * Fragrance_expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subset</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagine you are about to buy a fragrance and you are reading reviews of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine you are about to buy a makeup product and you are reading reviews of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine you are about to buy a skincare product and you are reading reviews of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine you are about to buy a haircare product and you are reading reviews of the product. Whose opinion would you value more?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistic: 1.860
Sig. (2-sided test): .173
Adjusted Sig. (2-sided test): .316

Homogeneous subsets are based on asymptotic significances. The significance level is .05.

1 Each cell shows the sample average rank.
2 Unable to compute because the subset contains only one sample.

### Table 5. Makeup_expertise * Skincare_expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>84.458</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>62.654</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>26.775</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases: 120

### Table 6. Makeup_expertise * Haircare_expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>84.458</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>62.654</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>26.775</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of Valid Cases: 120
### Table 7. Fragrance_expertise * Skincare_expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>85.769</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>71.587</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>36.696</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Fragrance_expertise * Haircare_expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>33.066</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>37.287</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>6.728</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Skincare_expertise * haircare_expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>64.339</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>67.581</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>19.555</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Makeup_attractiveness * Fragrance_attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>103.211</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>60.461</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>27.940</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11. Makeup_attractiveness * skincare_attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>109.500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>84.858</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>29.930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Makeup_attractiveness * haircare_attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>214.899</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>142.478</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>62.076</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. fragrance_attractiveness * skincare_attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>190.387</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>124.634</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>55.945</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. fragrance_attractiveness * haircare_attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>124.712</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>102.523</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>22.311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. skincare_attractiveness * haircare_attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>109.651</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>87.308</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>32.497</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. makeup_trustworthiness * fragrance_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>208.000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>123.002</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>46.734</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. makeup_trustworthiness * skincare_trustworthiness
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Table 18. makeup\_trustworthiness * haircare\_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>131.974*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>77.426</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>47.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. fragrance\_trustworthiness * skincare\_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>107.131*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>85.685</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>36.867</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. fragrance\_trustworthiness * haircare\_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>126.282*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>108.410</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>42.122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. skincare\_trustworthiness * haircare\_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>196.650*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>78.970</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>32.938</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. makeup\_expertise * makeup\_attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>32.303*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>33.034</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>makeup_expertise * makeup__trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>37.479⁸</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>36.740</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>12.951</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>makeup_attractiveness * makeup__trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>23.766⁸</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>27.622</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2.599</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>fragrance_expertise * fragrance__attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>122.721⁸</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>92.631</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>23.832</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>fragrance_expertise * fragrance__trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>128.280⁸</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>89.608</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>22.105</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>fragrance__attractiveness * fragrance__trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>104.538⁸</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>75.463</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>20.731</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>skincare_expertise * skincare__attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 29. skincare_expertise * skincare_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>72.408</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>40.983</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>8.851</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 30. skincare__attractiveness * skincare_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>218.622</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>97.425</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>50.465</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 31. haircare_expertise * haircare__attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>72.443</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>44.236</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>6.105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 32. haircare_expertise * haircare_trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>46.970</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>43.699</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>12.524</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 33. haircare__attractiveness * haircare_trustworthiness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>102.842</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>54.643</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>19.759</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>